United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2013 No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 21, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Send Your Spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. This is an important day for our Nation. As the Members approach the votes they are making today, may they be imbued with courage and leadership that looks to the health and vibrancy of our great Nation.

Assure them that, in the fulfillment of their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful to their duties and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations and fulfill them with integrity.

As the Congress looks to the upcoming Holy celebrations of millions of Americans, may they and may we all be mindful of God's love for us. May we be faithful stewards, not only of God's creation, but also of God's desire that all people would be free from whatever inhibits them to be fully alive.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 20, 2013 at 8:22 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 933.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO JAMES OSCAR CLEMONS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer early birthday greetings to one of America's Greatest Generation. James O. Clemons turns 90 next week, and it's important for him to know how grateful we are for his service to country.

Inducted into the Army in 1943, Mr. Clemons found himself in the Army Air Corps as a flight engineer, mechanic, and gunner. Based in Italy during World War II, Tech Sergeant Clemons and his unit, the 827th Bomb Squadron, 484th Bomb Group, 15th Air Force, flew missions in Italy, the Balkans, Austria, Germany, and southern France. A recipient of the Distinguished Flying Cross and of a number of other decorations, Tech Sergeant Clemons, like millions of other great Americans, answered his Nation's call, and as Tom

Printed on recycled paper.

Brokaw wrote in his famous book: ''They won the war. They saved the world.''

Mr. Speaker, we're losing this generation of patriots. In fact, Tech Sergeant Clemons and Tail Gunner Joseph Wythe are the last living crewmembers of his unit. So it is with a great source of honor that, in advance of his special day next week, March 27, and on behalf of the people's House, I say, Happy 90th birthday to James O. Clemons of Catoosa, Oklahoma.

JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I head back to my district tomorrow to face the thousands of people who sent me here to help them find jobs—800 days ago.

Mr. Speaker, what do I say to them? They know the real deficit is jobs. Do I say that the Republicans in Congress don't get it and that they don't understand that people are suffering and struggling and starving and looking for work? Millions of people are out of work, and this body seeks to fire millions more.

Wake up, America. It's time to bring the President's American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote. It deserves a vote.

Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be ''jobs, jobs, jobs—and more jobs.''

ESTABLISHING A SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE BENGHAZI ATTACK

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, while we are right to focus this week on passing a budget that puts our country back on a responsible economic path, I rise today to remind my colleagues that it has been over 6 months since four Americans, including our ambassador, were killed by terrorists in Benghazi, Libya.

In 6 months, what have we learned? We still don't know why U.S. military assets in the region were not ready, alert and in a position to respond. We still don't know why injured survivors of the attack have been pressured not to come forward with their stories. Frankly, we still don't know what specifically is being done to ensure that decisions about the security of our diplomatic missions are given the highest priority.

I stand with Congressman FRANK WOLF and 58 of our colleagues in supporting an effort to establish a select committee to investigate and report on the Benghazi attack. Only by aggressive congressional oversight will we ensure that our pitiful response to this attack will never be repeated.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in demanding the administration provide the straight answers that Americans deserve.

THE SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to remind this House of the threat that climate change poses to our communities and to emphasize the need for increased Federal investment in new and innovative technologies to protect and improve the world we live in.

This past October, Hurricane Sandy hit the mid-Atlantic, including my home State of New Jersey. Hurricane Sandy was one of the most costly storms in history. Society will bear the costs of climate change. Society is bearing the costs of climate change. The debt was wracked up as we recklessly burned fossil fuels over a century, filling the atmosphere with excess CO_2. Now the debts are coming due as wildfires, droughts, superstorms, and floods—a costly debt in lives and dollars.

We would be wise to invest in more resilient infrastructure and sustainable, non-fossil energy sources, in good science related to climate change. We as a country should rise to the challenge. The United States is not a poor, impoverished Nation. We are just acting like one. We should be investing as if we believe there is a future for us.

HOUSE GOP BUDGET

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the House Republican budget.

When a family racks up debt, it can take decades to pay off. The interest alone can add up to thousands of dollars. That's money that can be spent on braces, college tuition, or on a bigger home. The same is true for government.

Ignoring our debt will force us to break the promises we've made to seniors and to the poor. We won't be able to protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security for those who need it. The House Republican budget cuts spending by $4.6 trillion over 10 years, and it balances our budget within 10 years without raising taxes. In stark contrast, the House Democrat budget balances when Jesus comes back. A budget that spends too much hurts all Americans, but the poor and elderly are hurt the most.

It's time to fix our debt and get our country back on track. I urge my colleagues to support the Republican budget.

□ 0910

BALANCED DEBT REDUCTION PACKAGE

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today, thousands of Federal workers across the country, including nearly 5,000 at the Portsmouth Navy Shipyard in Kittery, Maine, will start getting furlough notices. These men and women in Kittery are some of the hardest working, most skilled and dedicated shipyard workers in America. Year in and year out, they repair and refit submarines to the highest standards, on time and on budget. Last year, some of them even risked their lives to put out a fire on board the USS *Miami* and save it from becoming a total loss.

Now the Federal Government is telling them they could have to take what could amount to a 20 percent pay cut. That is going to be a real hardship for working families in Maine and New Hampshire. And to add insult to injury, they could even have their security clearances suspended if they fall behind on their finances.

It is outrageous that Congress has not done its job and passed a balanced debt reduction package. It is outrageous that Congress has resorted to these arbitrary and extreme budget cuts. The public workers in the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and around our country deserve our thanks, not a 20 percent pay cut.

A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, with the House nearing important votes on adopting a bold, responsible plan toward a balanced budget, I rise today to speak to a question that is on the mind of many families in my district in Illinois and families across the Nation: How does Congress passing a budget directly help our economy to grow private sector jobs and restore opportunity for more American families?

The answer is actually very simple. The House Republican budget would create certainty in the job market through our commitment to reform and simplify the Tax Code, giving entrepreneurs and small businesses the confidence they need to expand and create new jobs.

Furthermore, unlike the Senate Democrats' plan, our budget would balance in 10 years without raising taxes. This would give bond houses and credit rating agencies confidence in our ability to reduce spending and get our debt under control, making it more affordable for families and small businesses to get loans.

Our budget plan means more jobs for American families. Let's act today to make that commitment to the American people.

TURNING A DEAF EAR

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on the Republican budget, better known as the Ryan budget, today. This budget has the distinction of actually being vetted by the voters of this country in the last election.

Voters said a resounding ''no'': no to the end of Medicare as we know it, no to the Medicaid cuts, no to the repeal of ObamaCare, no to the protection of the tax cuts for the superwealthy, and no to balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class.

This Ryan budget plan that this body will vote on in a few hours does exactly these things again. For the third time, the voters have said ''no.'' If we pass it, we are turning a deaf ear to the people.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Ryan budget.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, next week an important issue will be coming before our United States Supreme Court, and that is a challenge to our Defense of Marriage Act and a challenge to a proposition in the State of California.

I would encourage the Court to not be distracted by many issues circulating. The fundamental issue before the Court is this: the U.S. Supreme Court attempt to provide a radical 50–State mandate to change the definition of marriage.

I encourage the Court to uphold marriage and to uphold the will of the people represented in a vote in California and many other States, as well as a vote of the Defense of Marriage Act by this body and signed by President Bill Clinton. Uphold the will of the people. Uphold the definition of marriage. I appreciate the Supreme Court sticking to those points.

SAVING JOBS AND PREVENTING GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, transportation security officers, Customs and Border Protection, and Border Patrol agents with very devastating furloughs and cuts are jeopardizing the national security of this Nation.

Today, we can make a decision by voting on the Van Hollen Democratic substitute and a resounding ''no'' on the Republican budget. The Van Hollen bill gets rid of the sequester. It, in fact, saves 750,000 jobs and creates over 1.5 million jobs. We can do the right thing for America.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we look and do the right thing for gun control, gun regulation, gun violence prevention, and pass legislation such as H.R. 65, that is my Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act, that provides for safety locks and educational grants to train people how to be safe in using their guns and also provides for an age level for young people not being able to possess these guns.

This is a way that America wants us to go. Let us travel a pattern of saving jobs and preventing gun violence intervening in the lives of those who need our protection. That is what this Congress should be doing—providing the pathway for America's success.

CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933 as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 933, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 20, 2013, I call up the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the ''Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEC. 2. The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.
Sec. 4. Explanatory statement.
Sec. 5. Availability of funds.

DIVISION A—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—Agricultural Programs
Title II—Conservation Programs
Title III—Rural Development Programs
Title IV—Domestic Food Programs
Title V—Foreign Assistance and Related Programs
Title VI—Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration
Title VII—General provisions

DIVISION B—COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—Department of Commerce
Title II—Department of Justice
Title III—Science
Title IV—Related agencies
Title V—General provisions

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—Military Personnel
Title II—Operation and Maintenance
Title III—Procurement
Title IV—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation
Title V—Revolving and Management Funds
Title VI—Other Department of Defense Programs
Title VII—Related agencies
Title VIII—General provisions
Title IX—Overseas contingency operations

DIVISION D—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—Departmental management and operations
Title II—Security, enforcement, and investigations
Title III—Protection, preparedness, response, and recovery
Title IV—Research and development, training, and services
Title V—General provisions

DIVISION E—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—Department of Defense
Title II—Department of Veterans Affairs
Title III—Related agencies
Title IV—Overseas contingency operations
Title V—General provisions

DIVISION F—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Title I—General Provisions
Title II—Energy and Water Development
Title III—Financial Services and General Government
Title IV—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
Title V—Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
Title VI—Legislative Branch
Title VII—Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
Title VIII—Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

DIVISION G—OTHER MATTERS

REFERENCES

SEC. 3. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to ''this Act'' contained in division A, B, C, D, or E of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

SEC. 4. The explanatory statement regarding this Act printed in the Senate section of the Congressional Record on or about March 11,

2013, by the Chairwoman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall have the same effect with respect to the allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

DIVISION A—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $46,388,000, of which not to exceed $5,051,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed $498,000 shall be available for the Office of Tribal Relations; not to exceed $1,496,000 shall be available for the Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination; not to exceed $1,422,000 shall be available for the Office of Advocacy and Outreach; not to exceed $25,046,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, of which $24,242,000 shall be available for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration, security, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department; not to exceed $3,869,000 shall be available for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch; and not to exceed $9,006,000 shall be available for the Office of Communications: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: Provided further, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent: Provided further, That not to exceed $11,000 of the amount made available under this paragraph for the immediate Office of the Secretary shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: Provided further, That the amount made available under this heading for Departmental Administration shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations may be transferred to agencies of the Department of Agriculture funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level: Provided further, That no funds made available under this heading for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations may be obligated after 30 days from the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary has notified the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on the allocation of these funds by USDA agency.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Economist, $16,008,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be for grants or cooperative agreements for policy research under 7 U.S.C. 3155 and shall be obligated within 90 days of the enactment of this Act.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, $14,225,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, $9,049,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, $44,031,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, $6,247,000: Provided, That no funds made available by this appropriation may be obligated for FAIR Act or Circular A–76 activities until the Secretary has submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the Department's contracting out policies, including agency budgets for contracting out.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, $893,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $22,692,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for alterations and other actions needed for the Department and its agencies to consolidate unneeded space into configurations suitable for release to the Administrator of General Services, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings and facilities, and for related costs, $271,336,000, to remain available until expended, of which $175,694,000 shall be available for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; of which $13,473,000 is for payments to the Department of Homeland Security for building security activities; and of which $82,169,000 is for buildings operations and maintenance expenses: Provided, That the Secretary may use unobligated prior year balances of an agency or office that are no longer available for new obligation to cover shortfalls incurred in prior year rental payments for such agency or office: Provided further, That the Secretary is authorized to transfer funds from a Departmental agency to this account to recover the full cost of the space and security expenses of that agency that are funded by this account when the actual costs exceed the agency estimate which will be available for the activities and payments described herein.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), $3,992,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, $89,016,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, and including not to exceed $125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $45,074,000.

OFFICE OF ETHICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Ethics, $3,405,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics, $893,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service, $77,397,000.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service, $179,477,000, of which up to $62,500,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Agricultural Research Service and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, $1,101,853,000: Provided, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: Provided further, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $375,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,200,000, and except for 10 buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $750,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $375,000, whichever is greater: Provided further, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: Provided further, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center: Provided further, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): Provided further, That appropriations

hereunder shall be available for granting easements at any Agricultural Research Service location for the construction of a research facility by a non-Federal entity for use by, and acceptable to, the Agricultural Research Service and a condition of the easements shall be that upon completion the facility shall be accepted by the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds herein, if the Secretary finds that acceptance of the facility is in the interest of the United States: Provided further, That section 732(b) of division A of Public Law 112–55 (125 Stat. 587) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The conveyance authority provided by this subsection expires September 30, 2013, and all conveyances under this subsection must be completed by that date.'': Provided further, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, $738,638,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Research and Education Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: Provided, That funds for research grants for 1994 institutions, education grants for 1890 institutions, capacity building for non-land-grant colleges of agriculture, the agriculture and food research initiative, Critical Agricultural Materials Act, veterinary medicine loan repayment, multicultural scholars, graduate fellowship and institution challenge grants, and grants management systems shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each institution eligible to receive funds under the Evans-Allen program receives no less than $1,000,000: Provided further, That funds for education grants for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions be made available to individual eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions with funds awarded equally to each of the States of Alaska and Hawaii: Provided further, That funds for education grants for 1890 institutions shall be made available to institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 and 3222.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $11,880,000, to remain available until expended.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

For payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, the Northern Marianas, and American Samoa, $475,854,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Extension Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: Provided, That funds for facility improvements at 1890 institutions shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 for cooperative extension receive no less than $1,000,000: Provided further, That funds for cooperative extension under sections 3(b) and (c) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b) and (c)) and section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471 shall be available for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

For the integrated research, education, and extension grants programs, including necessary administrative expenses, $21,482,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Integrated Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: Provided, That funds for the Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, $893,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, including up to $30,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4085), $821,851,000, of which $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds (''contingency fund'') to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions; of which $15,970,000, to remain available until expended, shall be used for the cotton pests program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones; of which $36,858,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for Animal Health Technical Services; of which $696,000 shall be for activities under the authority of the Horse Protection Act of 1970, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1831); of which $52,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be used to support avian health; of which $4,335,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for information technology infrastructure; of which $153,950,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for specialty crop pests; of which, $9,068,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for field crop and rangeland ecosystem pests; of which $56,638,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for tree and wood pests; of which $2,750,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the National Veterinary Stockpile; of which up to $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the scrapie program for indemnities; of which $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the wildlife damage management program for aviation safety: Provided, That of amounts available under this heading for wildlife services methods development, $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That of amounts available under this heading for the screwworm program, $4,971,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: Provided further, That in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with sections 10411 and 10417 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8310 and 8316) and sections 431 and 442 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7751 and 7772), and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: Provided further, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 2013, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be reimbursed to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $3,175,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service, $78,863,000: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $62,592,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: Provided, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $20,056,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,331,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, $40,261,000: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed $50,000,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: Provided, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety, $811,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, including not to exceed $50,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $1,001,427,000; and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1327 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 138f): Provided, That funds provided for the Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure system shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That no fewer than 148 full-time equivalent positions shall be employed during fiscal year 2013 for purposes dedicated solely to inspections and enforcement related to the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act: Provided further, That the Food Safety and Inspection Service shall continue implementation of section 11016 of Public Law 110–246: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, $893,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Farm Service Agency, $1,208,290,000: Provided, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: Provided further, That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: Provided further, That funds made available to county committees shall remain available until expended.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $4,369,000.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out wellhead or groundwater protection activities under section 1240O of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–2), $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products under a dairy indemnity program, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such program is carried out by the Secretary in the same manner as the dairy indemnity program described in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–387, 114 Stat. 1549A–12).

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed farm ownership (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.) and operating (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.) loans, emergency loans (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), Indian tribe land acquisition loans (25 U.S.C. 488), boll weevil loans (7 U.S.C. 1989), guaranteed conservation loans (7 U.S.C. 1924 et seq.), and Indian highly fractionated land loans (25 U.S.C. 488) to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: $1,500,000,000 for guaranteed farm ownership loans and $475,000,000 for farm ownership direct loans; $1,500,000,000 for unsubsidized guaranteed operating loans and $1,050,090,000 for direct operating loans; emergency loans, $34,658,000; Indian tribe land acquisition loans, $2,000,000; guaranteed conservation loans, $150,000,000; Indian highly fractionated land loans, $10,000,000; and for boll weevil eradication program loans, $100,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary shall deem the pink bollworm to be a boll weevil for the purpose of boll weevil eradication program loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans and grants, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership, $20,140,000 for direct loans; farm operating loans, $58,490,000 for direct operating loans, $17,850,000 for unsubsidized guaranteed operating loans, emergency loans, $1,317,000, to remain available until expended; and Indian highly fractionated land loans, $173,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $312,897,000, of which $304,977,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

Funds appropriated by this Act to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Program Account for farm ownership, operating and conservation direct loans and guaranteed loans may be transferred among these programs: Provided, That the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses of the Risk Management Agency, $74,900,000: Provided, That the funds made available under section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) may be used for the Common Information Management System: Provided further, That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1516), such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11): Provided, That of the funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i) for the conduct of its business with the Foreign Agricultural Service, up to $5,000,000 may be transferred to and used by the Foreign Agricultural Service for information resource management activities of the Foreign Agricultural Service that are not related to Commodity Credit Corporation business.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(LIMITATION ON EXPENSES)

For the current fiscal year, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for site investigation and cleanup expenses, and operations and maintenance expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9607(g)), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6961).

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, $893,000.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $830,998,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed $250,000: Provided further, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Under the authorities of section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, $14,700,000 is provided.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, $893,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs

in the Rural Development mission area, including activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; $206,857,000: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the Rural Development mission area: Provided further, That any balances available from prior years for the Rural Utilities Service, Rural Housing Service, and the Rural Business—Cooperative Service salaries and expenses accounts shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: $900,000,000 shall be for direct loans and $24,000,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $27,952,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $31,277,000 for section 515 rental housing; $150,000,000 for section 538 guaranteed multi-family housing loans; $10,000,000 for credit sales of single family housing acquired property; and $5,000,000 for section 523 self-help housing land development loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: section 502 loans, $53,730,000 shall be for direct loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $3,821,000; and repair, rehabilitation, and new construction of section 515 rental housing, $11,000,000: Provided, That to support the loan program level for section 538 guaranteed loans made available under this heading the Secretary may charge or adjust any fees to cover the projected cost of such loan guarantees pursuant to the provisions of the Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), and the interest on such loans may not be subsidized: Provided further, That applicants in communities that have a current rural area waiver under section 541 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490q) shall be treated as living in a rural area for purposes of section 502 guaranteed loans provided under this heading: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated in this paragraph, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: Provided further, That of the amounts available under this paragraph for section 502 direct loans, no less than $5,000,000 shall be available for direct loans for individuals whose homes will be built pursuant to a program funded with a mutual and self help housing grant authorized by section 523 of the Housing Act of 1949 until June 1, 2013.

In addition, for the cost of direct loans, grants, and contracts, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1484 and 1486, $16,526,000, to remain available until expended, for direct farm labor housing loans and domestic farm labor housing grants and contracts: Provided, That any balances available for the Farm Labor Program Account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $410,627,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, $907,128,000; and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: Provided, That of this amount not less than $3,000,000 is available for newly constructed units financed under sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949: Provided further, That rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed during the current fiscal year shall be funded for a 1-year period: Provided further, That any unexpended balances remaining at the end of such 1-year agreements may be transferred and used for the purposes of any debt reduction; maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of any existing projects; preservation; and rental assistance activities authorized under title V of the Act: Provided further, That rental assistance provided under agreements entered into prior to fiscal year 2013 for a farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act may not be recaptured for use in another project until such assistance has remained unused for a period of 12 consecutive months, if such project has a waiting list of tenants seeking such assistance or the project has rental assistance eligible tenants who are not receiving such assistance: Provided further, That such recaptured rental assistance shall, to the extent practicable, be applied to another farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the rural housing voucher program as authorized under section 542 of the Housing Act of 1949, but notwithstanding subsection (b) of such section, and for additional costs to conduct a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of multi-family rental housing properties described in this paragraph, $27,782,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, $10,000,000, shall be available for rural housing vouchers to any low-income household (including those not receiving rental assistance) residing in a property financed with a section 515 loan which has been prepaid after September 30, 2005: Provided further, That the amount of such voucher shall be the difference between comparable market rent for the section 515 unit and the tenant paid rent for such unit: Provided further, That funds made available for such vouchers shall be subject to the availability of annual appropriations: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, administer such vouchers with current regulations and administrative guidance applicable to section 8 housing vouchers administered by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: Provided further, That if the Secretary determines that the amount made available for vouchers in this or any other Act is not needed for vouchers, the Secretary may use such funds for the demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of multi-family rental housing properties described in this paragraph: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $17,782,000 shall be available for a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the sections 514, 515, and 516 multi-family rental housing properties to restructure existing USDA multi-family housing loans, as the Secretary deems appropriate, expressly for the purposes of ensuring the project has sufficient resources to preserve the project for the purpose of providing safe and affordable housing for low-income residents and farm laborers including reducing or eliminating interest; deferring loan payments, subordinating, reducing or reamortizing loan debt; and other financial assistance including advances, payments and incentives (including the ability of owners to obtain reasonable returns on investment) required by the Secretary: Provided further, That the Secretary shall as part of the preservation and revitalization agreement obtain a restrictive use agreement consistent with the terms of the restructuring: Provided further, That if the Secretary determines that additional funds for vouchers described in this paragraph are needed, funds for the preservation and revitalization demonstration program may be used for such vouchers: Provided further, That if Congress enacts legislation to permanently authorize a multi-family rental housing loan restructuring program similar to the demonstration program described herein, the Secretary may use funds made available for the demonstration program under this heading to carry out such legislation with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: Provided further, That in addition to any other available funds, the Secretary may expend not more than $1,000,000 total, from the program funds made available under this heading, for administrative expenses for activities funded under this heading.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Mutual and Self-Help Grants allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for very low-income housing repair and rural housing preservation made by the Rural Housing Service, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, and 1490m, $33,136,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Housing Assistance Grants allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $2,200,000,000 for direct loans and $57,481,000 for guaranteed loans.

For the cost of guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $3,880,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost of grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $28,428,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $6,121,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available for a Rural Community Development Initiative: Provided further, That such funds shall be used solely to develop the capacity and ability of private, nonprofit community-based housing and community development organizations, low-income rural communities, and Federally Recognized Native American Tribes to undertake projects to improve housing, community facilities, community and economic development projects in rural areas: Provided further, That such funds shall be made available to qualified

private, nonprofit and public intermediary organizations proposing to carry out a program of financial and technical assistance: Provided further, That such intermediary organizations shall provide matching funds from other sources, including Federal funds for related activities, in an amount not less than funds provided: Provided further, That $5,938,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be to provide grants for facilities in rural communities with extreme unemployment and severe economic depression (Public Law 106–387), with up to 5 percent for administration and capacity building in the State rural development offices: Provided further, That $3,369,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available for community facilities grants to tribal colleges, as authorized by section 306(a)(19) of such Act: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Community Facilities Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: Provided further, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading.

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of loan guarantees and grants, for the rural business development programs authorized by sections 306 and 310B and described in subsections (f) and (g) of section 310B and section 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $85,904,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be made available for two grants to qualified national organizations to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to the Delta Regional Authority (7 U.S.C. 2009aa et seq.) for any Rural Community Advancement Program purpose as described in section 381E(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, of which not more than 5 percent may be used for administrative expenses: Provided further, That $4,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for business grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, including $250,000 for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Business Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in section 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: Provided further, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to funds made available under this heading.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), $18,889,000.

For the cost of direct loans, $6,052,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), of which $900,000 shall be available through June 30, 2013, for Federally Recognized Native American Tribes; and of which $2,000,000 shall be available through June 30, 2013, for Mississippi Delta Region counties (as determined in accordance with Public Law 100–460): Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, $4,438,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $33,077,000.

Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, $180,000,000 shall not be obligated and $180,000,000 are rescinded.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932), $27,706,000, of which $2,250,000 shall be for cooperative agreements for the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program: Provided, That not to exceed $3,456,000 shall be for grants for cooperative development centers, individual cooperatives, or groups of cooperatives that serve socially disadvantaged groups and a majority of the boards of directors or governing boards of which are comprised of individuals who are members of socially disadvantaged groups; and of which $15,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for value-added agricultural product market development grants, as authorized by section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

For the cost of a program of loan guarantees, under the same terms and conditions as authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107), $3,400,000: Provided, That the cost of loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants for the rural water, waste water, waste disposal, and solid waste management programs authorized by sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, 306E, and 310B and described in sections 306C(a)(2), 306D, 306E, and 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $524,466,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306(a)(2)(B) of such Act, and of which not to exceed $993,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306E of such Act: Provided, That $66,500,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for loans and grants including water and waste disposal systems grants authorized by 306C(a)(2)(B) and 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, Federally recognized Native American Tribes authorized by 306C(a)(1), and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (of the State of Hawaii): Provided further, That funding provided for section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may be provided to a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of Public Law 105–83: Provided further, That not more than 2 percent of the funding provided for section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may be used by the State of Alaska for training and technical assistance programs and not more than 2 percent of the funding provided for section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may be used by a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of Public Law 105–83 for training and technical assistance programs: Provided further, That not to exceed $19,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for technical assistance grants for rural water and waste systems pursuant to section 306(a)(14) of such Act, unless the Secretary makes a determination of extreme need, of which $5,750,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified non-profit multistate regional technical assistance organization, with experience in working with small communities on water and waste water problems, the principal purpose of such grant shall be to assist rural communities with populations of 3,300 or less, in improving the planning, financing, development, operation, and management of water and waste water systems, and of which not less than $800,000 shall be for a qualified national Native American organization to provide technical assistance for rural water systems for tribal communities: Provided further, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: Provided further, That not to exceed $3,400,000 shall be for solid waste management grants: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2012, shall be available through June 30, 2013, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: Provided further, That $10,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to, and merged with, the Rural Utilities Service, High Energy Cost Grants Account to provide grants authorized under section 19 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 918a): Provided further, That any prior year balances for high-energy cost grants authorized by section 19 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 918a) shall be transferred to and merged with the Rural Utilities Service, High Energy Cost Grants Account: Provided further, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading.

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans as authorized by section 1006a of title 16 of the United States Code, except for the limitations contained in the last sentence of such section, for projects whose features include agricultural water supply benefits, groundwater protection, environmental enhancement and flood control, $40,000,000: Provided, That such loans shall be made by the Rural Utilities Service.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by sections 305 and 306 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C.

935 and 936) shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $100,000,000; loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric, $6,500,000,000; guaranteed underwriting loans pursuant to section 313A, $500,000,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, $690,000,000: Provided, That up to $2,000,000,000 shall be used for the construction, acquisition, or improvement of fossil-fueled electric generating plants (whether new or existing) that utilize carbon sequestration systems.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $34,467,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

For the principal amount of broadband telecommunication loans, $42,239,000.

For grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., $24,950,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $3,000,000 shall be made available for grants authorized by 379G of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: Provided further, That funding provided under this heading for grants under 379G of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may only be provided to entities that meet all of the eligibility criteria for a consortium as established by this section: Provided further, That $3,000,000 shall be made available to those noncommercial educational television broadcast stations that serve rural areas and are qualified for Community Service Grants by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting under section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, including associated translators and repeaters, regardless of the location of their main transmitter, studio-to-transmitter links, and equipment to allow local control over digital content and programming through the use of high-definition broadcast, multi-casting and datacasting technologies.

For the cost of broadband loans, as authorized by section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act, $4,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the cost of direct loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, $10,372,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant program to finance broadband transmission in rural areas eligible for Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program benefits authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, $811,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; $19,916,436,000, to remain available through September 30, 2014, of which such sums as are made available under section 14222(b)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246), as amended by this Act, shall be merged with and available for the same time period and purposes as provided herein: Provided, That of the total amount available, $16,504,000 shall be available to carry out section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.): Provided further, That of the total amount available, $35,000,000 shall be available to provide competitive grants to State agencies for subgrants to local educational agencies and schools to purchase the equipment needed to serve healthier meals, improve food safety, and to help support the establishment, maintenance, or expansion of the school breakfast program.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $7,046,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2014: Provided, That notwithstanding section 17(h)(10) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(10)), not less than $60,000,000 shall be used for breastfeeding peer counselors and other related activities, $14,000,000 shall be used for infrastructure, and $35,000,000 shall be used for management information systems: Provided further, That funds made available for the purposes specified in section 17(h)(10)(B)(i) and section 17(h)(10)(B)(ii) shall only be made available upon a determination by the Secretary that funds are available to meet caseload requirements without the use of funds in the contingency reserve that are without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of such Act: Provided further, That none of the funds provided shall be available for activities that are not fully reimbursed by other Federal Government departments or agencies unless authorized by section 17 of such Act.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), $77,290,160,000, of which $3,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2014, shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: Provided, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $998,000 may be used to provide nutrition education services to state agencies and Federally recognized tribes participating in the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: Provided further, That funds made available for Employment and Training under this heading shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding section 16(h)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading may be used to enter into contracts and employ staff to conduct studies, evaluations, or to conduct activities related to program integrity provided that such activities are authorized by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out disaster assistance and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note); the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983; special assistance for the nuclear affected islands, as authorized by section 103(f)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–188); and the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, $253,952,000, to remain available through September 30, 2014: Provided, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective with funds made available in fiscal year 2013 to support the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, such funds shall remain available through September 30, 2014: Provided further, That of the funds made available under section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)), the Secretary may use up to 10 percent for costs associated with the distribution of commodities.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service for carrying out any domestic nutrition assistance program, $143,505,000: Provided, That of the funds provided herein, $2,000,000 shall be used for the purposes of section 4404 of Public Law 107–171, as amended by section 4401 of Public Law 110–246.

TITLE V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including not to exceed $158,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $176,789,000: Provided, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1737) and the foreign assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development: Provided further, That funds made available for middle-income country training programs, funds made available for the Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellowship program, and up to $2,000,000 of the Foreign Agricultural Service appropriation solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation by the Foreign Agricultural Service, shall remain available until expended.

FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE I DIRECT CREDIT AND FOOD FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of title I, Food for Peace Act (Public Law 83–480) and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, $2,806,000, shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses'': Provided, That funds made available for the cost of agreements under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably between the two accounts with prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Food for Peace Act (Public Law 83–480, as amended), for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, $1,435,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MCGOVERN–DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1), $184,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to provide the services, facilities, and authorities for the purpose of implementing such section, subject to reimbursement from amounts provided herein.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT (LOANS) CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $6,806,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which $6,452,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Foreign Agricultural Service, Salaries and Expenses'', and of which $354,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCY AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; and notwithstanding section 521 of Public Law 107–188; $4,223,295,000: Provided, That of the amount provided under this heading, $718,669,000 shall be derived from prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379h, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and shall not include any fees pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379h(a)(2) and (a)(3) assessed for fiscal year 2014 but collected in fiscal year 2013; $97,722,000 shall be derived from medical device user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $299,000,000 shall be derived from human generic drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–42, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $20,242,000 shall be derived from biosimilar biological product user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–52, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $23,848,000 shall be derived from animal drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–12, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $6,031,000 shall be derived from animal generic drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–21, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $505,000,000 shall be derived from tobacco product user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 387s, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $12,925,000 shall be derived from food and feed recall fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–31, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $15,367,000 shall be derived from food reinspection fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–31, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; and amounts derived from voluntary qualified importer program fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–31, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: Provided further, That in addition and notwithstanding any other provision under this heading, amounts collected for prescription drug user fees, medical device user fees, human generic drug user fees, biosimilar biological product user fees, animal drug user fees, and animal generic drug user fees that exceed the respective fiscal year 2013 limitations are appropriated and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: Provided further, That fees derived from prescription drug, medical device, animal drug, and animal generic drug assessments for fiscal year 2013 received during fiscal year 2013, including any such fees assessed prior to fiscal year 2013 but credited for fiscal year 2013, shall be subject to the fiscal year 2013 limitations: Provided further, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated: (1) $887,162,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) $1,261,369,000 shall be for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (3) $329,708,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) $167,576,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) $393,988,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) $59,429,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) $482,398,000 shall be for the Center for Tobacco Products and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (8) not to exceed $168,971,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, of which $61,713,000 is for White Oak Consolidation, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration for rent; (9) not to exceed $213,352,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; and (10) $259,342,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Office of Foods and Veterinary Medicine, the Office of Medical and Tobacco Products, the Office of Global and Regulatory Policy, the Office of Operations, the Office of the Chief Scientist, and central services for these offices: Provided further, That the Secretary may, prior to the due date for such fees, accept payment of prescription drug user fees, medical device user fees, human generic drug user fees, biosimilar biological product user fees, animal drug user fees and animal generic drug user fees authorized for fiscal year 2014, and that amounts of such fees assessed for fiscal year 2014 for which the Secretary accepts payment in fiscal year 2013 shall not be included in amounts provided under this heading: Provided further, That not to exceed $25,000 of this amount shall be for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Commissioner: Provided further, That any transfer of funds pursuant to section 770(n) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379dd(n)) shall only be from amounts made available under this heading for other activities: Provided further, That funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263b, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381, and priority review user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 360n may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $5,320,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $63,300,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions, including the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 204 passenger motor vehicles of which 170 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles: Provided, That notwithstanding this section, the only purchase of new passenger vehicles shall be for those determined by the Secretary to be necessary for transportation safety, to reduce operational costs, and for the protection of life, property, and public safety.

SEC. 702. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer unobligated balances of discretionary funds appropriated by this Act or any other available unobligated discretionary balances of the Department of Agriculture that are remaining available at the end of the fiscal year, to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services of primary benefit to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, such transferred funds to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the prior approval of the agency administrator: Provided further, That none of the funds transferred to the Working Capital Fund pursuant to this section shall be available for obligation without written notification to and the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or made available to the Department's Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation or expenditure to make any changes to the Department's National Finance Center without written notification to and prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress as required by section 726 of this Act: Provided further, That of annual income amounts in the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture allocated for the National Finance Center, the Secretary may reserve not more than 4 percent for the replacement or acquisition of capital equipment, including equipment for the improvement and implementation of a financial management plan, information technology, and other systems of the National Finance Center or to pay any unforeseen, extraordinary cost of the National Finance Center: Provided further, That none of the amounts reserved shall be available for obligation unless the Secretary submits written notification of the obligation to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That the limitation on the obligation of funds pending notification to Congressional Committees shall not apply to any obligation that, as determined by the Secretary, is necessary to respond to a declared state of emergency that significantly impacts the operations of the National Finance Center; or to evacuate employees of the National Finance Center to a safe haven to continue operations of the National Finance Center.

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 704. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost

rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 705. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year for the following accounts: the Rural Development Loan Fund program account, the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program account, and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account.

SEC. 706. Funds made available by this Act under title II of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.) may only be used to provide assistance to recipient nations if adequate monitoring and controls, as determined by the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, are in place to ensure that emergency food aid is received by the intended beneficiaries in areas affected by food shortages and not diverted for unauthorized or inappropriate purposes.

SEC. 707. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without written notification to and the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: Provided further, That none of the funds available to the Department of Agriculture for information technology shall be obligated for projects over $25,000 prior to receipt of written approval by the Chief Information Officer.

SEC. 708. Funds made available under section 1240I and section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 and section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)) in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any former RUS borrower that has repaid or prepaid an insured, direct or guaranteed loan under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, or any not-for-profit utility that is eligible to receive an insured or direct loan under such Act, shall be eligible for assistance under section 313(b)(2)(B) of such Act in the same manner as a borrower under such Act.

SEC. 710. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purposes of a grant under section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to prohibit the provision of in-kind support from non-Federal sources under section 412(e)(3) of such Act in the form of unrecovered indirect costs not otherwise charged against the grant, consistent with the indirect rate of cost approved for a recipient.

SEC. 711. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, unobligated balances from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses in this Act for the Farm Service Agency and the Rural Development mission area, shall remain available through September 30, 2014, for information technology expenses.

SEC. 712. The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a State agency to use funds provided in this Act to exceed the maximum amount of liquid infant formula specified in 7 CFR 246.10 when issuing liquid infant formula to participants.

SEC. 713. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 714. In the case of each program established or amended by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246), other than by title I or subtitle A of title III of such Act, that is authorized or required to be carried out using funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

(1) such funds shall be available for salaries and related administrative expenses, including technical assistance, associated with the implementation of the program, without regard to the limitation on the total amount of allotments and fund transfers contained in section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i); and

(2) the use of such funds for such purpose shall not be considered to be a fund transfer or allotment for purposes of applying the limitation on the total amount of allotments and fund transfers contained in such section.

SEC. 715. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1736f(e)(1) may be waived for any amounts higher than those specified under this authority for fiscal year 2009.

SEC. 716. None of the funds made available in fiscal year 2013 or preceding fiscal years for programs authorized under the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) in excess of $20,000,000 shall be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the release of eligible commodities under section 302(f)(2)(A) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f–1): Provided, That any such funds made available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation shall only be used pursuant to section 302(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.

SEC. 717. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than $1,800,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 718. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs charged against any agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture that exceed 30 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award: Provided, That notwithstanding section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310), funds provided by this Act for grants awarded competitively by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture shall be available to pay full allowable indirect costs for each grant awarded under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

SEC. 719. For an additional amount for ''Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses'', $50,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $40,000,000 is for one-time activities directly related to implementation of the Food Safety Modernization Act, and of which $10,000,000 is for one-time activities directly related to improving the safety of the human drug supply.

SEC. 720. There is hereby appropriated $1,996,000 to carry out section 1621 of Public Law 110–246.

SEC. 721. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the following:

(1) The Watershed Rehabilitation program authorized by section 14(h) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h));

(2) The Environmental Quality Incentives Program as authorized by sections 1240–1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3839aa–8) in excess of $1,400,000,000;

(3) The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Act authorized by section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–1)) in excess of $73,000,000; and

(4) Agricultural Management Assistance Program as authorized by section 524 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1524) in excess of $2,500,000 for the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

SEC. 722. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out a program under subsection (b)(2)(A)(v) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246 in excess of $981,000,000, as follows: Child Nutrition Programs Entitlement Commodities—$465,000,000; State Option Contracts—$5,000,000; Removal of Defective Commodities—$2,500,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act shall be used for salaries and expenses to carry out in this fiscal year section 19(i)(1)(E) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act as amended by section 4304 of Public Law 110–246 in excess of $41,000,000, including the transfer of funds under subsection (c) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246, until October 1, 2013: Provided further, That $117,000,000 made available on October 1, 2013, to carry out section 19(i)(1)(E) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act as amended by section 4304 of Public Law 110–246 shall be excluded from the limitation described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(vi) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any employee of the Department of Agriculture or officer of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out clause 3 of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 (Public Law 74–320, 7 U.S.C. 612c, as amended), or for any surplus removal activities or price support activities under section 5 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act: Provided further, That of the available unobligated balances under (b)(2)(A)(v) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246, $150,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 723. Subject to authorizing legislation by the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the Secretary may reserve, through April 1, 2013, up to 5 percent of the funding available for the following items for projects in areas that are engaged in strategic regional development planning as defined by the Secretary: business and industry guaranteed loans; rural development loan fund; rural business enterprise grants; rural business opportunity grants; rural economic development program; rural microenterprise program; biorefinery assistance program; rural energy for America program; value-added producer grants; broadband program; water and waste program; and rural community facilities program.

SEC. 724. There is hereby appropriated $600,000 for the purposes of section 727 of division A of Public Law 112–55.

SEC. 725. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that

have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the budget unless such budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2014 appropriations Act.

SEC. 726. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming, transfer of funds, or reimbursements as authorized by the Economy Act, or in the case of the Department of Agriculture, through use of the authority provided by section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or section 8 of Public Law 89–106 (7 U.S.C. 2263), that—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(4) relocates an office or employees;

(5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

(6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees;

unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (as the case may be) notifies, in writing, the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days in advance of the reprogramming of such funds or the use of such authority.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming or use of the authorities referred to in subsection (a) involving funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that—

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or

(3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (as the case may be) notifies, in writing, the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days in advance of the reprogramming or transfer of such funds or the use of such authority.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall notify in writing the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress before implementing any program or activity not carried out during the previous fiscal year unless the program or activity is funded by this Act or specifically funded by any other Act.

(d) As described in this section, no funds may be used for any activities unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission receives from the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress written or electronic mail confirmation of receipt of the notification as required in this section.

SEC. 727. Notwithstanding section 310B(g)(5) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(5)), the Secretary may assess a one-time fee for any guaranteed business and industry loan in an amount that does not exceed 3 percent of the guaranteed principal portion of the loan.

SEC. 728. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 729. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this Act, may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 730. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act or any other Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 731. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any area eligible for rural housing programs of the Rural Housing Service on September 30, 2012, shall remain eligible for such programs until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 732. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 733. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 734. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who provide nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8731).

SEC. 735. In the event that a determination of non-regulated status made pursuant to section 411 of the Plant Protection Act is or has been invalidated or vacated, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon request by a farmer, grower, farm operator, or producer, immediately grant temporary permit(s) or temporary deregulation in part, subject to necessary and appropriate conditions consistent with section 411(a) or 412(c) of the Plant Protection Act, which interim conditions shall authorize the movement, introduction, continued cultivation, commercialization and other specifically enumerated activities and requirements, including measures designed to mitigate or minimize potential adverse environmental effects, if any, relevant to the Secretary's evaluation of the petition for non-regulated status, while ensuring that growers or other users are able to move, plant, cultivate, introduce into commerce and carry out other authorized activities in a timely manner: Provided, That all such conditions shall be applicable only for the interim period necessary for the Secretary to complete any required analyses or consultations related to the petition for non-regulated status: Provided further, That nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the Secretary's authority under section 411, 412 and 414 of the Plant Protection Act.

SEC. 736. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay for mitigation associated with the removal of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project number 2342.

SEC. 737. Of the unobligated balance of funds available to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of broadband loans under the heading ''Rural Development Programs—Rural Utilities Service—Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program'' in prior appropriation Acts, $25,320,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 738. Of the unobligated balances provided pursuant to section 9004(d)(1) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8104), $28,045,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 739. Funds received by the Secretary of Agriculture in the global settlement of any Federal litigation concerning Federal mortgage loans during fiscal year 2012 may be expended, in addition to any other available funds, by the Rural Housing Service to pay for costs associated with servicing single family housing loans guaranteed by the Rural Housing Service and such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 740. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, and the Chairman of the Farm Credit Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed spending plan by program, project, and activity for the funds made available under this Act.

SEC. 741. There is hereby appropriated for the ''Emergency Conservation Program'', $11,100,000, to remain available until expended; for the ''Emergency Forestry Restoration Program'', $14,200,000, to remain available until expended; and for the ''Emergency Watershed Protection Program'', $65,454,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not less than $48,257,000 made available for the Emergency Watershed Protection Program under this general provision are provided for necessary expenses for a major disaster declaration issued under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et. seq.).

SEC. 742. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to write, prepare, or publish a final rule or an interim final rule in furtherance of, or otherwise to implement, ''Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI, of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act'' (75 Fed. Reg. 35338 (June 22, 2010)) unless the combined annual cost to the economy of such rules does not exceed $100,000,000 or such rules have already been published in compliance

with Section 721 of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012, Public Law 112–55: Provided, That no funds made available by this or any other Act be used to publish a final or interim final rule in furtherance of, or otherwise to implement, proposed sections 201.2(l), 201.2(t), 201.2(u), 201.3(c), 201.210, 201.211, 201.213, or 201.214 of ''Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act'' (75 Fed. Reg. 35338 (June 22, 2010)): Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement such rules until 60 days from the publication date of such rules: Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce or to take regulatory action based on or in furtherance of sections 201.2(o), 201.3(a), or 201.215(a), of Title 9 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as they exist at the time this Act is passed, or to write, prepare, or publish a final or interim final rule in furtherance of, or otherwise to implement, the definitions or criteria embodied in these sections: Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within 60 days, rescind sections 201.2(o), 201.3(a), or 201.215(a), of Title 9 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 743. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amount made available for buildings operations and maintenance expenses in the matter before the first proviso under the heading ''AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS'' under the heading ''AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS'' in title I shall be $52,169,000;

(2) the amount made available for necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act in the matter before the first proviso under the heading ''FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE'' under the heading ''AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS'' in title I shall be $1,056,427,000; and

(3) the amount made available to provide competitive grants to State agencies in the second proviso under the heading ''CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS'' under the heading ''FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE'' under the heading ''DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS'' in title IV shall be $10,000,000.

This division may be cited as the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013''.

DIVISION B—COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to sections 3702 and 3703 of title 44, United States Code; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the International Trade Administration between two points abroad, without regard to section 40118 of title 49, United States Code; employment of citizens of the United States and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $294,300 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed $45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, $482,538,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $11,360,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International Trade Administration, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: Provided, That, of amounts provided under this heading, not less than $16,400,000 shall be for China antidumping and countervailing duty enforcement and compliance activities: Provided further, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities; and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of citizens of the United States and aliens by contract for services abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $13,500 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by section 1(b) of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223; 22 U.S.C. 401(b)); and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law, $101,796,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities: Provided further, That payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided as part of such activities may be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities, and for providing information to the public with respect to the export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce and other export control programs of the United States and other governments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for trade adjustment assistance, for the cost of loan guarantees authorized by section 26 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3721), and for grants, and for the cost of loan guarantees authorized by section 27 (15 U.S.C. 3722) of such Act, $187,300,000, to remain available until expended; of which $5,000,000 shall be for projects to facilitate the relocation, to the United States, of a source of employment located outside the United States; of which $5,000,000 shall be for loan guarantees under section 26; and of which up to $5,000,000 shall be for loan guarantees under section 27: Provided, That the costs for loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds for loan guarantees under such sections 26 and 27 combined are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $70,000,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, $37,500,000: Provided, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, $28,689,000.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, $100,228,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing and publishing statistics, provided for by law, $256,255,000: Provided, That, from amounts provided herein, funds may be used for promotion, outreach, and marketing activities.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing and publishing statistics for periodic censuses and programs, provided for by law, $667,953,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That $649,953,000 is appropriated from the general fund and $18,000,000 is derived from available unobligated balances from the Census Working Capital Fund: Provided further, That from amounts provided herein, funds may be used for promotion, outreach, and marketing activities: Provided further, That within the amounts appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' account for activities associated with carrying out investigations and audits related to the Bureau of the Census.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), $45,994,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce shall charge Federal agencies for costs incurred in spectrum management, analysis, operations, and related services, and such fees shall be retained and used as offsetting collections for costs of such spectrum services, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of NTIA, in furtherance of its assigned

functions under this paragraph, and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For the administration of prior-year grants, recoveries and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated are available for the administration of all open grants until their expiration.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO, $2,933,241,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as offsetting collections of fees and surcharges assessed and collected by the USPTO under any law are received during fiscal year 2013, so as to result in a fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $0: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2013, should the total amount of such offsetting collections be less than $2,933,241,000 this amount shall be reduced accordingly: Provided further, That any amount received in excess of $2,933,241,000 in fiscal year 2013 and deposited in the Patent and Trademark Fee Reserve Fund shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the Director of USPTO shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for any amounts made available by the preceding proviso and such spending plan shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: Provided further, That from amounts provided herein, not to exceed $900 shall be made available in fiscal year 2013 for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That in fiscal year 2013 from the amounts made available for ''Salaries and Expenses'' for the USPTO, the amounts necessary to pay (1) the difference between the percentage of basic pay contributed by the USPTO and employees under section 8334(a) of title 5, United States Code, and the normal cost percentage (as defined by section 8331(17) of that title) as provided by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for USPTO's specific use, of basic pay, of employees subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of that title, and (2) the present value of the otherwise unfunded accruing costs, as determined by OPM for USPTO's specific use of post-retirement life insurance and post-retirement health benefits coverage for all USPTO employees who are enrolled in Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) and Federal Employees Group Life Insurance (FEGLI), shall be transferred to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the FEGLI Fund, and the FEHB Fund, as appropriate, and shall be available for the authorized purposes of those accounts: Provided further, That any differences between the present value factors published in OPM's yearly 300 series benefit letters and the factors that OPM provides for USPTO's specific use shall be recognized as an imputed cost on USPTO's financial statements, where applicable: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, all fees and surcharges assessed and collected by USPTO are available for USPTO only pursuant to section 42(c) of title 35, United States Code, as amended by section 22 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (Public Law 112–29): Provided further, That within the amounts appropriated, $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' account for activities associated with carrying out investigations and audits related to the USPTO.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), $621,173,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,000,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund'': Provided, That not to exceed $5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That NIST may provide local transportation for summer undergraduate research fellowship program participants.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses for industrial technology services, $143,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $128,500,000 shall be for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and of which $14,500,000 shall be for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by sections 13 through 15 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278c–278e), $60,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of Commerce shall include in the budget justification materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the Department of Commerce budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) an estimate for each National Institute of Standards and Technology construction project having a total multi-year program cost of more than $5,000,000 and simultaneously the budget justification materials shall include an estimate of the budgetary requirements for each such project for each of the five subsequent fiscal years.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft and vessels; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and relocation of facilities, $3,112,614,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, except that funds provided for cooperative enforcement shall remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That in addition, $119,064,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries'', which shall only be used for fishery activities related to Cooperative Research, Annual Stock Assessments, Survey and Monitoring Projects, Interjurisdictional Fisheries Grants, and Fish Information Networks: Provided further, That of the $3,246,678,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading $3,112,614,000 is appropriated from the general fund, $119,064,000 is provided by transfer and $15,000,000 is derived from recoveries of prior year obligations: Provided further, That the total amount available for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration corporate services administrative support costs shall not exceed $212,664,000: Provided further, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the statement accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act: Provided further, That in allocating grants under sections 306 and 306A of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, no coastal State shall receive more than 5 percent or less than 1 percent of increased funds appropriated over the previous fiscal year: Provided further, That in addition, for necessary retired pay expenses under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plan, and for payments for the medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. 55), such sums as may be necessary.

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For procurement, acquisition and construction of capital assets, including alteration and modification costs, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $1,926,036,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, except that funds provided for construction of facilities shall remain available until expended: Provided, That of the $1,941,036,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading, $1,926,036,000 is appropriated from the general fund and $15,000,000 is provided from recoveries of prior year obligations: Provided further, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the statement accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce shall include in budget justification materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the Department of Commerce budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) an estimate for each National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration procurement, acquisition or construction project having a total of more than $5,000,000 and simultaneously the budget justification shall include an estimate of the budgetary requirements for each such project for each of the 5 subsequent fiscal years: Provided further, That, within the amounts appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' account for activities associated with carrying out investigations and audits related to satellite procurement, acquisition and construction.

PACIFIC COASTAL SALMON RECOVERY

For necessary expenses associated with the restoration of Pacific salmon populations, $65,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That, of the funds provided herein, the Secretary of Commerce may issue grants to the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, California, and Alaska, and to the Federally recognized tribes of the Columbia River and Pacific Coast (including Alaska), for projects necessary for conservation of salmon and steelhead populations that are listed as threatened or endangered, or that are identified by a State as at-risk to be so listed, for maintaining populations necessary for exercise of tribal treaty fishing rights or native subsistence fishing, or for conservation of Pacific coastal salmon and steelhead habitat, based on guidelines to be developed by the Secretary of Commerce: Provided further, That all funds shall be allocated based on scientific and other merit principles and shall not be available for marketing activities: Provided further, That funds disbursed to States shall be subject to a matching requirement of funds or documented in-kind contributions of at least 33 percent of the Federal funds.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of Public Law 95–372, not to exceed $350,000, to be

derived from receipts collected pursuant to that Act, to remain available until expended.

FISHERIES FINANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2013, obligations of direct loans may not exceed $24,000,000 for Individual Fishing Quota loans and not to exceed $59,000,000 for traditional direct loans as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for direct loans for any new fishing vessel that will increase the harvesting capacity in any United States fishery.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the management of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed $4,500 for official reception and representation, $56,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Commerce shall maintain a task force on job repatriation and manufacturing growth and shall produce an annual report on related incentive strategies, implementation plans and program results.

RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION

For expenses necessary for the renovation and modernization of Department of Commerce facilities, $2,040,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $28,753,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 101. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary of Commerce that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 102. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days in advance of the acquisition or disposal of any capital asset (including land, structures, and equipment) not specifically provided for in this Act or any other law appropriating funds for the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 104. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under this title resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this title or from actions taken for the care and protection of loan collateral or grant property shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such department or agency: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 105. (a) Section 105(f) of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–55) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)(2)''; and

(2) by striking ''this subsection'' and inserting ''subsection (e)''.

(b) The requirements set forth by section 105 of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–55), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, are hereby adopted by reference.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may furnish services (including but not limited to utilities, telecommunications, and security services) necessary to support the operation, maintenance, and improvement of space that persons, firms, or organizations are authorized, pursuant to the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 or other authority, to use or occupy in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, Washington, DC, or other buildings, the maintenance, operation, and protection of which has been delegated to the Secretary from the Administrator of General Services pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis. Amounts received as reimbursement for services provided under this section or the authority under which the use or occupancy of the space is authorized, up to $200,000, shall be credited to the appropriation or fund which initially bears the costs of such services.

SEC. 107. Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a grant recipient from deterring child pornography, copyright infringement, or any other unlawful activity over its networks.

SEC. 108. The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is authorized to use, with their consent, with reimbursement and subject to the limits of available appropriations, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State, local government, Indian tribal government, Territory, or possession, or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any foreign government or international organization, for purposes related to carrying out the responsibilities of any statute administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SEC. 109. The Department of Commerce shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on any official travel to China by any employee of the U.S. Department of Commerce, including the purpose of such travel.

SEC. 110. Section 113(b)(3) of division B of Public Law 112–55 is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Commerce Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, $110,822,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 for security and construction of Department of Justice facilities shall remain available until expended.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses for information sharing technology, including planning, development, deployment and departmental direction, $33,426,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, $313,438,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Executive Office for Immigration Review fees deposited in the ''Immigration Examinations Fee'' account.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $85,985,000, including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, $12,772,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, $881,000,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $9,000 shall be available to INTERPOL Washington for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for litigation activities of the Civil Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to ''Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'' from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to reimburse the Office of Personnel Management for salaries and expenses associated with the election monitoring program under section 8 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973f): Provided further, That of the amounts provided under this heading for the election monitoring program, $3,390,000 shall remain available until expended.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $7,833,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $162,170,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection (and estimated to be $115,000,000 in fiscal year 2013), shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2013, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $47,170,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including inter-governmental and cooperative agreements, $1,969,687,000: Provided, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $7,200 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not to exceed $25,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each United States Attorney shall establish or participate in a United States Attorney-led task force on human trafficking: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, $10,000,000 shall only be available after the Attorney General certifies that each United States Attorney is participating in a United States Attorney-led task force on human trafficking.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, $223,258,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: Provided, That not less than $1,500,000 shall be for debtor audits: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $223,258,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2013, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $2,000,000.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, including advances, and for expenses of foreign counsel, $270,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 is for construction of buildings for protected witness safesites; not to exceed $3,000,000 is for the purchase and maintenance of armored and other vehicles for witness security caravans; and not to exceed $11,000,000 is for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, $12,036,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to the preceding proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by subparagraphs (B), (F), and (G) of section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code, $20,948,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, $1,196,000,000, of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, and not to exceed $15,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction in space controlled, occupied or utilized by the United States Marshals Service for prisoner holding and related support, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized by section 4013 of title 18, United States Code, $1,647,383,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be considered ''funds appropriated for State and local law enforcement assistance'' pursuant to section 4013(b) of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That the United States Marshals Service shall be responsible for managing the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System: Provided further, That any unobligated balances available from funds appropriated under the heading ''General Administration, Detention Trustee'' shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under this heading.

NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the National Security Division, $90,039,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 for information technology systems shall remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for the activities of the National Security Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to this heading from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to the preceding proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking and affiliated money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $521,793,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States, $8,185,007,000, of which not to exceed $216,900,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $184,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That $500,000 shall be for a comprehensive review of the implementation of the recommendations related to the Federal Bureau of Investigation that were proposed in the report issued by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses, to include the cost of equipment, furniture, and information technology requirements, related to construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law; conversion, modification and extension of Federally-owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects; and operation and maintenance of secure work environment facilities and secure networking capabilities; $80,982,000, to remain available until expended.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to section 530C of title 28, United States Code; and expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs, $2,050,904,000; of which not to exceed $75,000,000 shall remain available until expended and not to exceed $90,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $1,153,345,000, of which not to exceed $36,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses, not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by section 924(d)(2) of title 18, United States Code, and not to exceed $15,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That, in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, no funds appropriated under this or any other Act shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to section 478.118 of title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, or to change the definition of ''Curios or relics'' in section 478.11 of title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to other agencies or Departments: Provided further, That, in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, no funds made available by this or

any other Act shall be expended to promulgate or implement any rule requiring a physical inventory of any business licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That, in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, no funds authorized or made available under this or any other Act may be used to deny any application for a license under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, or renewal of such a license due to a lack of business activity, provided that the applicant is otherwise eligible to receive such a license, and is eligible to report business income or to claim an income tax deduction for business expenses under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Prison System for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 835, of which 808 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments, $6,820,217,000: Provided, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Prison System, where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent or fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the Federal Prison System, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the Federal Prison System: Provided further, That not to exceed $5,400 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000,000 shall remain available for necessary operations until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That, of the amounts provided for contract confinement, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements, and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522 note), for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants: Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Prison System may accept donated property and services relating to the operation of the prison card program from a not-for-profit entity which has operated such program in the past notwithstanding the fact that such not-for-profit entity furnishes services under contracts to the Federal Prison System relating to the operation of pre-release services, halfway houses, or other custodial facilities: Provided further, That of the amount provided under this heading, not less than $99,496,000 shall be for activation of newly constructed prisons in Berlin, New Hampshire, Aliceville, Alabama, Yazoo City, Mississippi, and Hazelton, West Virginia, as requested in the Department's fiscal year 2013 budget.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling, and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, $90,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than $66,965,000 shall be available only for modernization, maintenance and repair, and of which not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: Provided, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed $2,700,000 of the funds of the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which such accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention and prosecution of violence against women, as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) (''the 1968 Act''); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647) (''the 1990 Act''); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) (''the 1974 Act''); the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386) (''the 2000 Act''); and the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); and for related victims services, $416,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That except as otherwise provided by law, not to exceed 5 percent of funds made available under this heading may be used for expenses related to evaluation, training, and technical assistance: Provided further, That of the amount provided—

(1) $189,000,000 is for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act;

(2) $25,000,000 is for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault as authorized by section 40299 of the 1994 Act;

(3) $3,500,000 is for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women and related issues addressed by grant programs of the Office on Violence Against Women, which may be transferred to ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'' for administration by the Office of Justice Programs;

(4) $10,000,000 is for a grant program to provide services to advocate for and respond to youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; assistance to children and youth exposed to such violence; programs to engage men and youth in preventing such violence; and assistance to middle and high school students through education and other services related to such violence: Provided, That unobligated balances available for the programs authorized by sections 41201, 41204, 41303 and 41305 of the 1994 Act shall be available for this program: Provided further, That 10 percent of the total amount available for this grant program shall be available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of the 1968 Act: Provided further, That the definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the 1994 Act shall apply to this program;

(5) $50,000,000 is for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act, of which $4,000,000 is for a homicide reduction initiative;

(6) $25,000,000 is for sexual assault victims assistance, as authorized by section 41601 of the 1994 Act;

(7) $36,500,000 is for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act;

(8) $9,000,000 is for grants to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 304 of the 2005 Act;

(9) $41,000,000 is for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201 of the 2000 Act;

(10) $4,250,000 is for enhanced training and services to end violence against and abuse of women in later life, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act;

(11) $15,500,000 is for a grant program to support families in the justice system, including for the purposes described in the safe havens for children program, as authorized by section 1301 of the 2000 Act, and the court training and improvements program, as authorized by section 41002 of the 1994 Act;

(12) $5,750,000 is for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402 of the 2000 Act;

(13) $500,000 is for the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to assist victims of domestic violence, as authorized by section 41501 of the 1994 Act;

(14) $1,000,000 is for analysis and research on violence against Indian women, including as authorized by section 904 of the 2005 Act, which may be transferred to ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'' for administration by the Office of Justice Programs; and

(15) $500,000 is for the Office on Violence Against Women to establish a national clearinghouse that provides training and technical assistance on issues relating to sexual assault of American Indian and Alaska Native women.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND STATISTICS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''); the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647); the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199); the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) (''the Adam Walsh Act''); the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401); subtitle D of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) (''the 2002 Act''); the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180); and other programs, $127,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) $48,000,000 is for criminal justice statistics programs, and other activities, as authorized by

part C of title I of the 1968 Act, of which $36,000,000 is for the administration and redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey;

(2) $43,000,000 is for research, development, and evaluation programs, and other activities as authorized by part B of title I of the 1968 Act and subtitle D of title II of the 2002 Act: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this paragraph, $5,000,000 is transferred directly to the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Office of Law Enforcement Standards from the National Institute of Justice for research, testing and evaluation programs;

(3) $1,000,000 is for an evaluation clearinghouse program; and

(4) $35,000,000 is for regional information sharing activities, as authorized by part M of title I of the 1968 Act.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647) (''the 1990 Act''); the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–164); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) (''the Adam Walsh Act''); the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386); the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180); subtitle D of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) (''the 2002 Act''); the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199); the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–403); the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473); the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–416); and other programs, $1,140,418,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $392,418,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program as authorized by subpart 1 of part E of title I of the 1968 Act (except that section 1001(c), and the special rules for Puerto Rico under section 505(g), of title I of the 1968 Act shall not apply for purposes of this Act), of which, notwithstanding such subpart 1, $2,000,000 is for a program to improve State and local law enforcement intelligence capabilities including antiterrorism training and training to ensure that constitutional rights, civil liberties, civil rights, and privacy interests are protected throughout the intelligence process, $4,000,000 is for a State, local, and tribal assistance help desk and diagnostic center program, $5,000,000 is for a Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement Officer Resilience and Survivability Initiative (VALOR), $6,000,000 is for a criminal justice reform and recidivism reduction program, and $4,000,000 is for use by the National Institute of Justice for research targeted toward developing a better understanding of the domestic radicalization phenomenon, and advancing evidence-based strategies for effective intervention and prevention;

(2) $255,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 241(i)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)(5)): Provided, That no jurisdiction shall request compensation for any cost greater than the actual cost for Federal immigration and other detainees housed in State and local detention facilities;

(3) $5,000,000 for a border prosecutor initiative to reimburse State, county, parish, tribal, or municipal governments for costs associated with the prosecution of criminal cases declined by local offices of the United States Attorneys;

(4) $19,000,000 for competitive grants to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system, to prevent or combat juvenile delinquency, and to assist victims of crime (other than compensation);

(5) $13,500,000 for victim services programs for victims of trafficking, as authorized by section 107(b)(2) of Public Law 106–386, and for programs authorized under Public Law 109–164;

(6) $41,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by section 1001(a)(25)(A) of title I of the 1968 Act;

(7) $9,000,000 for mental health courts and adult and juvenile collaboration program grants, as authorized by parts V and HH of title I of the 1968 Act, and the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–416);

(8) $12,500,000 for grants for Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners, as authorized by part S of title I of the 1968 Act;

(9) $3,000,000 for the Capital Litigation Improvement Grant Program, as authorized by section 426 of Public Law 108–405, and for grants for wrongful conviction review;

(10) $9,000,000 for economic, high technology and Internet crime prevention grants, including as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 110–403;

(11) $4,000,000 for a student loan repayment assistance program pursuant to section 952 of Public Law 110–315;

(12) $20,000,000 for implementation of the Adam Walsh Act and related activities;

(13) $13,000,000 for an initiative relating to children exposed to violence;

(14) $18,000,000 for an Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program;

(15) $21,500,000 for the matching grant program for law enforcement armor vests, as authorized by section 2501 of title I of the 1968 Act: Provided, That $1,500,000 is transferred directly to the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Office of Law Enforcement Standards for research, testing and evaluation programs;

(16) $1,000,000 for the National Sex Offender Public Website;

(17) $5,000,000 for competitive and evidence-based programs to reduce gun crime and gang violence;

(18) $12,000,000 for grants to assist State and tribal governments and related activities, as authorized by the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180);

(19) $6,000,000 for the National Criminal History Improvement Program for grants to upgrade criminal records;

(20) $12,000,000 for Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Improvement Grants under part BB of title I of the 1968 Act;

(21) $125,000,000 for DNA-related and forensic programs and activities, of which—

(A) $117,000,000 is for a DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities, including the purposes authorized under section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program): Provided, That up to 4 percent of funds made available under this paragraph may be used for the purposes described in the DNA Training and Education for Law Enforcement, Correctional Personnel, and Court Officers program (Public Law 108–405, section 303);

(B) $4,000,000 is for the purposes described in the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Program (Public Law 108–405, section 412); and

(C) $4,000,000 is for Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program Grants, including as authorized by section 304 of Public Law 108–405;

(22) $6,000,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the 1990 Act;

(23) $38,000,000 for assistance to Indian tribes;

(24) $68,750,000 for offender reentry programs and research, as authorized by the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199), of which not to exceed $5,000,000 is for a program to improve State, local, and tribal probation supervision efforts and strategies;

(25) $4,000,000 for a veterans treatment courts program;

(26) $1,000,000 for the purposes described in the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program (section 240001 of the 1994 Act);

(27) $7,000,000 for a program to monitor prescription drugs and scheduled listed chemical products;

(28) $12,500,000 for prison rape prevention and prosecution grants to States and units of local government, and other programs, as authorized by the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–79);

(29) $3,500,000 for emergency law enforcement assistance, as authorized by section 609M of the Justice Assistance Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10513; Public Law 98–473); and

(30) $2,750,000 to establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety:

Provided, That, if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this heading to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform non-administrative public sector safety service.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647) (''the 1990 Act''); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) (''the Adam Walsh Act''); the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401); and other juvenile justice programs, $279,500,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $44,000,000 for programs authorized by section 221 of the 1974 Act, and for training and technical assistance to assist small, nonprofit organizations with the Federal grants process: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this paragraph, $500,000 shall be for a competitive demonstration grant program to support emergency planning among State, local and tribal juvenile justice residential facilities;

(2) $90,000,000 for youth mentoring grants;

(3) $20,000,000 for delinquency prevention, as authorized by section 505 of the 1974 Act, of which, pursuant to sections 261 and 262 thereof—

(A) $10,000,000 shall be for the Tribal Youth Program;

(B) $5,000,000 shall be for gang and youth violence education, prevention and intervention, and related activities; and

(C) $5,000,000 shall be for programs and activities to enforce State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors or the purchase or consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, for prevention and reduction of consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, and for technical assistance and training;

(4) $19,000,000 for programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990;

(5) $25,000,000 for the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program as authorized by part R of title I of the 1968 Act and Guam shall be considered a State;

(6) $11,000,000 for community-based violence prevention initiatives;

(7) $67,000,000 for missing and exploited children programs, including as authorized by sections 404(b) and 405(a) of the 1974 Act (except

that section 102(b)(4)(B) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401) shall not apply for purposes of this Act);

(8) $1,500,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act; and

(9) $2,000,000 for grants and technical assistance in support of the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention:

Provided, That not more than 10 percent of each amount may be used for research, evaluation, and statistics activities designed to benefit the programs or activities authorized: Provided further, That not more than 2 percent of the amounts designated under paragraphs (1) through (6), (8) and (9) may be used for training and technical assistance: Provided further, That the previous two provisos shall not apply to grants and projects authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER BENEFITS

For payments and expenses authorized under section 1001(a)(4) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, such sums as are necessary (including amounts for administrative costs), to remain available until expended; and $16,300,000 for payments authorized by section 1201(b) of such Act and for educational assistance authorized by section 1218 of such Act, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for such disability and education payments, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to ''Public Safety Officer Benefits'' from available appropriations for the Department of Justice as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); and the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''), $222,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That any balances made available through prior year deobligations shall only be available in accordance with section 505 of this Act: Provided further, That of the amount provided—

(1) $12,500,000 is for anti-methamphetamine-related activities, which shall be transferred to the Drug Enforcement Administration upon enactment of this Act;

(2) $20,000,000 is for improving tribal law enforcement, including hiring, equipment, training, and anti-methamphetamine activities; and

(3) $190,000,000 is for grants under section 1701 of title I of the 1968 Act (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers under part Q of such title notwithstanding subsection (i) of such section: Provided, That, notwithstanding section 1704(c) of such title (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–3(c)), funding for hiring or rehiring a career law enforcement officer may not exceed $125,000 unless the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services grants a waiver from this limitation: Provided further, That within the amounts appropriated, $15,000,000 shall be transferred to the Tribal Resources Grant Program: Provided further, That of the amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $10,000,000 is for community policing development activities in furtherance of the purposes in section 1701.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 201. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed $50,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 202. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: Provided, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 204. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: Provided, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 203 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 206. The Attorney General is authorized to extend through September 30, 2014, the Personnel Management Demonstration Project transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to section 1115 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296; 28 U.S.C. 599B) without limitation on the number of employees or the positions covered.

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, section 102(b) of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–395) shall extend to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in the conduct of undercover investigative operations and shall apply with respect to any undercover investigative operation by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives that is necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States.

SEC. 208. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used for the purpose of transporting an individual who is a prisoner pursuant to conviction for crime under State or Federal law and is classified as a maximum or high security prisoner, other than to a prison or other facility certified by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as appropriately secure for housing such a prisoner.

SEC. 209. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by Federal prisons to purchase cable television services, or to rent or purchase audiovisual or electronic media or equipment used primarily for recreational purposes.

(b) Subsection (a) does not preclude the rental, maintenance, or purchase of audiovisual or electronic media or equipment for inmate training, religious, or educational programs.

SEC. 210. None of the funds made available under this title shall be obligated or expended for any new or enhanced information technology program having total estimated development costs in excess of $100,000,000, unless the Deputy Attorney General and the investment review board certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the information technology program has appropriate program management controls and contractor oversight mechanisms in place, and that the program is compatible with the enterprise architecture of the Department of Justice.

SEC. 211. The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act shall apply to deviations from the amounts designated for specific activities in this Act and accompanying statement, and to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this title in previous years.

SEC. 212. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve a public-private competition under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy for work performed by employees of the Bureau of Prisons or of Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated.

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be available for the salary, benefits, or expenses of any United States Attorney assigned dual or additional responsibilities by the Attorney General or his designee that exempt that United States Attorney from the residency requirements of section 545 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 214. At the discretion of the Attorney General, and in addition to any amounts that otherwise may be available (or authorized to be made available) by law, with respect to funds appropriated by this title under the headings ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'', ''State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'', and ''Juvenile Justice Programs''—

(1) up to 3 percent of funds made available to the Office of Justice Programs for grant or reimbursement programs may be used by such Office to provide training and technical assistance; and

(2) up to 2 percent of funds made available for grant or reimbursement programs under such headings, except for amounts appropriated specifically for research, evaluation, or statistical programs administered by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, shall be transferred to and merged with funds provided to the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, to be used by them for research, evaluation or statistical purposes, without regard to the authorizations for such grant or reimbursement programs, and of such amounts, $1,300,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Prisons for Federal inmate research and evaluation purposes.

SEC. 215. Upon request by a grantee for whom the Attorney General has determined there is a fiscal hardship, the Attorney General may, with respect to funds appropriated by this or any other Act making appropriations for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 for the following programs, waive the following requirements:

(1) For the Adult and Juvenile Offender State and Local Reentry Demonstration Projects under part FF of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(g)(1)), the requirements under section 2976(g)(1) of such part.

(2) For State, Tribal, and Local Reentry Courts under part FF of title I of such Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w–2(e)(1) and (2)), the requirements under section 2978(e)(1) and (2) of such part.

(3) For the Prosecution Drug Treatment Alternatives to Prison Program under part CC of title I of such Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797q–3), the requirements under section 2904 of such part.

(4) For Grants to Protect Inmates and Safeguard Communities under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15605(c)(3)), the requirements of section 6(c)(3) of such Act.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 20109(a) of subtitle A of title II

of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13709(a)) shall not apply to amounts made available by this or any other Act.

SEC. 217. None of the funds made available under this Act, other than for the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note), may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel, unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 218. (a) None of the income retained in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund pursuant to title I of Public Law 102–140 (105 Stat. 784; 28 U.S.C. 527 note) shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2013.

(b) Not to exceed $30,000,000 of the unobligated balances transferred to the capital account of the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund pursuant to title I of Public Law 102–140 (105 Stat. 784; 28 U.S.C. 527 note) shall be available for obligation in fiscal year 2013, and any use, obligation, transfer or allocation of such funds shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act.

(c) Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the excess unobligated balances available under section 524(c)(8)(E) of title 28, United States Code, shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2013, and any use, obligation, transfer or allocation of such funds shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act.

(d) Of amounts available in the Assets Forfeiture Fund in fiscal year 2013, $154,700,000 shall be for payments associated with joint law enforcement operations as authorized by section 524(c)(1)(I) of title 28, United States Code.

(e) The Attorney General shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing the planned distribution of Assets Forfeiture Fund joint law enforcement operations funding during fiscal year 2013.

(f) Subsections (a) through (d) of this section shall sunset on September 30, 2013.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE III

SCIENCE

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, not to exceed $2,250 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $5,850,000.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SCIENCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $5,144,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which up to $14,500,000 shall be available for a reimbursable agreement with the Department of Energy for the purpose of reestablishing facilities to produce fuel required for radioisotope thermoelectric generators to enable future missions: Provided, That $75,000,000 shall be for pre-formulation and/or formulation activities for a mission that meets the science goals outlined for the Jupiter Europa mission in the most recent planetary science decadal survey: Provided further, That the formulation and development costs (with development cost as defined under section 30104 of title 51, United States Code) for the James Webb Space Telescope shall not exceed $8,000,000,000: Provided further, That should the individual identified under subsection (c)(2)(E) of section 30104 of title 51, United States Code, as responsible for the James Webb Space Telescope determine that the development cost of the program is likely to exceed that limitation, the individual shall immediately notify the Administrator and the increase shall be treated as if it meets the 30 percent threshold described in subsection (f) of section 30104.

AERONAUTICS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of aeronautics research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $570,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space research and technology development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $642,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

EXPLORATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of exploration research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $3,887,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not less than $1,197,000,000 shall be for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle: Provided further, That not less than $1,857,000,000 shall be for the Space Launch System, which shall have a lift capability not less than 130 tons and which shall have an upper stage and other core elements developed simultaneously: Provided further, That of the funds made available for the Space Launch System, $1,454,200,000 shall be for launch vehicle development and $402,800,000 shall be for exploration ground systems: Provided further, That funds made available for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle and Space Launch System are in addition to funds provided for these programs under the ''Construction and Environmental Compliance and Restoration'' heading: Provided further, That $525,000,000 shall be for commercial spaceflight activities: Provided further, That $308,000,000 shall be for exploration research and development.

SPACE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space operations research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities, including operations, production, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $3,953,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

EDUCATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out aerospace and aeronautical education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $18,000,000 shall be for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and $40,000,000 shall be for the National Space Grant College program.

CROSS AGENCY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics, exploration, space operations and education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $63,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $2,823,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not less than $39,100,000 shall be available for independent verification and validation activities.

CONSTRUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, and environmental compliance and restoration, $680,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That hereafter, notwithstanding section 315 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (51 U.S.C. 20145), all proceeds from leases entered into under that section shall be deposited into this account: Provided

further, That such proceeds shall be available for a period of 5 years to the extent and in amounts as provided in annual appropriations Acts: Provided further, That such proceeds referred to in the two preceding provisos shall be available for obligation for fiscal year 2013 in an amount not to exceed $3,791,000: Provided further, That each annual budget request shall include an annual estimate of gross receipts and collections and proposed use of all funds collected pursuant to section 315 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (51 U.S.C. 20145).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, $38,000,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers. Balances so transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred. Any transfer pursuant to this provision shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

The spending plan required by this Act shall be provided by NASA at the theme, program, project and activity level. The spending plan, as well as any subsequent change of an amount established in that spending plan that meets the notification requirements of section 505 of this Act, shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

Section 30102(c) of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) refunds or rebates received on an ongoing basis from a credit card services provider under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's credit card programs.''.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), and Public Law 86–209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.); services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; and authorized travel; $5,983,280,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which not to exceed $500,000,000 shall remain available until expended for polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program: Provided, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: Provided further, That not less than $158,190,000 shall be available for activities authorized by section 7002(c)(2)(A)(iv) of Public Law 110–69.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the acquisition, construction, commissioning, and upgrading of major research equipment, facilities, and other such capital assets pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), including authorized travel, $196,170,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds may be used to reimburse the Judgment Fund established under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science, mathematics and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $895,610,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not less than $54,890,000 shall be available until expended for activities authorized by section 7030 of Public Law 110–69.

AGENCY OPERATIONS AND AWARD MANAGEMENT

For agency operations and award management necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.); services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the Department of Homeland Security for security guard services; $299,400,000: Provided, That not to exceed $8,280 is for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That contracts may be entered into under this heading in fiscal year 2013 for maintenance and operation of facilities and for other services to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) involved in carrying out section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863) and Public Law 86–209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.), $4,440,000: Provided, That not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, $14,200,000, of which $400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the National Science Foundation in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 15 percent by any such transfers. Any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the ''Science Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE IV

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $9,400,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the chairperson, who is permitted 125 billable days: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for any activity or expense that is not explicitly authorized by section 3 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975a): Provided further, That there shall be an Inspector General at the Commission on Civil Rights who shall have the duties, responsibilities, and authorities specified in the Inspector General Act of 1978: Provided further, That an individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Commission on Civil Rights: Provided further, That the Inspector General of the Commission on Civil Rights shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of GAO in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Commission on Civil Rights, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Commission on Civil Rights: Provided further, That the Inspector General may waive any statutorily required reporting requirement (with the exception of the semiannual report required by section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978) upon a certification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that such report is not necessary for effective oversight of the Commission: Provided further, That of the amounts made available in this paragraph, $450,000 shall be transferred directly to the Office of Inspector General of GAO upon enactment of this Act for salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the duties of the Inspector General of the Commission on Civil Rights.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Genetic Information Non-Discrimination Act (GINA) of 2008 (Public Law 110–233), the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–325), and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–2), including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by section 1343(b) of title 31, United States Code; nonmonetary awards to private citizens; and up to $29,500,000 for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for authorized services to the Commission, $370,000,000: Provided, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,250 from available funds: Provided further, That the Commission may take no action to implement any workforce repositioning, restructuring, or reorganization until such time as the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate have been notified of such proposals, in accordance with the reprogramming requirements of section 505 of this Act: Provided further, That the Chair is authorized to accept and use any gift or donation to carry out the work of the Commission.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and not to exceed $2,250 for official reception and representation expenses, $83,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, $365,000,000, of which $339,400,000 is for basic field programs and required independent audits; $4,200,000 is for the Office of Inspector General, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be used to conduct additional audits of recipients; $17,000,000 is for management and grants oversight; $3,400,000 is for client self-help and information technology; and $1,000,000 is for loan repayment assistance: Provided, That the Legal Services Corporation may continue to provide locality pay to officers and employees at a rate no greater than that provided by the Federal Government to Washington, DC-based employees as authorized by section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding section 1005(d) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996(d)): Provided further, That the authorities provided in section 205 of this Act shall be applicable to the Legal Services Corporation: Provided further, That, for the purposes of section 505 of this division, and section 3003 of division G, the Legal Services Corporation shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of, sections 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, and 506 of Public Law 105–119, and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such sections, except that all references in sections 502 and 503 to 1997 and 1998 shall be deemed to refer instead to 2012 and 2013, respectively.

Section 501(a)(2)(A) of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–134) is amended by striking ''on the basis of the most recent decennial census of population conducted pursuant to section 141 of title 13, United States Code'' and inserting ''triennially by the Bureau of the Census, except that, with respect to fiscal year 2013, the change in allocation resulting from the amendment made to this subparagraph by the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 shall only be half of the change which would otherwise result from that amendment in order to phase in the change over a 2 year period''.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.), $3,081,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $51,251,000, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $111,600 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by the State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10701 et seq.) $5,121,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That, for the purposes of section 505 of this Act, the State Justice Institute shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 504. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 505. (a) Subject to subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates or initiates a new program, project or activity; (2) eliminates a program, project or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes or renames offices, programs or activities; (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; (7) augments existing programs, projects or activities in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, or reduces by 10 percent funding for any program, project or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent; or (8) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel, which would result in a change in existing programs, projects or activities as approved by Congress; unless the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act to any agency of the Department of Justice, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to any agency of the Department of Justice that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates or initiates a new program, project or activity; (2) eliminates a program, project or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes or renames offices, programs or activities; (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; (7) augments existing programs, projects or activities in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, or reduces by 10 percent funding for any program, project or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent; or (8) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel, which would result in a change in existing programs, projects or activities as approved by Congress; unless the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations are notified 45 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall sunset on September 30, 2013.

SEC. 506. (a) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b)(1) To the extent practicable, with respect to authorized purchases of promotional items, funds made available by this Act shall be used to purchase items that are manufactured, produced, or assembled in the United States, its territories, or its possessions.

(2) The term ''promotional items'' has the meaning given the term in OMB Circular A–87, Attachment B, Item (1)(f)(3).

SEC. 507. (a) The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Science Foundation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a quarterly report on the status of balances of appropriations at the account level. For unobligated, uncommitted balances and unobligated, committed balances the quarterly reports shall separately identify the amounts attributable to each source year of appropriation from which the balances were derived. For balances that are obligated, but unexpended, the quarterly reports shall separately identify amounts by the year of obligation.

(b) The report described in subsection (a) shall be submitted within 30 days of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2013, and subsequent reports shall be submitted within 30 days of the end of each quarter thereafter.

(c) If a department or agency is unable to fulfill any aspect of a reporting requirement described in subsection (a) due to a limitation of a current accounting system, the department or agency shall fulfill such aspect to the maximum extent practicable under such accounting system and shall identify and describe in each quarterly report the extent to which such aspect is not fulfilled.

SEC. 508. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under this Act resulting from, or to prevent, personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such department or agency: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 509. None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek

the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of tobacco or tobacco products, except for restrictions which are not applied equally to all tobacco or tobacco products of the same type.

SEC. 510. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts deposited or available in the Fund established by section 1402 of chapter XIV of title II of Public Law 98–473 (42 U.S.C. 10601) in any fiscal year in excess of $730,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the following fiscal year.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used to discriminate against or denigrate the religious or moral beliefs of students who participate in programs for which financial assistance is provided from those funds, or of the parents or legal guardians of such students.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 513. Any funds provided in this Act used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act.

SEC. 514. (a) Tracing studies conducted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives are released without adequate disclaimers regarding the limitations of the data.

(b) For fiscal year 2013 and thereafter, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives shall include in all such data releases, language similar to the following that would make clear that trace data cannot be used to draw broad conclusions about firearms-related crime:

(1) Firearm traces are designed to assist law enforcement authorities in conducting investigations by tracking the sale and possession of specific firearms. Law enforcement agencies may request firearms traces for any reason, and those reasons are not necessarily reported to the Federal Government. Not all firearms used in crime are traced and not all firearms traced are used in crime.

(2) Firearms selected for tracing are not chosen for purposes of determining which types, makes, or models of firearms are used for illicit purposes. The firearms selected do not constitute a random sample and should not be considered representative of the larger universe of all firearms used by criminals, or any subset of that universe. Firearms are normally traced to the first retail seller, and sources reported for firearms traced do not necessarily represent the sources or methods by which firearms in general are acquired for use in crime.

SEC. 515. (a) The Inspectors General of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Legal Services Corporation shall conduct audits, pursuant to the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App.), of grants or contracts for which funds are appropriated by this Act, and shall submit reports to Congress on the progress of such audits, which may include preliminary findings and a description of areas of particular interest, within 180 days after initiating such an audit and every 180 days thereafter until any such audit is completed.

(b) Within 60 days after the date on which an audit described in subsection (a) by an Inspector General is completed, the Secretary, Attorney General, Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, shall make the results of the audit available to the public on the Internet website maintained by the Department, Administration, Foundation, or Corporation, respectively. The results shall be made available in redacted form to exclude—

(1) any matter described in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) sensitive personal information for any individual, the public access to which could be used to commit identity theft or for other inappropriate or unlawful purposes.

(c) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a banquet or conference that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a banquet or conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(d) Any person awarded a grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act shall submit a statement to the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, certifying that no funds derived from the grant or contract will be made available through a subcontract or in any other manner to another person who has a financial interest in the person awarded the grant or contract.

(e) The provisions of the preceding subsections of this section shall take effect 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, determines that a uniform set of rules and requirements, substantially similar to the requirements in such subsections, consistently apply under the executive branch ethics program to all Federal departments, agencies, and entities.

SEC. 516. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation to acquire an information technology system unless the head of the entity involved, in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other appropriate Federal entity, has made an assessment of any associated risk of cyber-espionage or sabotage associated with the acquisition of such system, including any risk associated with such system being produced, manufactured or assembled by one or more entities that are owned, directed or subsidized by the People's Republic of China.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to acquire an information technology system described in an assessment required by subsection (a) and produced, manufactured or assembled by one or more entities that are owned, directed or subsidized by the People's Republic of China unless the head of the assessing entity described in subsection (a) determines, and reports that determination to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that the acquisition of such system is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 517. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

SEC. 518. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or treaty, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended or obligated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to pay administrative expenses or to compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with requiring an export license for the export to Canada of components, parts, accessories or attachments for firearms listed in Category I, section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations (International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (ITAR), part 121, as it existed on April 1, 2005) with a total value not exceeding $500 wholesale in any transaction, provided that the conditions of subsection (b) of this section are met by the exporting party for such articles.

(b) The foregoing exemption from obtaining an export license—

(1) does not exempt an exporter from filing any Shipper's Export Declaration or notification letter required by law, or from being otherwise eligible under the laws of the United States to possess, ship, transport, or export the articles enumerated in subsection (a); and

(2) does not permit the export without a license of—

(A) fully automatic firearms and components and parts for such firearms, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada;

(B) barrels, cylinders, receivers (frames) or complete breech mechanisms for any firearm listed in Category I, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada; or

(C) articles for export from Canada to another foreign destination.

(c) In accordance with this section, the District Directors of Customs and postmasters shall permit the permanent or temporary export without a license of any unclassified articles specified in subsection (a) to Canada for end use in Canada or return to the United States, or temporary import of Canadian-origin items from Canada for end use in the United States or return to Canada for a Canadian citizen.

(d) The President may require export licenses under this section on a temporary basis if the President determines, upon publication first in the Federal Register, that the Government of Canada has implemented or maintained inadequate import controls for the articles specified in subsection (a), such that a significant diversion of such articles has and continues to take place for use in international terrorism or in the escalation of a conflict in another nation. The President shall terminate the requirements of a license when reasons for the temporary requirements have ceased.

SEC. 519. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this Act or any other Act shall obligate or expend in any way such funds to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to deny any application submitted pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)(B) and qualified pursuant to 27 CFR section 478.112 or .113, for a permit to import United States origin ''curios or relics'' firearms, parts, or ammunition.

SEC. 520. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to include in any new bilateral or multilateral trade agreement the text of—

(1) paragraph 2 of article 16.7 of the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement;

(2) paragraph 4 of article 17.9 of the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement; or

(3) paragraph 4 of article 15.9 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement.

SEC. 521. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to authorize or issue a national security letter in contravention of any of the following laws authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to issue national security letters: The Right to Financial Privacy Act; The Electronic Communications Privacy Act; The Fair Credit Reporting Act; The National Security Act of 1947; USA PATRIOT Act; and the laws amended by these Acts.

SEC. 522. If at any time during any quarter, the program manager of a project within the jurisdiction of the Departments of Commerce or Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation totaling more than $75,000,000 has reasonable cause to believe that the total program cost has increased by 10 percent, the program manager shall immediately inform the respective Secretary, Administrator, or Director. The Secretary, Administrator, or Director shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days in writing of such increase, and shall include in such notice: the date on which such determination was made; a statement of the reasons for such increases; the action taken and proposed to be taken to control

future cost growth of the project; changes made in the performance or schedule milestones and the degree to which such changes have contributed to the increase in total program costs or procurement costs; new estimates of the total project or procurement costs; and a statement validating that the project's management structure is adequate to control total project or procurement costs.

SEC. 523. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2013 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 524. The Departments, agencies, and commissions funded under this Act, shall establish and maintain on the homepages of their Internet websites—

(1) a direct link to the Internet websites of their Offices of Inspectors General; and

(2) a mechanism on the Offices of Inspectors General website by which individuals may anonymously report cases of waste, fraud, or abuse with respect to those Departments, agencies, and commissions.

SEC. 525. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than $5,000,000 or to award a grant in excess of such amount unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, the contractor or grantee has filed all Federal tax returns required during the three years preceding the certification, has not been convicted of a criminal offense under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and has not, more than 90 days prior to certification, been notified of any unpaid Federal tax assessment for which the liability remains unsatisfied, unless the assessment is the subject of an installment agreement or offer in compromise that has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service and is not in default, or the assessment is the subject of a non-frivolous administrative or judicial proceeding.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 526. (a) Of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Justice, the following funds are hereby rescinded, not later than September 30, 2013, from the following accounts in the specified amounts—

(1) ''Working Capital Fund'', $26,000,000;

(2) ''Legal Activities, Assets Forfeiture Fund'', $722,697,000;

(3) ''Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Violent Crime Reduction Program'', $1,028,000;

(4) ''Federal Prison System, Buildings and Facilities'', $64,700,000;

(5) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'', $12,000,000;

(6) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office of Justice Programs'', $43,000,000; and

(7) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Community Oriented Policing Services'', $12,200,000.

(b) The Department of Justice shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report no later than September 1, 2013, specifying the amount of each rescission made pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 527. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws to preserve the ability of the United States—

(1) to enforce vigorously its trade laws, including antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws;

(2) to avoid agreements that—

(A) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies; or

(B) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(3) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market-access barriers.

SEC. 528. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase first class or premium airline travel in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 529. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States, unless such conference is a law enforcement training or operational conference for law enforcement personnel and the majority of Federal employees in attendance are law enforcement personnel stationed outside the United States.

SEC. 530. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 531. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 532. None of the funds made available under this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

SEC. 533. To the extent practicable, funds made available in this Act should be used to purchase light bulbs that are ''Energy Star'' qualified or have the ''Federal Energy Management Program'' designation.

SEC. 534. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government receiving funds appropriated under this Act to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts and include in its annual performance plan and performance and accountability reports the following:

(1) Details on future action the department, agency, or instrumentality will take to resolve undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(2) The method that the department, agency, or instrumentality uses to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(3) Identification of undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts that may be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(4) In the preceding 3 fiscal years, details on the total number of expired grant accounts with undisbursed balances (on the first day of each fiscal year) for the department, agency, or instrumentality and the total finances that have not been obligated to a specific project remaining in the accounts.

SEC. 535. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) or the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall also apply to any funds used to effectuate the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by NASA.

(c) The limitations described in subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to activities which NASA or OSTP has certified—

(1) pose no risk of resulting in the transfer of technology, data, or other information with national security or economic security implications to China or a Chinese-owned company; and

(2) will not involve knowing interactions with officials who have been determined by the United States to have direct involvement with violations of human rights.

(d) Any certification made under subsection (c) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than 30 days prior to the activity in question and shall include a description of the purpose of the activity, its agenda, its major participants, and its location and timing.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to relocate the Bureau of the Census or employees from the Department of Commerce to the jurisdiction of the Executive Office of the President.

SEC. 537. The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation shall submit spending plans, signed by the respective department or agency head, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 538. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to deny, or fail to act on, an application for the importation of any model of shotgun if—

(1) all other requirements of law with respect to the proposed importation are met; and

(2) no application for the importation of such model of shotgun, in the same configuration, had been denied by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 2011, on the basis that the shotgun was not particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes.

SEC. 539. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 540. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless an agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and

has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless an agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 542. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce who uses amounts in the Fisheries Enforcement Asset Forfeiture Fund of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that consists of the sums described in section 311(e)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861(e)(1)) for any purpose other than a purpose specifically authorized under such section.

SEC. 543. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States.

(b) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall publish a statement of the reason for each certification made pursuant to subsection (a) on the public website of the National Science Foundation.

(c) Any unobligated balances for the Political Science Program described in subsection (a) may be provided for other scientific research and studies that do not duplicate those being funded by other Federal agencies.

This division may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013''.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $40,199,263,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,902,346,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,531,549,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,052,826,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,456,823,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,874,023,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $658,251,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,722,425,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,981,577,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,153,990,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $35,409,260,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $14,804,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $41,614,453,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $6,034,963,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $34,780,406,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $31,862,980,000: Provided, That not more than $30,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: Provided further, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $36,480,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: Provided further, That $8,563,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,182,923,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,256,347,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $277,377,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,261,324,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $7,154,161,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $6,494,326,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $13,516,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $335,921,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $310,594,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $529,263,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $11,133,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $287,543,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $108,759,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $519,111,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $50,198,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $6,028,754,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,535,433,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,857,823,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,641,306,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,741,664,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,382,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $3,036,871,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $659,897,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $565,371,000;
Virginia Class Submarine, $3,217,601,000;
Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,652,557,000;
CVN Refuelings, $1,613,392,000;
CVN Refuelings (AP), $70,010,000;
DDG–1000 Program, $669,222,000;
DDG–51 Destroyer, $4,036,628,000;
DDG–51 Destroyer (AP), $466,283,000;
Littoral Combat Ship, $1,784,959,000;
LPD–17 (AP), $263,255,000;
Joint High Speed Vessel, $189,196,000;
Moored Training Ship, $307,300,000;
LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $85,830,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $290,035,000.

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $372,573,000.

In all: $15,584,212,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: Provided, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2017, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,955,078,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land

necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,411,411,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $11,774,019,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $4,962,376,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $594,694,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,082,508,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $4,878,985,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $223,531,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $8,676,627,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $16,963,398,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $25,432,738,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,631,946,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: Provided, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $223,768,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,516,184,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $697,840,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, $32,715,304,000; of which $30,885,165,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available until September 30, 2014, and of which up to $15,934,952,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $521,762,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,308,377,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations: Provided further, That of the funds provided to develop a joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs (DOD–VA) integrated Electronic Health Record, not more than 25 percent may be obligated until the DOD–VA Interagency Program Office submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for

expenditure that: (1) defines the budget and cost baseline for development of the integrated Electronic Health Record; (2) identifies the deployment timeline for the system for both agencies; (3) breaks out annual and total spending for each Department; (4) relays detailed cost-sharing business rules; (5) establishes data standardization schedules between the Departments; (6) has been submitted to the Government Accountability Office for review; and (7) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $1,301,786,000, of which $635,843,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $53,948,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $22,214,000 for activities on military installations and $31,734,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, to assist State and local governments; $18,592,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $1,823,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $647,351,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $627,705,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $1,159,263,000: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $350,321,000, of which $347,621,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $2,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $534,421,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: Provided further, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $4,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: Provided further, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2013: Provided further, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled ''Explanation of Project Level Adjustments'' in the explanatory statement described in section 4 (in the matter preceding division A of this consolidated Act), the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: Provided, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such funds: Provided further, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity

procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: Provided further, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows:

F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft; up to 10 DDG–51 Arleigh Burke class Flight IIA guided missile destroyers, as well as the AEGIS Weapon Systems, MK 41 Vertical Launching Systems, and Commercial Broadband Satellite Systems associated with those vessels; SSN–774 Virginia class submarine and government-furnished equipment; CH–47 Chinook helicopter; and V–22 Osprey aircraft variants.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: Provided, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: Provided further, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2013, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2014 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2014.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: Provided, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: Provided further, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protégé Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: Provided, That for the purpose of this section, the term ''manufactured'' shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): Provided further, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided further, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8019. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $15,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $38,634,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $28,404,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counterdrug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $9,298,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $932,000 shall be available from ''Other Procurement, Air Force'' for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the

Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: Provided, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2013 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2013, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: Provided; That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: Provided further, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2014 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8027. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2013. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8028. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8029. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a–1).

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $250,000.

SEC. 8031. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2014 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2014 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8032. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

SEC. 8033. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8034. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8035. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally

affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8036. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8037. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats; or

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8038. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F–22A advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government: Provided, That the Department of Defense may conduct or participate in studies, research, design and other activities to define and develop a future export version of the F–22A that protects classified and sensitive information, technologies and U.S. warfighting capabilities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) $10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2018'': DDG–51 Destroyer, $98,400,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2018'': DDG–51 Destroyer Advance Procurement, $2,500,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2018'': CVN Refueling Overhaul, $14,100,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2011/2013'', $14,862,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2011/2013'', $108,098,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013'', $43,860,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2011/2015'': DDG–51 Destroyer, $215,300,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013'', $22,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013'', $93,400,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013'', $9,500,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, 2012/XXXX'', $21,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2012/2014'', $47,400,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2012/2014'', $179,608,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014'', $19,040,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2012/2016'': Littoral Combat Ship, $28,800,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2012/2016'': DDG–51 Destroyer, $83,000,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014'', $36,467,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, 2012/2014'', $16,300,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps, 2012/2014'', $132,555,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $394,299,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $52,898,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $55,800,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide, 2012/2014'', $16,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2012/2013'', $41,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 2012/2013'', $246,800,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2012/2013'', $149,460,000.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2003, level: Provided, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

SEC. 8045. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8049. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): Provided, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: Provided further, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8053. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8054. Using funds made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: Provided, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: Provided further, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8057. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces or police of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary

of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8058. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8059. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 45 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8060. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8061. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: Provided, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8062. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8063. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary tracer (API–T)'', except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8064. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: Provided, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: Provided further, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: Provided further, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8066. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $133,381,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: Provided further, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided further, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8067. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2013.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8068. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $200,000,000 from funds available under ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to the Department of State ''Global Security Contingency Fund'': Provided, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers to the Department of State ''Global Security Contingency Fund'', notify the congressional defense committees in writing with the source of funds and a detailed justification, execution plan, and timeline for each proposed project.

SEC. 8069. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $4,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8070. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $479,736,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: Provided, That of this amount, $211,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, $149,679,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which $39,200,000 shall be for production activities of SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures, $74,692,000 shall be available for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, and $44,365,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: Provided further, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8071. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet.

(b) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give United States Transportation Command operational and administrative control of C–130 and KC–135 forces assigned to the Pacific and European Air Force Commands.

(c) The command and control relationships in subsections (a) and (b) which existed on March 13, 2011, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

(d) This subsection does not apply to administrative control of Navy Air and Missile Defense Command.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8072. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $372,573,000 shall be available until September 30, 2013, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred to:

(1) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2013'': LHA Replacement Program $156,685,000;

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2013'': LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $80,888,000; and

(3) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2009/2013'': CVN Refueling Overhauls Program $135,000,000.

SEC. 8073. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be

specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2013 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

SEC. 8074. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8075. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2014 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: Provided, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8076. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8077. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, he shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and $24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8078. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: Provided, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8079. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: Provided, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8080. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8081. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuations, or rate adjustments for any ship construction program appropriated in law: Provided, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed $100,000,000 under the authority provided by this section: Provided further, That the Secretary may not transfer any funds until 30 days after the proposed transfer has been reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, unless a response from the Committees is received sooner: Provided further, That any funds transferred pursuant to this section shall retain the same period of availability as when originally appropriated: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8082. For purposes of section 7108 of title 41, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' that is not closed at the time reimbursement is made shall be available to reimburse the Judgment Fund and shall be considered for the same purposes as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in the current fiscal year or any prior fiscal year.

SEC. 8083. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ–1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8084. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: Provided, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: Provided further, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8085. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

SEC. 8086. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8087. The Director of National Intelligence shall include the budget exhibits identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) as described in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation with the congressional budget justification books:

(1) For procurement programs requesting more than $10,000,000 in any fiscal year, the P–1, Procurement Program; P–5, Cost Analysis; P–5a, Procurement History and Planning; P–21, Production Schedule; and P–40, Budget Item Justification.

(2) For research, development, test and evaluation projects requesting more than $5,000,000 in any fiscal year, the R–1, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program; R–2, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Budget Item Justification; R–3, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project Cost Analysis; and R–4, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program Schedule Profile.

SEC. 8088. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8089. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $20,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: Provided, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

SEC. 8090. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1(d)) that—

(1) creates a new start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of $10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8091. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8092. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8093. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, or any other named operations in the U.S. Central Command area of operation on a monthly basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 ''Contingency Operations'', Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8095. Funds appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance may be available for the purpose of making remittances to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with the requirements of section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8096. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8097. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of $1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a ''covered subcontractor'' is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of $1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

SEC. 8098. None of the funds made available under this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8099. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $139,204,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–84: Provided, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417: Provided further, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8100. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more Senior Executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8101. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay a retired general or flag officer to serve as a senior mentor advising the Department of Defense unless such retired officer files a Standard Form 278 (or successor form concerning public financial disclosure under part 2634 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Office of Government Ethics.

SEC. 8102. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8103. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund''. There is appropriated $2,382,100,000, for the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'', to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'' to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; research, development, test and evaluation; and procurement, only for the purposes of manning, operating, sustaining, equipping and modernizing the Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers CG–63, CG–64, CG–65, CG–66, CG–68, CG–69, CG–73, and the Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships LSD–41 and LSD–46: Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which they are transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided herein shall be in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, not less than 30 days prior to making any transfer from the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'', notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of such transfer.

SEC. 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to take beneficial occupancy of more than 2,500 parking spaces (other than handicap-reserved spaces) to be provided by the BRAC 133 project: Provided, That this limitation may be waived in part if: (1) the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that levels of service at existing intersections in the vicinity of the project have not experienced failing levels of service as defined by the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual over a consecutive 90-day period; (2) the Department of Defense and the Virginia Department of Transportation agree on the number of additional parking spaces that may be made available to employees of the facility subject to continued 90-day traffic monitoring; and (3) the Secretary of Defense notifies the congressional defense committees in writing at least 14 days prior to exercising this waiver of the number of additional parking spaces to be made available.

SEC. 8105. Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall resume quarterly reporting of the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance Federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees within 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to plan, prepare for, or otherwise take any action to undertake or implement the separation of the National Intelligence Program budget from the Department of Defense budget.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8107. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of

Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $2,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2013.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8108. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in the Act, there is appropriated $270,000,000 for an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', to be available until expended: Provided, That such funds shall only be available to the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, or supplement other Federal funds to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools: Provided further, That in making such funds available, the Office of Economic Adjustment or the Secretary of Education shall give priority consideration to those military installations with schools having the most serious capacity or facility condition deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may not be made available for a school unless its enrollment of Department of Defense-connected children is greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8110. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to effectuate—

(A) an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance); or

(B) a pre-trial agreement entered in a military commission case prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) A certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that—

(1) the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantánamo is to be transferred—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or re-engage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(2) includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to effectuate—

(A) an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance); or

(B) a pre-trial agreement entered in a military commission case prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d)(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability to a detainee transfer of a certification requirement specified in subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1) or the prohibition in subsection (c), if the Secretary certifies the rest of the criteria required by subsection (b) for transfers prohibited by (c) and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, determines that—

(A) alternative actions will be taken to address the underlying purpose of the requirement or requirements to be waived;

(B) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated, but the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate such risks with regard to the individual to be transferred;

(C) in the case of a waiver of subsection (c), the Secretary has considered any confirmed case in which an individual who was transferred to the country subsequently engaged in terrorist activity, and the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism with regard to the individual to be transferred; and

(D) the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual concerned, the following:

(A) A copy of the determination and the waiver concerned.

(B) A statement of the basis for the determination, including—

(i) an explanation why the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(ii) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), an explanation why it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the subparagraph to be waived have been completely eliminated.

(C) A summary of the alternative actions to be taken to address the underlying purpose of, and to mitigate the risks addressed in, the subparagraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''individual detained at Guantánamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SEC. 8111. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation

under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8114. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104(g) or (h)).

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act for International Military education and training, foreign military financing, excess defense article, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456) issuance for direct commercial sales of military equipment, or peacekeeping operations for the countries of Chad, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Burma may be used to support any military training or operation that include child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, and except if such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c–1).

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8117. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, realign, or transfer Air Force aircraft, to disestablish or convert units associated with such aircraft, or to disestablish or convert any other unit of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve: Provided, That this section shall not apply to actions affecting C–5, C–17, or E–8 aircraft, or the units associated with such aircraft: Provided further, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8118. The Secretary of the Air Force shall obligate and expend funds previously appropriated for the procurement of RQ–4B Global Hawk and C–27J Spartan aircraft for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

SEC. 8119. It is the Sense of the Senate that the next available capital warship of the U.S. Navy be named the USS Ted Stevens to recognize the public service achievements, military service sacrifice, and undaunted heroism and courage of the long-serving United States Senator for Alaska.

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to retire C–23 Sherpa aircraft.

SEC. 8121. The total amount available in the Act for pay for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 shall be the amount otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act for such pay reduced by $72,718,000.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract for UH–60 Leak Proof Drip Pans using procedures other than competitive procedures (as defined in section 2302(2) of title 10, United States Code).

SEC. 8123. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1646; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) or any provision of an Act authorizing appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 relating to sharing classified ballistic missile defense information with Russia.

SEC. 8124. None of the Operation and Maintenance funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 41106 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 8125. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

SEC. 8126. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person or other entity listed in the Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)/System for Award Management (SAM) as having been convicted of fraud against the Federal Government.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of Defense may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, that does not exist as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8129. (a) REQUIREMENT TO CONTINUE PROVISION OF TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall carry out tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces during the remainder of fiscal year 2013 using amounts specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS.—The minimum amount used by the Secretary of a military department for tuition assistance for members of an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be not less than—

(1) the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for tuition assistance programs for members of that Armed Force, minus

(2) an amount that is not more than the percentage of the reduction required to the Operation and Maintenance account for that Armed Force for fiscal year 2013 by the budget sequester required by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $9,790,082,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $774,225,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $1,425,156,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $1,286,783,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $156,893,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $39,335,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $24,722,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $25,348,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $583,804,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $10,473,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $28,452,018,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $5,839,934,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $4,116,340,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $9,249,736,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the

Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $7,714,079,000: Provided, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military operations in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and post-operation Iraq border security related to the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided further, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the requirement under this heading to provide notification to the appropriate congressional committees shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: Provided further, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: Provided further, That such amount in this section is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $157,887,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $55,924,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $25,477,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $60,618,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $392,448,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $34,500,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated $582,884,000 for the ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'' for expenses directly relating to overseas contingency operations by United States military forces, to be available until expended: Provided, That of the funds made available in this section, the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, and working capital fund accounts: Provided further, That the funds made available in this paragraph may only be used for programs, projects, or activities categorized as Overseas Contingency Operations in the fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense and the justification material and other documentation supporting such request: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to such transfer: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'', $325,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, which may require funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, water, power, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: Provided further, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: Provided further, That any projects funded under this heading shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for purposes of undertaking projects, which funds shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act: Provided further, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: Provided further, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: Provided further, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: Provided further, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 635(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committees of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That the ''appropriate committees of Congress'' are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $5,124,167,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding: Provided further, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: Provided further, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of $20,000,000: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $550,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $67,951,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $15,422,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $338,493,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,740,157,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $215,698,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $22,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $283,059,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $98,882,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $822,054,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $305,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $34,350,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $116,203,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $2,680,270,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $188,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: Provided, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $29,660,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $52,519,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $53,150,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $112,387,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $243,600,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $993,898,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $469,025,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $1,622,614,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That

such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Inspector General'', $10,766,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: Provided further, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'', or the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: Provided, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle; and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9005. Not to exceed $200,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: Provided, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed $20,000,000: Provided further, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: Provided further, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: Provided further, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9006. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9009. None of the funds provided for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: Provided, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of $50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of $100,000,000 using ASFF: Provided further, That the AROC must approve all projects and the execution plan under the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' (AIF) and any project in excess of $5,000,000 from the Commanders Emergency Response Program (CERP): Provided further, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding provisos and accompanying report language for the ASFF, AIF, and CERP.

SEC. 9010. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: Provided, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $500,000.

SEC. 9011. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to $93,000,000 of funds made available in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be obligated and expended for purposes of the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out strategic business and economic assistance activities in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom: Provided, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section for any project with a total anticipated cost of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for each proposed project.

SEC. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' up to $508,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Ministry of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: Provided further, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and

the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are needed after the end of fiscal year 2013, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): Provided further, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notification containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2013.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9013. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That such amounts are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985:

''Retroactive Stop Loss Special Pay Program, 2009/XXXX'', $127,200,000;

''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, 2012/2013'', $1,000,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2012/2014'', $207,600,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, 2012/2014'', $32,176,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps, 2012/2014'', $2,776,000;

''Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund, 2012/2013'', $400,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2012/2013'', $50,000,000;

''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, 2012/2014'', $40,300,000.

SEC. 9014. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for payments under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(6) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in paragraph (a) on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so: Provided, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises the authority of the previous proviso, the Secretaries shall report to the Committees on Appropriations on both the justification for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: Provided further, That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

This division may be cited as the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013''.

DIVISION D—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, $130,000,000: Provided, That not to exceed $45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, expenditure plans for the Office of Policy, the Office for Intergovernmental Affairs, the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman, and the Privacy Officer.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), $218,511,000, of which not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $5,448,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and $9,680,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: Provided further, That the Under Secretary for Management shall, pursuant to the requirements contained in House Report 112–331, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014, submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'' under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), $51,500,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for financial systems modernization efforts.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, $243,732,000; of which $118,000,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $125,732,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That the Department of Homeland Security Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan, to include each of fiscal years 2013 through 2016, for all information technology acquisition projects funded under this heading or funded by multiple components of the Department of Homeland Security through reimbursable agreements, that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities that are proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) a current acquisition program baseline for each project, that—

(A) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) aligns the acquisition programs covered by the baseline to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) defines life-cycle costs for such programs.

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $322,280,000; of which not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which $94,359,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $121,164,000, of which not to exceed $300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

TITLE II

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500

for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; $8,293,351,000; of which $3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which not to exceed $34,425 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided, That for fiscal year 2013, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be $35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: Provided further, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for operation and improvement of automated systems, including salaries and expenses, $719,866,000; of which $325,526,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015; and of which not less than $138,794,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, $324,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including salaries and expenses and operational training and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; $799,006,000; of which $283,570,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $515,436,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2013 without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under this heading in Public Law 112–74.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, $233,563,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an inventory of the real property of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and a plan for each activity and project proposed for funding under this heading that includes the full cost by fiscal year of each activity and project proposed and underway in fiscal year 2014.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; $5,394,402,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed $11,475 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than $305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than $5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); and of which not to exceed $11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, $15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed $6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That of the total amount available, not less than $1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable, of which $138,249,000 shall be for completion of Secure Communities deployment: Provided further, That the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 45 days after the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, on progress in implementing the preceding proviso and the funds obligated during that quarter to make such progress: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: Provided further, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2013: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, not less than $2,753,610,000 is for detention and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, $10,300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for the Visa Security Program: Provided further, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including operation of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been violated: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than ''adequate'' or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: Provided further, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, $33,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That of the total amount provided, up to $1,000,000 may be transferred to the Department of Justice Executive Office of Immigration Review to improve case management and electronic communication with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Provided further, That no transfer described in the previous proviso shall occur until 15 days after the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified of such transfer.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs and immigration, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $5,052,620,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which not to exceed $7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $3,975,517,000 shall be for screening operations, of which $408,930,000 shall be available for explosives detection systems; $115,204,000 shall be for checkpoint support; and not to exceed $1,077,103,000 shall be for aviation security direction and enforcement: Provided further, That of the amount made available in the preceding proviso for explosives detection systems, $99,930,000 shall be available for the purchase

and installation of these systems: Provided further, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: Provided further, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: Provided further, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2013 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $2,982,620,000: Provided further, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount made available under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2014: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2013, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: Provided further, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 46,000 full-time equivalent screeners: Provided further, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: Provided further, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

Provided further, That the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall, within 270 days of the date of enactment of this Act, establish procedures allowing members of cabin flight crews of air carriers to participate in the Known Crewmember pilot program, unless the Administrator determines that meeting the requirement within this timeline is not practicable and informs the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the basis for that determination and the new timeline for implementing the requirement: Provided further, That Members of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the United States Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, $124,418,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

TRANSPORTATION THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CREDENTIALING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of screening programs of the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing, $192,424,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support and intelligence pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $954,277,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $20,000,000 may not be obligated for headquarters administration until the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailed expenditure plans for air cargo security, checkpoint support, and explosives detection systems refurbishment, procurement, and installations on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2013: Provided further, That these plans shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Air Marshal Service, $907,757,000: Provided, That the Director of the Federal Air Marshal Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a detailed, classified expenditure and staffing plan for ensuring optimal coverage of high risk flights.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than $700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of $31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding $1,000,000 in total cost on any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; $7,074,782,000; of which $594,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which $254,000,000 is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; of which $24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed $15,300 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, $75,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a revised future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, as specified under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' of this Act is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism may be allocated by program, project, and activity, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, $13,151,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; $132,528,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $1,545,393,000; of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, for military family housing, of which not more than $6,828,691 shall be derived from the Coast Guard Housing Fund established pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 687; of which $1,082,800,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; of which $190,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; of which $64,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for other acquisition programs; of which $84,411,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for shore facilities and aids to navigation, including waterfront facilities at Navy installations used by the Coast Guard; of which $113,682,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: Provided, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for the production of the sixth National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for post-production costs: Provided further, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for long lead time materials, components, and designs for the seventh National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for production costs or post-production costs: Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a

detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget as submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year: Provided further, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: Provided further, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110–28 shall apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $19,690,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which $500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): Provided, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, $1,423,000,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; $1,555,913,000; of which not to exceed $19,125 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which $2,366,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which $6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2014; and of which $4,000,000 shall be for activities related to training in electronic crimes investigations and forensics: Provided, That up to $18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That $4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: Provided further, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided further, That the Director of the United States Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation: Provided further, That for purposes of section 503(b) of this Act, $15,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, may be transferred between ''Protection of persons and facilities'' and ''Domestic field operations''.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, $56,750,000; of which $4,430,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of facilities; and of which $52,320,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be for information integration and technology transformation execution: Provided, That the Director of the United States Secret Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for its Information Integration and Technology Transformation program that describes funding for the current fiscal year and the following 3 fiscal years, with associated plans for systems acquisition and technology deployment.

TITLE III

PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, $50,220,000: Provided, That not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $1,157,529,000, of which $200,000,000, shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That of the total amount provided for the ''Infrastructure security compliance'' program, project, and activity, $20,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an expenditure plan for the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program that includes the number of facilities covered by the program, inspectors on-board, inspections pending, and inspections projected to be completed by September 30, 2013.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall certify in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than May 1, 2013, that the operations of the Federal Protective Service will be fully funded in fiscal year 2013 through revenues and collection of security fees, and shall adjust the fees to ensure fee collections are sufficient to ensure that the Federal Protective Service maintains not fewer than 1,371 full-time equivalent staff and 1,007 full-time equivalent Police Officers,

Inspectors, Area Commanders, and Special Agents who, while working, are directly engaged on a daily basis protecting and enforcing laws at Federal buildings (referred to as ''in-service field staff''): Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Protective Service shall include with the submission of the President's fiscal year 2014 budget a strategic human capital plan that aligns fee collections to personnel requirements based on a current threat assessment.

OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), $232,422,000: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $113,956,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management program, to include each fiscal year starting with the current fiscal year and the 3 subsequent fiscal years, that provides—

(1) the proposed appropriation for each activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered, noting any deviations in cost or performance from the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology;

(2) the total estimated cost, projected funding by fiscal year, and projected timeline of completion for all enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget and underway, including and clearly delineating associated efforts and funds requested by other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security and in the Federal Government and detailing any deviations in cost, performance, schedule, or estimated date of completion provided in the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology; and

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance, contractor services, and program costs associated with the management of identity services:

Provided further, That amounts obligated under Public Law 112–175 for National Protection and Programs Directorate, ''United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology'' shall be charged to the appropriate successor account of the following: National Protection and Programs Directorate, ''Office of Biometric Identity Management''; U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Salaries and Expenses''; or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ''Salaries and Expenses''.

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, $132,499,000; of which $26,702,000 is for salaries and expenses; and of which $85,390,000 is for BioWatch operations: Provided, That of the amount made available under this heading, $20,407,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for biosurveillance, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: Provided further, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, $973,118,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–295; 120 Stat. 1394), and the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 917): Provided, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2013 and thereafter, for purposes of planning, coordination, execution, and decision making related to mass evacuation during a disaster, the Governors of the State of West Virginia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or their designees, shall be incorporated into efforts to integrate the activities of Federal, State, and local governments in the National Capital Region, as defined in section 882 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296): Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $35,180,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which none is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency administrative costs: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $22,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for expenses related to modernization of automated systems: Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security Chief Information Officer, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an expenditure plan including results to date, plans for the program, and a list of projects with associated funding provided from prior appropriations and provided by this Act for modernization of automated systems.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For grants contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, $1,466,082,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) Not less than $346,600,000 shall be for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), of which not less than $46,600,000 shall be for Operation Stonegarden: Provided, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2013, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(2) Not less than $500,376,000 shall be for the Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604), of which not less than $10,000,000 shall be for organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(3) Not less than $97,500,000 shall be for Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163), of which not less than $10,000,000 shall be for Amtrak security: Provided, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(4) Not less than $97,500,000 shall be for Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(5) Notwithstanding section 503 of this Act, $188,932,000 shall be distributed, according to threat, vulnerability, and consequence, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security based on the following authorities:

(A) The State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605): Provided, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2013, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(B) Operation Stonegarden.

(C) The Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604).

(D) Organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(E) Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163), including Amtrak security: Provided, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(F) Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(G) Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under section 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1182).

(H) The Metropolitan Medical Response System under section 635 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

(I) The Citizen Corps Program.

(J) The Driver's License Security Grants Program in accordance with section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

(K) The Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 579).

(L) Emergency Operations Centers under section 614 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196c).

(M) The Buffer Zone Protection Program Grants.

(N) Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants.

(6) $235,174,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which $157,991,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers:

Provided, That for grants under paragraphs (1) through (5), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)), or any other provision of law, a grantee may not use more than 5

percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: Provided further, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: Provided further, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided further, That in fiscal year 2013 and thereafter: (a) the Center for Domestic Preparedness may provide training to emergency response providers from the Federal Government, foreign governments, or private entities, if the Center for Domestic Preparedness is reimbursed for the cost of such training, and any reimbursement under this subsection shall be credited to the account from which the expenditure being reimbursed was made and shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which amounts in the account may be expended; (b) the head of the Center for Domestic Preparedness shall ensure that any training provided under (a) does not interfere with the primary mission of the Center to train State and local emergency response providers; and (c) subject to (b), nothing in (a) prohibits the Center for Domestic Preparedness from providing training to employees of the Federal Emergency Management Agency in existing chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosives, mass casualty, and medical surge courses pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 4103 without reimbursement for the cost of such training.

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), $675,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For emergency management performance grants, as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $350,000,000.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2013, as authorized in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5196e), shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: Provided, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: Provided further, That fees received under this heading shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2013, and remain available until September 30, 2015.

UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the United States Fire Administration and for other purposes, as authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), $44,000,000.

DISASTER RELIEF FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $7,007,926,000, to remain available until expended, of which $24,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: Provided, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit an expenditure plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing the use of the funds made available in this or any other Act for disaster readiness and support not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to such Committees a quarterly report detailing obligations against the expenditure plan and a justification for any changes from the initial plan: Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following reports, including a specific description of the methodology and the source data used in developing such reports:

(1) an estimate of the following amounts shall be submitted for the budget year at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code:

(A) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the prior fiscal year to the budget year;

(B) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the budget year to the budget year plus 1;

(C) the amount of obligations for non-catastrophic events for the budget year;

(D) the amount of obligations for the budget year for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State;

(E) the total amount that has been previously obligated or will be required for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State for all prior years, the current year, the budget year, the budget year plus 1, the budget year plus 2, and the budget year plus 3 and beyond;

(F) the amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered for the budget year;

(G) the amount that will be required for obligations for emergencies, as described in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), major disasters, as described in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), fire management assistance grants, as described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187), surge activities, and disaster readiness and support activities;

(H) the amount required for activities not covered under section 251(b)(2)(D)(iii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)(iii); Public Law 99–177);

(2) an estimate or actual amounts, if available, of the following for the current fiscal year shall be submitted not later than the fifth day of each month:

(A) a summary of the amount of appropriations made available by source, the transfers executed, the previously allocated funds recovered, and the commitments, allocations, and obligations made;

(B) a table of disaster relief activity delineated by month, including—

(i) the beginning and ending balances;

(ii) the total obligations to include amounts obligated for fire assistance, emergencies, surge, and disaster support activities;

(iii) the obligations for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State; and

(iv) the amount of previously obligated funds that are recovered;

(C) a summary of allocations, obligations, and expenditures for catastrophic events delineated by event; and

(D) the date on which funds appropriated will be exhausted:

Provided further, That of the amount provided under this heading, $6,400,000,000 is for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): Provided further, That the amount in the preceding proviso is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, including administrative costs, under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101) and under sections 100215, 100216, 100226, 100230, and 100246 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 917), $95,329,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4101(f)(2)), to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), and the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 917), $171,000,000, which shall be derived from offsetting amounts collected under section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)); of which not to exceed $22,000,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and not less than $149,000,000 shall be available for flood plain management and flood mapping, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That any additional fees collected pursuant to section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to this account, to be available for flood plain management and flood mapping: Provided further, That in fiscal year 2013, no funds shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund under section 1310 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 4017) in excess of:

(1) $132,000,000 for operating expenses;

(2) $1,056,602,000 for commissions and taxes of agents;

(3) such sums as are necessary for interest on Treasury borrowings; and

(4) $120,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for flood mitigation actions under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c): Provided further, That the amounts collected under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) and section 1366(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 shall be deposited in the National Flood Insurance Fund to supplement other amounts specified as available for section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, notwithstanding subsection (f)(8) of such section 102 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(8)) and subsection 1366(e) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1367(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c(e), 4104d(b)(2)–(3)): Provided further, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 4 percent of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

For the predisaster mitigation grant program under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133), $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out the emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), $120,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That total administrative

costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, $111,924,000 for the E-Verify Program, as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), to assist United States employers with maintaining a legal workforce: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds otherwise made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may be used to acquire, operate, equip, and dispose of up to 5 vehicles, for replacement only, for areas where the Administrator of General Services does not provide vehicles for lease: Provided further, That the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may authorize employees who are assigned to those areas to use such vehicles to travel between the employees' residences and places of employment.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; the purchase of not to exceed 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in firearms matches and presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; $228,467,000; of which up to $44,758,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; of which $300,000 shall remain available until expended to be distributed to Federal law enforcement agencies for expenses incurred participating in training accreditation; and of which not to exceed $9,180 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: Provided further, That section 1202(a) of Public Law 107–206 (42 U.S.C. 3771 note), as amended by Public Law 112–74, is further amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015'': Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that such training facilities are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year: Provided further, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board, including representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training, shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, construction, and ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, $28,385,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That the Center is authorized to accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and for management and administration of programs and activities, as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), $132,000,000: Provided, That not to exceed $7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for science and technology research, including advanced research projects, development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and operations as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), and the purchase or lease of not to exceed 5 vehicles, $703,471,000; of which $538,539,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015; and of which $164,932,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, solely for operation and construction of laboratory facilities.

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, as authorized by title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.), for management and administration of programs and activities, $39,650,000: Provided, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a strategic plan of investments necessary to implement the Department of Homeland Security's responsibilities under the domestic component of the global nuclear detection architecture that shall:

(1) define the role and responsibilities of each Departmental component in support of the domestic detection architecture, including any existing or planned programs to pre-screen cargo or conveyances overseas;

(2) identify and describe the specific investments being made by each Departmental component in fiscal year 2013 and planned for fiscal year 2014 to support the domestic architecture and the security of sea, land, and air pathways into the United States;

(3) describe the investments necessary to close known vulnerabilities and gaps, including associated costs and timeframes, and estimates of feasibility and cost effectiveness; and

(4) explain how the Department's research and development funding is furthering the implementation of the domestic nuclear detection architecture, including specific investments planned for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for radiological and nuclear research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations, $226,830,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For expenses for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office acquisition and deployment of radiological detection systems in accordance with the global nuclear detection architecture, $51,455,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act, may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts, and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program, project, or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project, office, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; or

(5) contracts out any function or activity for which funding levels were requested for Federal full-time equivalents in the object classification tables contained in the fiscal year 2013 Budget Appendix for the Department of Homeland Security, as modified by the joint explanatory statement accompanying this Act, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or proceeds available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that:

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity;

(3) reduces by 10 percent the numbers of personnel approved by the Congress; or

(4) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by the Congress, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security by this Act or provided by previous appropriations Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: Provided, That any transfer under this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under subsection (b) and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, no funds shall be reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriations after June 30, except in extraordinary

circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.

(e) The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in this section shall apply to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided in previous Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 504. The Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund, established pursuant to section 403 of Public Law 103–356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note), shall continue operations as a permanent working capital fund for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security may be used to make payments to the Working Capital Fund, except for the activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget: Provided further, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation until expended to carry out the purposes of the Working Capital Fund: Provided further, That all departmental components shall be charged only for direct usage of each Working Capital Fund service: Provided further, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be used only for purposes consistent with the contributing component: Provided further, That the Working Capital Fund shall be paid in advance or reimbursed at rates which will return the full cost of each service: Provided further, That the Working Capital Fund shall be subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2013 from appropriations for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2013 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2014, in the account and for the purposes for which the appropriations were provided: Provided, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2013 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) make or award a grant allocation, grant, contract, other transaction agreement, task or delivery order on a Department of Homeland Security multiple award contract, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of $1,000,000;

(2) award a task or delivery order requiring an obligation of funds in an amount greater than $10,000,000 from multi-year Department of Homeland Security funds or a task or delivery order that would cause cumulative obligations of multi-year funds in a single account to exceed 50 percent of the total amount appropriated;

(3) make a sole-source grant award; or

(4) announce publicly the intention to make or award items under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance of making an award or issuing a letter as described in that subsection.

(c) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with this section would pose a substantial risk to human life, health, or safety, an award may be made without notification, and the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 5 full business days after such an award is made or letter issued.

(d) A notification under this section—

(1) may not involve funds that are not available for obligation; and

(2) shall include the amount of the award; the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated; type of contract; and the account and each program, project, and activity from which the funds are being drawn.

(e) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 full business days in advance of announcing publicly the intention of making an award under ''State and Local Programs''.

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training that cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus otherwise required under chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 510. (a) Sections 520, 522, and 530 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008 (division E of Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 2073 and 2074) shall apply with respect to funds made available in this Act in the same manner as such sections applied to funds made available in that Act.

(b) The third proviso of section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006 (6 U.S.C. 114), shall not apply with respect to funds made available in this Act.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any person other than the Privacy Officer appointed under subsection (a) of section 222 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 142(a)) to alter, direct that changes be made to, delay, or prohibit the transmission to Congress of any report prepared under paragraph (6) of such subsection.

SEC. 513. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448).

SEC. 514. Within 45 days after the end of each month, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a monthly budget and staffing report for that month that includes total obligations, on-board versus funded full-time equivalent staffing levels, and the number of contract employees for each office of the Department.

SEC. 515. Except as provided in section 44945 of title 49, United States Code, funds appropriated or transferred to Transportation Security Administration ''Aviation Security'', ''Administration'', and ''Transportation Security Support'' for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for the procurement or installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification: Provided, That quarterly reports shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

SEC. 516. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to process or approve a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 for services provided as of June 1, 2004, by employees (including employees serving on a temporary or term basis) of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security who are known as of that date as Immigration Information Officers, Contact Representatives, or Investigative Assistants.

SEC. 517. Any funds appropriated to Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 for the 110–123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as the result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

SEC. 518. Section 532(a) of Public Law 109–295 (120 Stat. 1384) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

SEC. 519. The functions of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center instructor staff shall be classified as inherently governmental for the purpose of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note).

SEC. 520. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act to the ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', the ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'', or the ''Office of the Chief Financial Officer'', may be obligated for a grant or contract funded under such headings by any means other than full and open competition.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to obligation of funds for a contract awarded—

(1) by a means that is required by a Federal statute, including obligation for a purchase made under a mandated preferential program, including the AbilityOne Program, that is authorized under chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code;

(2) pursuant to the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.);

(3) in an amount less than the simplified acquisition threshold described under section 3101 (b) of title 41, United States Code; or

(4) by another Federal agency using funds provided through an interagency agreement.

(c)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of this section for the award of a contract in the interest of national security or if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare.

(2) Not later than 5 days after the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security issues a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit notification of that waiver to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including a description of the applicable contract to which the waiver applies and an explanation of why the waiver authority was used: Provided, That the Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(d) In addition to the requirements established by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall review departmental contracts awarded through means other than a full and open competition to assess departmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations: Provided, That the Inspector General shall review selected contracts awarded in the previous 3 fiscal years through means other than a full and open competition: Provided further, That in selecting which contracts to review, the Inspector General shall consider the cost and complexity of the goods and services to be provided under the contract, the criticality of

the contract to fulfilling Department missions, past performance problems on similar contracts or by the selected vendor, complaints received about the award process or contractor performance, and such other factors as the Inspector General deems relevant: Provided further, That the Inspector General shall report the results of the reviews to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than February 4, 2015, and every 3 years thereafter.

SEC. 521. None of the funds provided by this or previous appropriations Acts shall be used to fund any position designated as a Principal Federal Official (or the successor thereto) for any Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) declared disasters or emergencies unless—

(1) the responsibilities of the Principal Federal Official do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations, and are consistent with the requirements of section 509(c) and sections 503(c)(3) and 503(c)(4)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 319(c) and 313(c)(3) and 313(c)(4)(A)) and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

(2) not later than 10 business days after the latter of the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security appoints the Principal Federal Official and the date on which the President issues a declaration under section 401 or section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191, respectively), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a notification of the appointment of the Principal Federal Official and a description of the responsibilities of such Official and how such responsibilities are consistent with paragraph (1) to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report specifying timeframes and milestones regarding the update of operations, planning and policy documents, and training and exercise protocols, to ensure consistency with paragraph (1) of this section.

SEC. 522. None of the funds provided or otherwise made available in this Act shall be available to carry out section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452).

SEC. 523. Funds made available in this Act may be used to alter operations within the Civil Engineering Program of the Coast Guard nationwide, including civil engineering units, facilities design and construction centers, maintenance and logistics commands, and the Coast Guard Academy, except that none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce operations within any Civil Engineering Unit unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 524. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit unless the results of background checks required by law to be completed prior to the granting of the benefit have been received by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the results do not preclude the granting of the benefit.

SEC. 525. Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Until September 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''Until September 30, 2013,'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''September 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013,''.

SEC. 526. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that all contracts of the Department of Homeland Security that provide award fees link such fees to successful acquisition outcomes (which outcomes shall be specified in terms of cost, schedule, and performance).

SEC. 527. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be used to approve a waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b) for the transportation of crude oil distributed from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretaries of the Departments of Energy and Transportation and representatives from the United States flag maritime industry, takes adequate measures to ensure the use of United States flag vessels: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives within 2 business days of any request for waivers of navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b).

SEC. 528. None of the funds made available to the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management under this Act may be expended for any new hires by the Department of Homeland Security that are not verified through the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

SEC. 529. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to reduce the United States Coast Guard's Operations Systems Center mission or its government-employed or contract staff levels.

SEC. 530. None of the funds made available in this Act for U.S. Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug (within the meaning of section 801(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) from importing a prescription drug from Canada that complies with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: Provided, That this section shall apply only to individuals transporting on their person a personal-use quantity of the prescription drug, not to exceed a 90-day supply: Provided further, That the prescription drug may not be—

(1) a controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); or

(2) a biological product, as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

SEC. 531. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to conduct, or to implement the results of, a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 for activities performed with respect to the Coast Guard National Vessel Documentation Center.

SEC. 532. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any proposed transfers of funds available under section 9703.1(g)(4)(B) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102–393) from the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency within the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That none of the funds identified for such a transfer may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the proposed transfers.

SEC. 533. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

SEC. 534. If the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration determines that an airport does not need to participate in the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), the Administrator shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that no security risks will result from such non-participation.

SEC. 535. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), and 30 days after the date on which the President determines whether to declare a major disaster because of an event and any appeal is completed, the Administrator shall publish on the Web site of the Federal Emergency Management Agency a report regarding that decision that shall summarize damage assessment information used to determine whether to declare a major disaster.

(b) The Administrator may redact from a report under subsection (a) any data that the Administrator determines would compromise national security.

(c) In this section—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(2) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

SEC. 536. Any official that is required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may not delegate such authority to perform that act unless specifically authorized herein.

SEC. 537. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note), as amended by section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–83), is further amended by striking ''on October 4, 2012'' and inserting ''on October 4, 2013''.

SEC. 538. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 539. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301.10–124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 540. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act for fiscal year 2013 and thereafter may be used to propose or effect a disciplinary or adverse action, with respect to any Department of Homeland Security employee who engages regularly with the public in the performance of his or her official duties solely because that employee elects to utilize protective equipment or measures, including but not limited to surgical masks, N95 respirators, gloves, or hand-sanitizers, where use of such equipment or measures is in accord with Department of Homeland Security policy, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Office of Personnel Management guidance.

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

SEC. 542. (a) Any company that collects or retains personal information directly from any individual who participates in the Registered Traveler or successor program of the Transportation Security Administration shall safeguard and dispose of such information in accordance with the requirements in—

(1) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–30, entitled ''Risk Management Guide for Information Technology Systems'';

(2) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53, Revision 3, entitled ''Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations''; and

(3) any supplemental standards established by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'').

(b) The airport authority or air carrier operator that sponsors the company under the Registered Traveler program shall be known as the ''Sponsoring Entity''.

(c) The Administrator shall require any company covered by subsection (a) to provide, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Sponsoring Entity written certification that the procedures used by the company to safeguard and dispose of information are in compliance with the requirements under subsection (a). Such certification shall include a description of the procedures used by the company to comply with such requirements.

SEC. 543. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractor performance that has been judged to be below satisfactory performance or performance that does not meet the basic requirements of a contract.

SEC. 544. (a) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a report that either—

(1) certifies that the requirement for screening all air cargo on passenger aircraft by the deadline under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, has been met; or

(2) includes a strategy to comply with the requirements under title 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, including—

(A) a plan to meet the requirement under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, to screen 100 percent of air cargo transported on passenger aircraft arriving in the United States in foreign air transportation (as that term is defined in section 40102 of that title); and

(B) specification of—

(i) the percentage of such air cargo that is being screened; and

(ii) the schedule for achieving screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

(b) The Administrator shall continue to submit reports described in subsection (a)(2) every 180 days thereafter until the Administrator certifies that the Transportation Security Administration has achieved screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

SEC. 545. In developing any process to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security purposes, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all such processes take into consideration such passengers' and crews' privacy and civil liberties consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

SEC. 546. (a) Notwithstanding section 1356(n) of title 8, United States Code, of the funds deposited into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, $7,500,000 shall be allocated by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in fiscal year 2013 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

(b) For an additional amount for ''United States Citizenship and Immigration Services'' for the purpose of providing immigrant integration grants, $2,500,000.

(c) None of the funds made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for grants for immigrant integration may be used to provide services to aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SEC. 547. For an additional amount for necessary expenses for reimbursement of the actual costs to State and local governments for providing emergency management, public safety, and security at events, as determined by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, related to the presence of a National Special Security Event, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

SEC. 548. Notwithstanding the 10 percent limitation contained in section 503(c) of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer to the fund established by 8 U.S.C. 1101 note, up to $20,000,000 from appropriations available to the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 days in advance of such transfer.

SEC. 549. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless such contract is otherwise authorized by statute to be entered into without regard to the above referenced statutes.

SEC. 550. (a) For an additional amount for data center migration, $55,000,000.

(b) Funds made available in subsection (a) for data center migration may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

(c) No transfer described in subsection (b) shall occur until 15 days after the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified of such transfer.

SEC. 551. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that specific U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities no longer meet the mission need, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of individual Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities by directing the Administrator of General Services to sell all real and related personal property which support Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities, subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements: Provided, That the proceeds, net of the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall be deposited as offsetting collections into a separate account that shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended for other real property capital asset needs of existing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement assets, excluding daily operations and maintenance costs, as the Secretary deems appropriate: Provided further, That any sale or collocation of federally owned detention facilities shall not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds: Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified 15 days prior to the announcement of any proposed sale or collocation.

SEC. 552. For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'', $29,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses to plan, acquire, design, construct, renovate, remediate, equip, furnish, improve infrastructure, and occupy buildings and facilities for the department headquarters consolidation project and associated mission support consolidation: Provided, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall receive an expenditure plan not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing the allocation of these funds.

SEC. 553. In making grants under the heading ''Firefighter Assistance Grants'', the Secretary may grant waivers from the requirements in subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(E), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4) of section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 555. The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall, with respect to fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the information required in the multi-year investment and management plans required, respectively, under the headings U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Salaries and Expenses'' under title II of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'' under such title, and section 568 of such Act.

SEC. 556. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure enforcement of immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

SEC. 557. (a) Notwithstanding Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11, funds made available in fiscal year 2013, or any fiscal year thereafter, under Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' for—

(1) long lead time materials, components, and designs of a vessel of the Coast Guard shall be immediately available and allotted to make a contract award notwithstanding the availability of funds for production, outfitting, post-delivery activities, and spare or repair parts; and

(2) production of a vessel of the Coast Guard shall be immediately available and allotted to make a contract award notwithstanding the availability of funds for outfitting, post-delivery activities, and spare or repair parts.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop fiscal policy that prescribes Coast Guard budgetary policies, procedures and technical direction necessary to comply with subsection (a) of this section and consistent with the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation (Volume 2A, Chapter 1 C. Procedures for Full Funding) to include the costs associated with outfitting and post-delivery activities; spare and repair parts; and long lead time materials. The requirement set forth in this section shall not preclude the immediate availability or allotment of funds for fiscal year 2013, pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) In this section—

(1) the term ''long lead time items'' means components, parts, material, or effort which must be procured in advance of the production award in order to maintain the production schedule;

(2) the term ''outfitting'' means procurement or installation of onboard repair parts, other secondary items, equipage, and recreation items; precommissioning crew support; general use consumables furnished to the shipbuilder; the fitting out activity to fill a vessel's initial allowances; and contractor-furnished spares; and

(3) the term ''post-delivery activities'' means design, planning, Government-furnished material, and related labor for non-production and non-long lead time items contract activities and other work, including certifications, full operational capability activities and other equipment installation; spares, logistics, technical analysis, and support; correction of Government-responsible defects and deficiencies identified during builders trials, acceptance trials, and testing during the post-delivery period; costs of all work required to correct defects or deficiencies identified during the post-delivery period; and costs of all work required to correct

trial card deficiencies on a vessel of a particular class, as well as on subsequent vessels of that class (whether or not delivered) until the corrective action for that cutter class is completed.

SEC. 558. (a) Of the amounts made available by this Act for National Protection and Programs Directorate, ''Infrastructure Protection and Information Security'', $202,000,000 for the ''Federal Network Security'' program, project, and activity shall be used to deploy on Federal systems technology to improve the information security of agency information systems covered by section 3543(a) of title 44, United States Code: Provided, That funds made available under this section shall be used to assist and support Government-wide and agency-specific efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective cybersecurity to address escalating and rapidly evolving threats to information security, including the acquisition and operation of a continuous monitoring and diagnostics program, in collaboration with departments and agencies, that includes equipment, software, and Department of Homeland Security supplied services: Provided further, That not later than April 1, 2013, and quarterly thereafter, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security of the National Protection and Programs Directorate shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the obligation and expenditure of funds made available under this section: Provided further, That continuous monitoring and diagnostics software procured by the funds made available by this section shall not transmit to the Department of Homeland Security any personally identifiable information or content of network communications of other agencies' users: Provided further, That such software shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with all applicable privacy laws and agency-specific policies regarding network content.

(b) Funds made available under this section may not be used to supplant funds provided for any such system within an agency budget.

(c) Not later than July 1, 2013, the heads of all Federal agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives expenditure plans for necessary cybersecurity improvements to address known vulnerabilities to information systems described in subsection (a).

(d) Not later than October 1, 2013, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a report on the execution of the expenditure plan for that agency required by subsection (c): Provided, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall summarize such execution reports and annually submit such summaries to Congress in conjunction with the annual progress report on implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347), as required by section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

(e) This section shall not apply to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government and shall apply to all Federal agencies within the executive branch except for the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 559. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 560. (a) Notwithstanding sections 58c(e) and 1451 of title 19, United States Code, upon the request of any persons, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may enter into reimbursable fee agreements for a period of up to 5 years with such persons for the provision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services and any other costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services. Such requests may include additional U.S. Customs and Border Protection services at existing U.S. Customs and Border Protection-serviced facilities (including but not limited to payment for overtime), the provision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services at new facilities, and expanded U.S. Customs and Border Protection services at land border facilities.

(1) By December 31, 2013, the Commissioner may enter into not more than 5 agreements under this section.

(2) The Commissioner shall not enter into such an agreement if it would unduly and permanently impact services funded in this or any other appropriations Acts, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees.

(b) Funds collected pursuant to any agreement entered into under this section shall be deposited in a newly established account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended, without fiscal year limitation, and shall directly reimburse each appropriation for the amount paid out of that appropriation for any expenses incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection in providing U.S. Customs and Border Protection services and any other costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services.

(c) The amount of the fee to be charged pursuant to an agreement authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be paid by each person requesting U.S. Customs and Border Protection services and shall include, but shall not be limited to, the salaries and expenses of individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to provide such U.S. Customs and Border Protection services and other costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to those services, such as temporary placement or permanent relocation of those individuals.

(d) U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall terminate the provision of services pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (a) with a person that, after receiving notice from the Commissioner that a fee imposed under subsection (a) is due, fails to pay the fee in a timely manner. In the event of such termination, all costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, which have not been reimbursed, will become immediately due and payable. Interest on unpaid fees will accrue based on current U.S. Treasury borrowing rates. Additionally, any person who, after notice and demand for payment of any fee charged under subsection (a) of this section, fails to pay such fee in a timely manner shall be liable for a penalty or liquidated damage equal to two times the amount of the fee. Any amount collected pursuant to any agreement entered into under this subsection shall be deposited into the account specified under subsection (b) of this section and shall be available as described therein.

(e) Each facility at which such U.S. Customs and Border Protection services are performed shall provide, maintain, and equip, without cost to the Government, facilities in accordance with U.S. Customs and Border Protection specifications.

(f) The authority found in this section may not be used to enter into agreements to expand or begin to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection services outside of the United States.

(g) The authority found in this section may not be used at existing U.S. Customs and Border Protection-serviced air facilities to enter into agreements for costs other than payment of overtime.

(h) The Commissioner shall notify the appropriate Committees of Congress 15 days prior to entering into any agreement under the authority of this section and shall provide a copy of the agreement to the appropriate Committees of Congress.

(i) For purposes of this section the terms:

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection ''services'' means any activities of any employee or contractor of U.S. Customs and Border Protection pertaining to customs and immigration inspection-related matters.

(2) ''Person'' means any natural person or any corporation, partnership, trust, association, or any other public or private entity, or any officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(3) ''Appropriate Committees of Congress'' means the Committees on Appropriations; Finance; Judiciary; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations; Judiciary; Ways and Means; and Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 561. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 562. Twenty percent of each of the appropriations provided in this Act for the ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', the ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'', and the ''Office of the Chief Financial Officer'' shall be withheld from obligation until the reports and plans required in this Act to be submitted on or before May 1, 2013, are received by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SEC. 563. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2014, section 204(a)(1)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) Each petition to compete for consideration for a visa under section 1153(c) of this title shall be accompanied by a fee equal to $30. All amounts collected under this clause shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'':

Provided, That the Department of State, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security, shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the steps being taken to implement the recommendations of GAO–07–1174.

SEC. 564. The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall cancel the liquidated balances of all remaining uncancelled or partially cancelled loans disbursed under the Community Disaster Loan Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–88) and the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234), as amended by section 4502 of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–28) to the extent that revenues of the local government during the period following the major disaster are insufficient to meet the budget of the local government, including additional disaster-related expenses of a municipal character. In calculating a community's revenues while determining cancellation, the Administrator shall exclude revenues for special districts and any other revenues that are required by law to be disbursed to other units of local government or used for specific purposes more limited than the scope allowed by the General Fund. In calculating a community's expenses, the Administrator shall include disaster-related capital expenses for which the community has not been reimbursed by Federal or insurance proceeds, debt service expenses, and accrued but unpaid uncompensated absences (vacation and

sick pay). In calculating the operating deficit of the local government, the Administrator shall also consider all interfund transfers. When considering the period following the disaster, the Administrator may consider a period of 3, 5, or 7 full fiscal years after the disaster, beginning on the date of the declaration, in determining eligibility for cancellation. The criteria for cancellation do not apply to those loans already cancelled in full. Applicants shall submit supplemental documentation in support of their applications for cancellation on or before April 30, 2014, and the Administrator shall issue determinations and resolve any appeals on or before April 30, 2015. Loans not cancelled in full shall be repaid not later than September 30, 2035. The Administrator may use funds provided under Public Law 109–88 to reimburse those communities that have repaid all or a portion of loans, including interest, provided as Special Community Disaster Loans under Public Law 109–88 or Public Law 109–234, as amended by section 4502 of Public Law 110–28. Further, the Administrator may use funds provided under Public Law 109–88 for necessary expenses to carry out this provision.

SEC. 565. The Inspector General shall review the applications for public assistance provided through the Disaster Relief Fund with a project cost that exceeds $10,000,000 and the resulting decisions issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for category A debris removal for DR–1786 upon receipt of a request from an applicant made no earlier than 90 days after filing an appeal with the Federal Emergency Management Agency without regard to whether the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency has issued a final agency determination on the application for assistance: Provided, That not later than 180 days after the date of such request, the Inspector General shall determine whether the Federal Emergency Management Agency correctly applied its rules and regulations to determine eligibility of the applicant's claim: Provided further, That if the Inspector General finds that the Federal Emergency Management Agency determinations related to eligibility and cost involved a misapplication of its rules and regulations, the applicant may submit the dispute to the arbitration process established under the authority granted under section 601 of Public Law 111–5 not later than 15 days after the date of issuance of the Inspector General's finding in the previous proviso: Provided further, That if the Inspector General finds that the Federal Emergency Management Agency provided unauthorized funding, that the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall take corrective action.

SEC. 566. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be obligated to implement the National Preparedness Grant Program or any other successor grant programs unless explicitly authorized by Congress.

SEC. 567. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide funding for the position of Public Advocate within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 568. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to reimburse any Federal department or agency for its participation in a National Special Security Event.

SEC. 569. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees of a single component of the Department of Homeland Security, who are stationed in the United States, at a single international conference unless the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such attendance is in the national interest and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives within at least 10 days of that determination and the basis for that determination: Provided, That for purposes of this section the term ''international conference'' shall mean a conference occurring outside of the United States attended by representatives of the United States Government and of foreign governments, international organizations, or nongovernmental organizations.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 570. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) $1,800,000 from Public Law 112–74 under the heading ''Analysis and Operations'';

(2) $73,232,000 from funds made available in Public Law 112–10 and Public Law 112–74 under the heading U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'';

(3) $3,108,311 from unobligated prior year balances from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ''Construction'';

(4) $25,000,000 from Public Law 110–329 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(5) $43,000,000 from Public Law 111–83 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(6) $63,500,000 from Public Law 112–10 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(7) $23,000,000 from Public Law 112–74 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements''; and

(8) $21,667,000 from Public Law 112–74 under the heading Transportation Security Administration, ''Surface Transportation Security''.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 571. Of the funds provided in Public Law 110–161, Public Law 110–329, and Public Law 111–83, under the heading ''National Predisaster Mitigation Fund'' for congressionally directed spending items, $12,000,000 are rescinded from projects for which no applications were submitted or from projects which were completed for an amount less than that appropriated.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 572. Of the funds transferred to the Department of Homeland Security when it was created in 2003, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

(1) $199,657 from ''Operations'';

(2) $445,328 from U.S. Customs and Border Protection ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(3) $63,045 from U.S. Customs and Border Protection ''Violent Crime Reduction Programs'';

(4) $86,597 from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ''Violent Crime Reduction Programs'';

(5) $1,739 from Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(6) $1,329,239 from Federal Emergency Management Agency ''Office of Domestic Preparedness'';

(7) $3,262,677 from Federal Emergency Management Agency ''National Predisaster Mitigation Fund''; and

(8) $2,291,844 from Transportation Security Administration ''Administration''.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 573. The following unobligated balances made available to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 505 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 984) are rescinded:

(1) $314,674 from ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'';

(2) $185,813 from ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'';

(3) $114,391 from ''Office of the Chief Financial Officer'';

(4) $59,507 from ''Office of the Chief Information Officer'';

(5) $568,188 from ''Analysis and Operations'';

(6) $45,525 from ''Office of Inspector General'';

(7) $568,480 from U.S. Customs and Border Protection ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(8) $3,581,483 from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(9) $1,075,942 from Transportation Security Administration ''Federal Air Marshals'';

(10) $18,142,454 from Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'';

(11) $991,520 from Coast Guard ''Reserve Training'';

(12) $1,033,599 from Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(13) $2,371,377 from United States Secret Service ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(14) $82,084 from National Protection and Programs Directorate ''Management and Administration'';

(15) $1,683,470 from National Protection and Programs Directorate ''Infrastructure Protection and Information Security'';

(16) $184,583 from National Protection and Programs Directorate ''United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology'';

(17) $259,874 from Federal Emergency Management Agency ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(18) $206,722 from Federal Emergency Management Agency ''State and Local Programs'';

(19) $450,017 from Office of Health Affairs;

(20) $205,799 from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services;

(21) $512,660 from Federal Law Enforcement Training Center ''Salaries and Expenses'';

(22) $244,553 from Science and Technology ''Management and Administration''; and

(23) $128,565 from Domestic Nuclear Detection Office ''Management and Administration''.

SEC. 574. Fourteen days after the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a report required under this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary shall submit a copy of that report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

This division may be cited as the ''Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013''.

DIVISION E—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, $1,684,323,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $80,173,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Army determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real

property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, $1,549,164,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $102,619,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, $322,543,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $18,635,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $3,582,423,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $315,562,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $26,969,000 shall be available for payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the planning, design, and construction of a new North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $613,799,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $26,622,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Army National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $42,386,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Air National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $305,846,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $15,951,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Chief of the Army Reserve determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $49,532,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $2,118,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $10,979,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $2,879,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Chief of the Air Force Reserve determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $254,163,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $4,641,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $530,051,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $102,182,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $378,230,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $83,824,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $497,829,000.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, $52,238,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $1,786,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of construction, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, as currently authorized by law, $151,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, which shall be only for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $409,396,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $126,697,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 14 days prior to

obligating an amount for a construction project that exceeds or reduces the amount identified for that project in the most recently submitted budget request for this account by 20 percent or $2,000,000, whichever is less: Provided further, That the previous proviso shall not apply to projects costing less than $5,000,000, except for those projects not previously identified in any budget submission for this account and exceeding the minor construction threshold under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds made available in this title for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to begin construction of new bases in the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General; (3) where the estimated value is less than $25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: Provided, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense shall inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

SEC. 114. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 115. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were made available, if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. Subject to 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to: (1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in ''Family Housing'' accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or (2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in ''Military Construction'' accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: Provided, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program incurred under 42 U.S.C. 3374(a)(1)(A). Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: Provided, That not more than $35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress all operation and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 122. Amounts contained in the Ford Island Improvement Account established by subsection (h) of section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (i)(1) of such section or until transferred pursuant to subsection (i)(3) of such section.

SEC. 123. None of the funds made available in this title, or in any Act making appropriations for military construction which remain available for obligation, may be obligated or expended to carry out a military construction, land acquisition, or family housing project at or for a military installation approved for closure, or at a military installation for the purposes of supporting a function that has been approved for realignment to another installation, in 2005 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), unless such a project at a military installation approved for realignment will support a continuing mission or function at that installation or a new mission or function that is planned for that installation, or unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the cost to the United States of carrying out such project would be less than the cost to the United States of cancelling such project, or if the project is at an active component base that

shall be established as an enclave or in the case of projects having multi-agency use, that another Government agency has indicated it will assume ownership of the completed project. The Secretary of Defense may not transfer funds made available as a result of this limitation from any military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project to another account or use such funds for another purpose or project without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress. This section shall not apply to military construction projects, land acquisition, or family housing projects for which the project is vital to the national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees within seven days of a decision to carry out such a military construction project.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 124. During the 5-year period after appropriations available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense'', to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 125. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to take beneficial occupancy of more than 2,500 parking spaces (other than handicap-reserved spaces) to be provided by the BRAC 133 project: Provided, That this limitation may be waived in part if: (1) the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that levels of service at existing intersections in the vicinity of the project have not experienced failing levels of service as defined by the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual over a consecutive 90-day period; (2) the Department of Defense and the Virginia Department of Transportation agree on the number of additional parking spaces that may be made available to employees of the facility subject to continued 90-day traffic monitoring; and (3) the Secretary of Defense notifies the congressional defense committees in writing at least 14 days prior to exercising this waiver of the number of additional parking spaces to be made available.

SEC. 126. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any action that relates to or promotes the expansion of the boundaries or size of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado.

SEC. 127. Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in an account funded under the headings in this title may be transferred among projects and activities within the account in accordance with the reprogramming guidelines for military construction and family housing construction contained in Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation 7000.14–R, Volume 3, Chapter 7, of February 2009, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 128. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Army to relocate a unit in the Army that—

(1) performs a testing mission or function that is not performed by any other unit in the Army and is specifically stipulated in title 10, United States Code; and

(2) is located at a military installation at which the total number of civilian employees of the Department of the Army and Army contractor personnel employed exceeds 10 percent of the total number of members of the regular and reserve components of the Army assigned to the installation.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Army certifies to the congressional defense committees that in proposing the relocation of the unit of the Army, the Secretary complied with Army Regulation 5–10 relating to the policy, procedures, and responsibilities for Army stationing actions.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available to the Department of Defense for military construction in this or any other Act, may be obligated or expended for planning and design and construction of projects at Arlington National Cemetery.

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 130. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'', from prior appropriations Acts, $20,000,000 are hereby cancelled: Provided, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement or for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 131. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005'', from prior appropriations Acts, $132,513,000 are hereby cancelled: Provided, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement or for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 132. Of the proceeds credited to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(C) of section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, from a Department of Navy land conveyance, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $10,500,000 to the Secretary of the Navy under paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of such section for use by the Secretary of the Navy as provided in paragraph (1) of such subsection until expended.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by section 107 and chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; and burial benefits, the Reinstated Entitlement Program for Survivors, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of title IV of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 541 et seq.) and for other benefits as authorized by sections 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, and chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, $60,599,855,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $9,204,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to ''General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'', ''Medical support and compliance'', and ''Information technology systems'' for necessary expenses in implementing the provisions of chapters 51, 53, and 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the ''Compensation and pensions'' appropriation: Provided further, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to ''Medical care collections fund'' to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 21, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 41, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, and for the payment of benefits under the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, $12,023,458,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under subsection (a) of section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, other than under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of that subsection, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by chapters 19 and 21, title 38, United States Code, $104,600,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by subchapters I through III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2013, within the resources available, not to exceed $500,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $157,814,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $19,000, as authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $2,729,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $346,000, which may be paid to the appropriation for ''General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration''.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by subchapter V of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, $1,089,000.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL SERVICES

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department, and including medical supplies and equipment, bioengineering services, food services, and salaries and expenses of healthcare employees hired under title 38, United States Code, aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code, assistance and support services for caregivers as authorized by section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, loan repayments authorized by section 604 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services

Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 124 Stat. 1174; 38 U.S.C. 7681 note), and hospital care and medical services authorized by section 1787 of title 38, United States Code; $155,000,000, which shall be in addition to funds previously appropriated under this heading that become available on October 1, 2012; and in addition, $43,557,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2013, and shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a priority for the provision of medical treatment for veterans who have service-connected disabilities, lower income, or have special needs: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority funding for the provision of basic medical benefits to veterans in enrollment priority groups 1 through 6: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize the dispensing of prescription drugs from Veterans Health Administration facilities to enrolled veterans with privately written prescriptions based on requirements established by the Secretary: Provided further, That the implementation of the program described in the previous proviso shall incur no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

MEDICAL SUPPORT AND COMPLIANCE

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; and administrative and legal expenses of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); $6,033,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2013, and shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliary facilities, and other necessary facilities of the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction, and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department; for oversight, engineering, and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving, or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry services, $4,872,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2013, and shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, $582,674,000, plus reimbursements, shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and repair, alteration or improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Cemetery Administration, $258,284,000, of which not to exceed $25,828,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That none of the funds under this heading may be used to expand the Urban Initiative project beyond those sites outlined in the fiscal year 2012 or previous budget submissions or any other rural strategy, other than the Rural Initiative included in the fiscal year 2013 budget submission, until the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a strategy to serve the burial needs of veterans residing in rural and highly rural areas and that strategy has been approved by the Committees: Provided further, That the strategy shall include: (1) A review of previous policies of the National Cemetery Administration regarding establishment of new national cemeteries, including whether the guidelines of the Administration for establishing national cemetery annexes remain valid; (2) Data identifying the number of and geographic areas where rural veterans are not currently served by national or existing State cemeteries and identification of areas with the largest unserved populations, broken down by veterans residing in urban versus rural and highly rural; (3) Identification of the number of veterans who reside within the 75-mile radius of a cemetery that is limited to cremations or of a State cemetery which has residency restrictions, as well as an examination of how many communities that fall under a 75-mile radius have an actual driving distance greater than 75 miles; (4) Reassessment of the gaps in service, factoring in the above conditions that limit rural and highly rural veteran burial options; (5) An assessment of the adequacy of the policy of the Administration on establishing new cemeteries proposed in the fiscal year 2013 budget request; (6) Recommendations for an appropriate policy on new national cemeteries to serve rural or highly rural areas; (7) Development of a national map showing the locations and number of all unserved veterans; and (8) A time line for the implementation of such strategy and cost estimates for using the strategy to establish new burial sites in at least five rural or highly rural locations: Provided further, That the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the strategy to ensure that it includes the elements listed above: Provided further, That this strategy shall be submitted no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue guidelines on committal services held at cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the National Cemetery Administration to ensure that: (1) veterans' families may arrange to hold committal services with any religious or secular content they desire; (2) the choice by a family of an honor guard and the content and presentation of military honors may not be interfered with; and (3) attendance at committal services by outside organizations dedicated to the support of veterans will not be constrained except at the request of family members: Provided further, That the Department shall not edit, control, or exercise prior restraints on the content of religious speech and expression by speakers at events at veterans national cemeteries except as provided in section 2413 of title 38, United States Code: Provided further, That actions permitted by the foregoing provisos shall be subject to compliance with Department security, safety, and law enforcement regulations.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-Wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms, or allowances therefor; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, $424,737,000, of which not to exceed $20,837,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the Board of Veterans Appeals shall be funded at not less than $86,006,000: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to comply with the Department's energy management requirements under section 543(f)(7) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(7)): Provided further, That funds provided under this heading may be transferred to ''General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration''.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES, VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Benefits Administration, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and reimbursement of the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, $2,164,074,000: Provided, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed $113,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for information technology systems and telecommunications support, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; for pay and associated costs; and for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including contractual costs associated with operations authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $3,327,444,000, plus reimbursements: Provided, That $1,021,000,000 shall be for pay and associated costs, of which not to exceed $30,630,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That $1,812,045,000 shall be for operations and maintenance, of which not to exceed $126,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That $494,399,000 shall be for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement, and shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided further, That amounts made available for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement may not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a certification of the amounts, in parts or in full, to be obligated and expended for each development project: Provided further, That amounts made available for salaries and expenses, operations and maintenance, and information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement may be transferred among the three sub-accounts after the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: Provided further, That amounts made available for the ''Information technology systems'' account for development, modernization, and enhancement may be transferred between projects or to newly defined projects: Provided further, That no project may be increased or decreased by more than $1,000,000 of cost prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress to make

the transfer and an approval is issued, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed: Provided further, That of the funds provided for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement for the development of a joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs (DOD–VA) integrated electronic health record (iEHR), not more than 25 percent may be obligated until the DOD–VA Interagency Program Office submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) defines the budget and cost baseline for development of the integrated Electronic Health Record; (2) identifies the deployment timeline for the system for both Agencies; (3) breaks out annual and total spending for each Department; (4) relays detailed cost-sharing business rules; (5) establishes data standardization schedules between the Departments; (6) has been submitted to the Government Accountability Office for review; and (7) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the funds made available under this heading for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement, shall be for the projects, and in the amounts, specified under this heading in the explanatory statement described in section 4 (in the matter preceding division A of this consolidated Act).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, to include information technology, in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $115,000,000, of which $6,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, and chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, not otherwise provided for, including planning, architectural and engineering services, construction management services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $532,470,000, of which $502,470,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, and of which $30,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That $5,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 7108 of title 41, United States Code, for claims paid for contract disputes: Provided further, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, including portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and salaries and associated costs of the resident engineers who oversee those capital investments funded through this account, and funds provided for the purchase of land for the National Cemetery Administration through the land acquisition line item, none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading for fiscal year 2013, for each approved project shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2013; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2014: Provided further, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a written report on any approved major construction project for which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, and chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, not otherwise provided for, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, $607,530,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, along with unobligated balances of previous ''Construction, minor projects'' appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is equal to or less than the amount set forth in such section: Provided, That funds made available under this heading shall be for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital, nursing home, and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by sections 8131 through 8137 of title 38, United States Code, $85,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to assist States and tribal governments in establishing, expanding, or improving veterans cemeteries as authorized by section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, $46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2013 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' may be transferred as necessary to any other of the mentioned appropriations: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and such Committees issue an approval, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 202. Amounts made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2013, in this Act or any other Act, under the ''Medical services'', ''Medical support and compliance'', and ''Medical facilities'' accounts may be transferred among the accounts: Provided, That any transfers between the ''Medical services'' and ''Medical support and compliance'' accounts of 1 percent or less of the total amount appropriated to the account in this or any other Act may take place subject to notification from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the amount and purpose of the transfer: Provided further, That any transfers between the ''Medical services'' and ''Medical support and compliance'' accounts in excess of 1 percent, or exceeding the cumulative 1 percent for the fiscal year, may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: Provided further, That any transfers to or from the ''Medical facilities'' account may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 203. Appropriations available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by sections 5901 through 5902 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. No appropriations in this title (except the appropriations for ''Construction, major projects'', and ''Construction, minor projects'') shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 205. No appropriations in this title shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled to such hospitalization or examination under the laws providing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under sections 7901 through 7904 of title 5, United States Code, or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)), unless reimbursement of the cost of such hospitalization or examination is made to the ''Medical services'' account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 207. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3328(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable only from ''Compensation and pensions''.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2013, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund under section 1920 of title 38, United States Code, the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund under section 1923 of title 38, United States Code, and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund under section 1955 of title 38, United States Code, reimburse the ''General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'' and ''Information technology systems'' accounts for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: Provided, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in such an insurance program during fiscal year 2013 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: Provided further, That if the cost of administration of such an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: Provided further, That the Secretary

shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2013 which is properly allocable to the provision of each such insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in that insurance program.

SEC. 209. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication under section 319 of title 38, United States Code, for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not to exceed $42,904,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and $3,360,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: Provided, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: Provided further, That amounts received shall be credited to the ''General administration'' and ''Information technology systems'' accounts for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. No appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental cost is more than $1,000,000, unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 212. No funds of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospital care, nursing home care, or medical services provided to any person under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for a non-service-connected disability described in section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title: Provided, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges for such care or services from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: Provided further, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including disposal) may be deposited into the ''Construction, major projects'' and ''Construction, minor projects'' accounts and be used for construction (including site acquisition and disposition), alterations, and improvements of any medical facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such sums as realized are in addition to the amount provided for in ''Construction, major projects'' and ''Construction, minor projects''.

SEC. 214. Amounts made available under ''Medical services'' are available—

(1) for furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the Department.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 215. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to ''Medical services'', to remain available until expended for the purposes of that account.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into agreements with Indian tribes and tribal organizations which are party to the Alaska Native Health Compact with the Indian Health Service, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations serving rural Alaska which have entered into contracts with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self Determination and Educational Assistance Act, to provide healthcare, including behavioral health and dental care. The Secretary shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary. The term ''rural Alaska'' shall mean those lands sited within the external boundaries of the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(1)–(4) and (7)–(12) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), and those lands within the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(5) and 7(a)(6) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), which are not within the boundaries of the municipality of Anchorage, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the Kenai Peninsula Borough or the Matanuska Susitna Borough.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 217. Such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the ''Construction, major projects'' and ''Construction, minor projects'' accounts, to remain available until expended for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 218. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 219. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 220. Amounts made available under the ''Medical services'', ''Medical support and compliance'', ''Medical facilities'', ''General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'', ''General administration'', and ''National Cemetery Administration'' accounts for fiscal year 2013, may be transferred to or from the ''Information technology systems'' account: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 221. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with: (1) section 842 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–115; 119 Stat. 2506); or (2) section 8110(a)(5) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 222. Of the amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2013, in this Act or any other Act, under the ''Medical facilities'' account for nonrecurring maintenance, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available shall be obligated during the last 2 months of that fiscal year: Provided, That the Secretary may waive this requirement after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 223. Of the amounts appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2013 for ''Medical services'', ''Medical support and compliance'', ''Medical facilities'', ''Construction, minor projects'', and ''Information technology systems'', up to $247,356,000, plus reimbursements, may be transferred to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 3571) and may be used for operation of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4500): Provided, That additional funds may be transferred from accounts designated in this section to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 224. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, for healthcare provided at facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4500) shall also be available: (1) for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 3571); and (2) for operations of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4500).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 225. Of the amounts available in this title for ''Medical services'', ''Medical support and compliance'', and ''Medical facilities'', a minimum of $15,000,000, shall be transferred to the DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by section 8111(d) of title 38, United States Code, to remain available until expended, for any purpose authorized by section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 226. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title II of division H of Public Law 112–74, the following amounts which became available on October 1, 2012, are hereby rescinded from the following accounts in the amounts specified:

(1) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services'', $1,500,000,000.

(2) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance'', $200,000,000.

(3) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities'', $250,000,000.

(b) In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, an additional amount is appropriated to the following accounts in the amounts specified to remain available until September 30, 2014:

(1) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services'', $1,500,000,000.

(2) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance'', $200,000,000.

(3) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities'', $250,000,000.

SEC. 227. The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of all bid savings in major construction projects that total at least $5,000,000, or 5 percent of the programmed amount of the project, whichever is less: Provided, That such notification shall occur within 14 days of a contract identifying the programmed amount: Provided further, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 14 days

prior to the obligation of such bid savings and shall describe the anticipated use of such savings.

SEC. 228. The scope of work for a project included in ''Construction, major projects'' may not be increased above the scope specified for that project in the original justification data provided to the Congress as part of the request for appropriations.

SEC. 229. The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall provide on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress notification of any single national outreach and awareness marketing campaign in which obligations exceed $2,000,000.

SEC. 230. The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a reprogramming request if at any point during fiscal year 2013, the funding allocated for a medical care initiative identified in the fiscal year 2013 expenditure plan is adjusted by more than $25,000,000 from the allocation shown in the corresponding congressional budget justification. Such a reprogramming request may go forward only if the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress approve the request or if a period of 14 days has elapsed.

SEC. 231. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract using procedures that do not give to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans (as that term is defined in section 3(q)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3)) that are included in the database under section 8127(f) of title 38, United States Code, any preference available with respect to such contract, except for a preference given to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as defined in section 3(q)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(2)).

SEC. 232. Funds made available under the heading ''Medical services'' in title II of division H of Public Law 112–74 may be used to carry out section 1787 of title 38, United States Code.

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one-for-one replacement basis only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, $62,929,000, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2109 of title 36, United States Code.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by sections 7251 through 7298 of title 38, United States Code, $32,481,000: Provided, That $2,726,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102–229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase or lease of passenger motor vehicles for replacement on a one-for-one basis only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $65,800,000, of which not to exceed $27,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the ''Lease of Department of Defense Real Property for Defense Agencies'' account.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for planning and design and construction at Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, $103,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which, $84,000,000 shall be for planning and design and construction associated with the Millennium Project at Arlington National Cemetery; and $19,000,000 shall be for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services for future expansion of burial space at Arlington National Cemetery.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

TRUST FUND

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, $67,590,000, of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 301. Funds appropriated in this Act under the heading, ''Department of Defense—Civil, Cemeterial Expenses, Army'', may be provided to Arlington County, Virginia, for the relocation of the federally owned water main at Arlington National Cemetery, making additional land available for ground burials.

TITLE IV

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'', $150,768,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 401. Of the unobligated balances in section 2005 in title X, of Public Law 112–10 and division H in title IV of Public Law 112–74, $150,768,000 are hereby rescinded: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 503. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentation to Congress itself.

SEC. 504. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of ''E-Commerce'' technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 505. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 506. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a project or program named for an individual serving as a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the United States House of Representatives.

SEC. 508. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains confidential or proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 509. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 510. None of the funds made available in this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries or successors.

SEC. 511. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense in this Act may be used to construct, renovate, or expand any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 512. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used by an agency of the executive branch to pay for first-class travel by an employee of the agency in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 513. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to execute a contract for goods or services, including construction services, where the contractor has not complied with Executive Order No. 12989.

SEC. 514. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 515. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 516. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2013 for pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 517. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency that are stationed within the United States at any single conference occurring outside a state of the United States, except for employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs stationed in the Philippines, unless the relevant Secretary reports to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 5 days in advance that such attendance is important to the national interest.

This division may be cited as the ''Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013''.

DIVISION F—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at the level specified in subsection (c) and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2012, for projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–74).

(2) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112–74).

(3) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division E of Public Law 112–74).

(4) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division F of Public Law 112–74).

(5) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2012 (division G of Public Law 112–74).

(6) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112–74).

(7) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112–55), except for the appropriations designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief under the heading ''Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Emergency Relief'' and in the last proviso of section 239 of such Act.

(8) The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–77), except for appropriations under the heading ''Corps of Engineers—Civil''.

(b) For purposes of this division, the term ''level'' means an amount.

(c) The level referred to in subsection (a) shall be the amounts appropriated in the appropriations Acts referred to in such subsection, including transfers and obligation limitations, except that such level shall be calculated without regard to any rescission or cancellation of funds or contract authority, other than—

(1) the 0.16 percent across-the-board rescission in section 436 of division E of Public Law 112–74 (relating to the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies); and

(2) the 0.189 percent across-the-board rescission in section 527 of division F of Public Law 112–74, (relating to the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies).

SEC. 1102. Appropriations made by section 1101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 1103. Appropriations provided by this division that, in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, carried a multiple-year or no-year period of availability shall retain a comparable period of availability.

SEC. 1104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 1101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 1105. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this division, the requirements, authorities, conditions, limitations, and other provisions of the appropriations Acts referred to in section 1101 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 1106.

SEC. 1106. Unless otherwise provided for in this division or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this division shall be available through September 30, 2013.

SEC. 1107. Expenditures made pursuant to the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112–175) shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided by this division.

SEC. 1108. Funds appropriated by this division may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), and section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212).

SEC. 1109. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2012, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, the levels established by section 1101 shall be the amounts necessary to maintain program levels under current law and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2012.

(b) In addition to the amounts otherwise provided by section 1101, the following amounts shall be available for the following accounts for advance payments for the first quarter of fiscal year 2014:

(1) ''Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners'', for benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(2) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Grants to States for Medicaid'', for payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act, $106,335,631,000, to remain available until expended.

(3) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs'', for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV–D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), $1,100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(4) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments for Foster Care and Permanency'', for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV–E of the Social Security Act, $2,200,000,000.

(5) ''Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program'', for benefit payments under title XVI of the Social Security Act, $19,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 1110. Each amount made available in this division by reference to an appropriation that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

SEC. 1111. With respect to any discretionary account for which advance appropriations were provided for fiscal year 2013 or 2014 in an appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, in addition to amounts otherwise made available by this division, advance appropriations are provided in the same amount for fiscal year 2014 or 2015, respectively, with a comparable period of availability.

SEC. 1112. (a) Section 147 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111–242), as added by section 1(a)(2) of the Continuing Appropriations and Surface Transportation Extensions Act, 2011 (Public Law 111–322; 5 U.S.C. 5303 note), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking the matter after ''ending on'' and before ''shall be made'' and inserting ''December 31, 2013,''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking the matter after ''ending on'' and before ''no senior executive'' and inserting ''December 31, 2013,''.

(b) Section 114 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112–175; 5 U.S.C. 5303 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1113. (a) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this division, each department and agency in subsection (c) shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending, expenditure, or operating plan for fiscal year 2013—

(1) at the program, project, or activity level (or, for foreign assistance programs funded in titles III, IV and VIII of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, at the country, regional, and central program level, and for any international organization); or

(2) as applicable, at any greater level of detail required for funds covered by such a plan in an appropriations Act referred to in section 1101, in the joint explanatory statement accompanying such Act, or in committee report language incorporated by reference in such joint explanatory statement.

(b) If a sequestration is ordered by the President under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the spending, expenditure, or operating plan required by this section shall reflect such sequestration.

(c) The departments and agencies to which this section applies are as follows:

(1) The Department of Agriculture.

(2) The Department of Commerce.

(3) The Department of Education.

(4) The Department of Energy.

(5) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(6) The Department of Homeland Security.

(7) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(8) The Department of the Interior.

(9) The Department of Justice.

(10) The Department of Labor.

(11) The Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.

(12) The Department of Transportation.

(13) The Department of the Treasury.

(14) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(15) The National Science Foundation.

(16) The Judiciary.

(17) With respect to amounts made available under the heading ''Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President'', agencies funded under such heading.

(18) The Federal Communications Commission.

(19) The General Services Administration.

(20) The Office of Personnel Management.

(21) The National Archives and Records Administration.

(22) The Securities and Exchange Commission.

(23) The Small Business Administration.

(24) The Environmental Protection Agency.

(25) The Indian Health Service.

(26) The Smithsonian Institution.

(27) The Social Security Administration.

(28) The Corporation for National and Community Service.

(29) The Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(30) The Food and Drug Administration.

(31) The Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SEC. 1114. Not later than May 15, 2013, and each month thereafter through November 1, 2013, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on all obligations incurred in fiscal year 2013, by each department and agency, using funds made available by this division. Such report shall—

(1) set forth obligations by account; and

(2) compare the obligations incurred in the period covered by the report to the obligations incurred in the same period in fiscal year 2012.

This division may be cited as the ''Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE II

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 1201. The amounts available for ''Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil, Construction'' are hereby reduced by $20,000,000.

SEC. 1202. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Central Utah Project, Central Utah Project Completion Account'' shall be $19,700,000, of which, $1,200,000 shall be deposited into the ''Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account'' for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. In addition $1,300,000 is provided for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 1203. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'', $1,814,091,000; ''Department of Energy, Nuclear Energy'', $759,000,000; ''Department of Energy, Science'', $4,876,000,000; ''Department of Energy, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy'', $265,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 1204. Notwithstanding section 1101, of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under ''Department of Energy, Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve'' $6,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 1205. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Energy, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, National Nuclear Security Administration, Weapons Activities'' shall be $7,577,341,000.

(b) Section 301(c) of division B of Public Law 112–274 shall not apply to amounts made available by this section.

SEC. 1206. In addition to amounts otherwise made available by this division, $110,000,000 is appropriated for ''Department of Energy, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, National Nuclear Security Administration, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' for domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration.

SEC. 1207. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this division by substituting the date specified in section 1106 of this division for ''October 1, 2012''.

TITLE III

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 1301. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, except section 1106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 6020 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request Act of 2012 (D.C. Act 19–381), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this division.

(b) Section 803(b) of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 940) is amended by striking ''November 1, 2012'' and inserting ''November 1, 2013''.

SEC. 1302. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''District of Columbia, Federal Funds, Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia'' shall be $24,700,000, of which not less than $9,800,000 shall be used for costs associated with the Presidential Inauguration.

SEC. 1303. Notwithstanding section 1101, the fifth proviso under the heading ''Federal Communications Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' in division C of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied by substituting ''$98,739,000'' for ''$85,000,000''.

SEC. 1304. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, amounts made available by section 1101 for ''Department of the Treasury, Departmental Offices, Salaries and Expenses'' and ''Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses'' may be used for activities in connection with section 1602(e) of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (subtitle F of title I of division A of Public Law 112–141).

SEC. 1305. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Office of Government Ethics, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $18,664,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be for development and deployment of the centralized, publicly accessible database required in section 11(b) of the STOCK Act (Public Law 112–105).

SEC. 1306. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account'' for the cost of guaranteed loans as authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall be $333,600,000.

SEC. 1307. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of the Treasury, Treasury Forfeiture Fund'', $950,000,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 1308. Notwithstanding section 1101, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund is authorized during Fiscal Year 2013 to guarantee bonds and notes pursuant section 114A of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.): Provided, That no funds appropriated by this Act for ''Department of the Treasury—Community Development Financial Institutions Fund Program Account'' shall be available for the cost, if any, of guaranteed loans (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) pursuant to section 114A of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.) to subsidize total loan principal not to exceed $500,000,000.

SEC. 1309. Sections 9503(a), 9504(a) and (b), and 9505(a) of title 5, United States Code, are amended by striking ''Before July 23, 2013'' each place it occurs and inserting ''Before September 30, 2013''.

SEC. 1310. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Executive Office of The President and Funds Appropriated to the President, Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1311. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''The Judiciary, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Defender Services'' shall be $1,040,000,000.

SEC. 1312. (a) Section 203(c) of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–650; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), as amended, is amended—

(1) in the third sentence (relating to the district of Kansas), by striking ''21 years or more'' and inserting ''22 years and 6 months or more''; and

(2) in the seventh sentence (relating to the district of Hawaii), by striking ''18 years or more'' and inserting ''19 years and 6 months or more''.

(b) Section 406 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, The Judiciary, The District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–115; 119 Stat. 2470; 28 U.S.C. 133 note) is amended in the second sentence (relating to the eastern district of Missouri) by inserting ''and 6 months'' after ''20 years''.

(c) Section 312(c)(2) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107–273; 28 U.S.C. 133 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''authorized by this subsection'' the following: '', except in the case of the central district of California and the western district of North Carolina'';

(2) by striking ''10 years'' and inserting ''11 years''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''The first vacancy in the office of district judge in the central district of California occurring 10 years and 6 months or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created in that district by this subsection, shall not be filled. The first vacancy in the office of district judge in the western district of North Carolina occurring 10 years or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created in that district by this subsection, shall not be filled.''.

SEC. 1313. Notwithstanding section 1101 of this division or division A, the level for the ''Commodity Futures Trading Commission'' shall be the level specified under Public Law 112–55 and the authorities and conditions, including comparable periods of availability, provided under such Public Law shall apply to such appropriation.

SEC. 1314. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Office of the Inspector General'' shall be $34,568,000.

TITLE IV

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1401. Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following appropriations of the Department of the Interior shall be:

(a) $950,757,000 for ''Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources'': Provided, That the amounts included under such heading in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$950,757,000'' for ''$961,900,000'' the second place it appears;

(b) $0 for ''Bureau of Land Management, Construction'';

(c) $1,213,915,000 for ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management'';

(d) $19,136,000 for ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction'';

(e) $2,214,202,000 for ''National Park Service, Operation of the National Park Service'';

(f) $131,173,000 for ''National Park Service, Construction'';

(g) $105,910,000 for ''Bureau of Indian Affairs, Construction'';

(h) $84,946,000 for ''Insular Affairs, Assistance to Territories'': Provided, That the matter under such heading in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$75,684,000'' for ''$78,517,000''; and by substituting ''$9,262,000'' for ''$9,480,000'';

(i) $146,000,000 for ''Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, Federal Trust Programs''; and

(j) $726,473,000 for ''Department-wide Programs, Wildland Fire Management'': Provided, That of the amounts made available by section 140(b) of Public Law 112–175 (126 Stat. 1321), $7,500,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 1402. The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2013 by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a is rescinded.

SEC. 1403. Section 10101(a) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f(a)), as amended by section 430 of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division E of Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1047), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) in the first sentence, by striking ''on'' the first place it appears and inserting ''before, on,''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''located'' the second place it appears;

(B) by inserting at the end of the following: ''Such claim maintenance fee shall be in lieu of the assessment work requirement contained in the Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. 28 to 28e) and the related filing requirements contained in section 314(a) and (c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1744(a) and (c)).''; and

(C) by striking ''(a)'' in the first sentence and inserting ''(a)(1)''.

SEC. 1404. (a) Division II of Public Law 104–333 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended in each of sections 107, 208, 310, 408, 507, 607, 707, 809, and 910, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

(b) Effective on October 12, 2012, section 7 of Public Law 99–647, as amended by section 702(d) of Public Law 109–338 and section 1767 of Public Law 112–10, is further amended by striking ''the date'' and all that follows and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

(c) Section 12 of Public Law 100–692 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this sub section'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

(d) Section 108 of Public Law 106–278 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

SEC. 1405. Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following appropriations of the Environmental Protection Agency shall be:

(a) $785,291,000 for ''Science and Technology'';

(b) $2,651,440,000 for ''Environmental Programs and Management'';

(c) $1,176,431,000 for ''Hazardous Substance Superfund'': Provided, That the matter under such heading in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$1,176,431,000'' for ''$1,215,753,000'' the second place it appears; and by substituting ''September 30, 2012'' for ''September 30, 2011''; and

(d) $3,579,094,000 for ''State and Tribal Assistance Grants'': Provided, That the amounts included under such hearing in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to fund appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$1,451,791,000'' for ''$1,468,806,000''; by substituting ''$908,713,000'' for ''$919,363,000''; and by substituting ''$19,952,000'' for ''$30,000,000''.

SEC. 1406. (a) Of the unobligated balances available to the Environmental Protection Agency under the following headings from prior appropriation Acts, the following amounts are rescinded:

(1) ''Hazardous Substance Superfund'', $15,000,000.

(2) ''State and Tribal Assistance Grants'', $35,000,000, as follows:

(A) $10,000,000 from unobligated Brownfields balances.

(B) $5,000,000 from unobligated categorical grant balances.

(C) $10,000,000 from unobligated Drinking Water State Revolving Funds balances.

(D) $10,000,000 from unobligated Clean Water State Revolving Funds balances.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded under subsection (a) from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 1407. Notwithstanding subsection (d)(2) of section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may assess pesticide registration service fees under such section for fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 1408. Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following appropriations of the Department of Agriculture shall be:

(a) $1,536,596,000 for ''Forest Service, National Forest System'';

(b) $369,800,000 for ''Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance''; and

(c) $1,971,390,000 for ''Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management''.

SEC. 1409. Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following appropriations of the Department of Health and Human Services shall be:

(a) $3,914,599,000 for ''Indian Health Service, Indian Health Services''; and

(b) $441,605,000 for ''Indian Health Service, Indian Health Facilities''.

SEC. 1410. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $640,512,000.

SEC. 1411. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $7,023,000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated herein, $1,300,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for expenses related to the relocation from the Old Post Office Building.

SEC. 1412. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Presidio Trust, Presidio Trust Fund'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1413. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $1,050,000 and the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Capital Construction'' shall be $0: Provided, That section 8162(m) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79), as added by section 8120 (a) of Public Law 107–117 (115 Stat. 2273), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) EXPIRATION.—Any reference in section 8903(e) of title 40, U.S.C. to the expiration at the end of, or extension beyond, a 7-year period shall be considered to be a reference to an expiration on, or extension beyond, September 30, 2013.''.

SEC. 1414. Notwithstanding section 1101, section 408 of division E of Public Law 112–74 (125 Stat. 1038) shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''112–10, and 112–74'' for ''112–10'' and by substituting ''2012'' for ''2011''.

SEC. 1415. The authority provided by section 331 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (enacted by reference in section 1000(a)(3) of Public Law 106–113; 16 U.S.C. 497 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 1106 of this division.

SEC. 1416. No funds made available under this Act shall be used for a 180-day period beginning on date of enactment of this Act to enforce with respect to any farm (as that term is defined in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) the Spill, Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule, including amendments to that rule, promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE V

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1501. Of the funds available to the Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration in this or any other Act making appropriations that remain unobligated as of the date of enactment of this Act, up to $30,000,000 may be transferred to ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Job Corps'' for Job Corps operations for program years 2012 and 2013 and shall be in addition to any other amounts available to the Office of Job Corps for such purposes: Provided, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be transferred within 30 days of enactment of this

Act to support Job Corps operations for the program year ending June 30, 2013: Provided further, That not later than 15 days after any transfer has been made under the authority of this section, the Secretary of Labor shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that details the source of the transferred funds, the specific programs, projects, or activities for which such funds will be used, provides a detailed explanation of the need for such transfer, and itemizes the cost saving measures implemented by the Office of the Job Corps during Program Years 2012 and 2013 and the savings gained by implementing each initiative.

SEC. 1502. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund for administrative expenses of ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations'' shall be $3,940,865,000 (which includes all amounts available to conduct in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews), of which $3,115,142,000 shall be for grants to the States for the administration of State unemployment insurance laws under paragraph (1). For the purposes of this section, the first proviso under this heading in Public Law 112–74 shall be applied by substituting ''2013'' and ''4,585,000'' for ''2012'' and ''4,832,000'', respectively.

SEC. 1503. Notwithstanding section 1101, language under the heading ''Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' in Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ''is authorized to collect and retain up to $2,499,000'' for ''may retain up to $1,499,000''.

SEC. 1504. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Veterans Employment and Training'' shall be $264,436,000, of which $226,251,000 shall be derived from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund: Provided, That the level provided under such heading for Veterans Workforce Investment Program grants shall be used for the Transition Assistance Program and activities authorized by the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011, shall be available through September 30, 2013, and shall be in addition to any other funds available for those purposes: Provided further, That of the level provided under such heading, not less than $14,000,000 shall be for the Transition Assistance Program, and $3,414,000 shall be for the National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute.

SEC. 1505. All funds provided for the Health Centers program, as defined by section 330 of the Public Health Service Act, by this Act or any other Act providing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 shall be obligated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services by September 30, 2013, of which $48,000,000 shall be awarded for base grant adjustments.

SEC. 1506. The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (hereafter referred to in this division as ''CDC'') may detail CDC staff without reimbursement for up to 30 days to support an activation of the CDC Emergency Operations Center, so long as the Director provides notification within 15 days of the use of this authority and a full report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after the use of this authority, which includes the number of staff and funding level broken down by the originating center and number of days detailed: Provided, That the annual reimbursement cannot exceed $3,000,000 across CDC.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1507. To facilitate the implementation of the permanent Working Capital Fund (''WCF'') authorized in Public Law 112–74, on or after October 1, 2013, unobligated balances of amounts appropriated for business services for fiscal year 2013 shall be transferred to the WCF: Provided, That on or after October 1, 2013, the CDC shall transfer other amounts available for business services to other CDC appropriations consistent with the benefit each appropriation received from the business services appropriation in fiscal year 2013: Provided further, That assets purchased with funds appropriated for or reimbursed to business services in this or any other Act may be transferred to the WCF and customers billed for depreciation of those assets: Provided further, That CDC shall, consistent with the authorities provided in 42 U.S.C. 231, ensure that the WCF is used only for administrative support services and not for programmatic activity funding: Provided further, That CDC shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 15 days prior to any transfer made under the authority provided in this section.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1508. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director'' shall be $1,528,181,000: Provided, That the fourth proviso under such heading shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting the following: '': Provided further, That $165,000,000 shall be for the National Children's Study (NCS), except that not later than July 15, 2013 the Director shall estimate the amount needed for the NCS during fiscal year 2013, taking into account the succeeding proviso, and any funds in excess of the estimated need shall be transferred to and merged with the accounts for the various Institutes and Centers of NIH in proportion to their shares of total NIH appropriations made by this Act: Provided further, That the Director shall contract with the National Academy of Sciences within 60 days of enactment of this Act to appoint an expert Institute of Medicine/National Research Council (IOM/NRC) panel to conduct a comprehensive review and issue a report regarding proposed methodologies for the NCS Main Study, including whether such methodologies are likely to produce scientifically sound results that are generalizable to the United States population and appropriate sub-populations: Provided further, That no contracts shall be awarded for conducting the Main Study until at least 60 days after the IOM/NRC report has been available to the public:''.

SEC. 1509. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' shall be $1,016,000,000.

SEC. 1510. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant'' shall be $2,328,313,000: Provided, That in addition to the amounts required to be reserved by the States under section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act, $297,078,000 shall be reserved by the States for activities authorized under section 658G of such Act, of which $108,950,000 shall be for activities that improve the quality of infant and toddler care.

SEC. 1511. In addition to amounts otherwise made available by section 1101, $33,500,000 is appropriated for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services'' for making payments under the Head Start Act: Provided, That notwithstanding section 640 of such Act, up to $25,000,000 of such funds shall be available for allocation by the Secretary to supplement activities described in paragraphs (7)(B) and (9) of section 641(c) of the Head Start Act under the Designation Renewal System, established under the authority of sections 641(c)(7), 645A(b)(12) and 645A(d) of such Act: Provided further, That amounts allocated to Head Start grantees at the discretion of the Secretary to supplement activities pursuant to the previous proviso shall not be included in the calculation of the ''base grant'' in subsequent fiscal years, as such term is used in section 640(a)(7)(A) of the Head Start Act.

SEC. 1512. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' shall be increased by $17,000,000 for expenses necessary for replacement of building leases and associated renovation costs for Public Health Service agencies and other components of the Department of Health and Human Services, including relocation and fit-out costs, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 1513. Of the amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education'' for subpart 2 of part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis.

SEC. 1514. Notwithstanding section 1101, the provisos under the heading ''Department of Education—Special Education'' shall be applicable as if the following four provisos were inserted after the first proviso: '': Provided further, That the Secretary shall distribute to all other States (as that term is defined in section 611(g)(2)), subject to the third proviso, any amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d), from funds appropriated under this heading, is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B), in accordance with section 611(d)(3)(A)(i)(II) and (III) without regard to section 611(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) and section 611(d)(3)(B): Provided further, That the Secretary may not distribute any funds under the previous proviso to any State whose reduction in allocation from funds appropriated under this heading made funds available for such a distribution: Provided further, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second preceding proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f): Provided further, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under the previous provisos from funds appropriated for fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:''.

SEC. 1515. Of the amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Education, Higher Education'' for subpart 2 of part A of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, up to $4,451,000 shall be available to fund continuation awards for projects originally supported under subpart 1 of part A of title VII of such act.

SEC. 1516. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Railroad Retirement Board, Limitation on Administration'' shall be $111,149,000.

SEC. 1517. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program'' for research and demonstrations under sections 1110, 1115, and 1144 of the Social Security Act shall be $17,000,000.

SEC. 1518. Of the funds made available by section 1101 for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'', $23,000,000 shall be for section 1149 of the Social Security Act and $7,000,000 shall be for section 1150 of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 1519. Of the funds made available by section 1101 for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for the

cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, $273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and $483,052,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

SEC. 1520. Of the funds made available for the Community-Based Care Transitions Program under section 3026 of Public Law 111–148, $200,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 1521. Notwithstanding section 1101, the rescissions made in sections 522 and 525 of division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be repeated in this Act with respect to funds available for fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 1522. Section 148 of Public Law 112–175 is amended to read as follows: ''Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b) of such Act) shall continue through September 30, 2013, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2012, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.''.

TITLE VI

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 1601. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, for a payment to Irene Hirano Inouye, widow of Daniel K. Inouye, late a Senator from Hawaii, $193,400.

SEC. 1602. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Joint Congressional Committee On Inaugural Ceremonies of 2013'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1603. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Capitol Police, General Expenses'' shall be $62,004,000.

SEC. 1604. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level of funding for ''Architect of the Capitol, General Administration'' shall be $97,340,000.

SEC. 1605. (a) Notwithstanding section 1104, of the amounts made available by section 1101 for accounts under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol'', the Architect of the Capitol may transfer an aggregate amount of not more than $61,247,000 to ''Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building'', solely for expenses related to the rehabilitation of the United States Capitol Dome.

(b) The transfer of amounts under the authority of subsection (a) shall be subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(c) Any amounts transferred under the authority of subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 1606. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, available balances of expired Architect of the Capitol appropriations shall be available to the Architect of the Capitol to make the deposit to the credit of the Employees' Compensation Fund required by section 8147(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to appropriations for fiscal year 2013 and each year thereafter.

SEC. 1607. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Library of Congress, Copyright Office, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $737,000 under the first proviso, and shall be $34,250,000 under the fourth proviso.

SEC. 1608. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Printing Office, Congressional Printing and Binding'' shall be $83,632,000; ''Government Printing Office, Government Printing Office Revolving Fund'' shall be $4,000,000.

SEC. 1609. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Printing Office, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $31,500,000 and the amounts authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications to depository and other designated libraries shall apply to publications for fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

SEC. 1610. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Accountability Office, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $506,282,000, the amount applicable under the first proviso under that heading shall be $26,404,000.

SEC. 1611. (a) IN GENERAL.—Available balances of expired Government Accountability Office appropriations shall be available to the Government Accountability Office to make the deposit to the credit of the Employees' Compensation Fund required by section 8147(b) of title 5 United States Code.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2013 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 1612. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund'' shall be $8,000,000.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

SEC. 1701. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'' under title I in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$938,125,000'' for ''$762,000,000'' in the first paragraph; and by substituting ''$688,499,000'' for ''$775,000,000'' in the second paragraph.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following accounts under title I in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: ''Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities'', $2,006,499,000; ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Salaries and Expenses'', $43,499,000; ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction'', $27,675,000; ''American Sections, International Commissions'', $11,923,000; ''International Fisheries Commissions'', $34,617,000; ''Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, Salaries and Expenses'', $606,000; ''United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, Salaries and Expenses'', $2,932,000; ''Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Salaries and Expenses'', $2,443,000; ''Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, Salaries and Expenses'', $1,906,000; and ''United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Salaries and Expenses'', $3,312,000.

SEC. 1702. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Global Health Programs'' under title III in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting in the first sentence in the first paragraph ''$2,755,950,000'' for ''$2,625,000,000''; by substituting in the first sentence in the second paragraph ''$5,720,499,000'' for ''$5,542,860,000''; and by substituting in the second proviso in the second paragraph ''$1,650,000,000'' for ''$1,050,000,000''.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' under title III in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by inserting after the tenth proviso and before the period the following: '': Provided further, That not less than $325,400,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated under the heading 'Development Assistance' in this Act''.

SEC. 1703. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the sixth proviso under the heading ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'' in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting the following: ''Provided further, That funds made available for demining, conventional weapons destruction, and related activities, in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes, may be used for administrative expenses related to the operation and management of demining, conventional weapons destruction, and related programs''.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the first sentence under the heading ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'' in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by inserting ''to remain available until September 30, 2014,'' after ''$590,113,000,''.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1101, the third proviso under the heading ''International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations'' in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$161,000,000'' for ''$91,818,000'' and ''2014'' for ''2013''.

(d) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included in the first paragraph under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' under title IV in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting in the second proviso ''$3,100,000,000'' for ''$3,075,000,000'' and by substituting in the fourth proviso ''$815,300,000'' for ''$808,725,000''.

SEC. 1704. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following accounts under title V in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be as follows: ''Global Environment Facility'', $129,400,000; ''Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development'', $186,957,000; ''Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund'', $15,000,000; and in the first paragraph under ''Contribution to the International Development Association'', $1,358,500,000; and ''Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank'', $111,153,000.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the following accounts shall be $0: ''Multilateral Assistance, International Financial Institutions, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Limitation on Callable Capital Subscriptions''; ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia''; and ''International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Pakistan Counter-insurgency Capability Fund''.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the second paragraphs for the following accounts under title V in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be $0: ''Contribution to the International Development Association''; ''Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank''; and ''Contribution to the African Development Fund''.

(d) Section 70 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.), is amended in subsection (b) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In order to pay for the increase in the United States subscription to the Bank under subsection (a)(1)(B), there are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, $4,639,501,466 for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(4) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (3), $278,370,088 shall be for paid in shares of the Bank, and $4,361,131,378 shall be for callable shares of the Bank.''.

SEC. 1705. Of the unexpended balances available under the heading ''Export and Investment Assistance, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Subsidy Appropriation'' from prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, $400,000,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 1706. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7006 in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this

division by substituting ''Afghanistan, Pakistan, and other hostile or high-risk areas'' for ''Afghanistan, and Pakistan''.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amount included in section 7034(f) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$100,000,000'' for ''$50,000,000''.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7054(b) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by inserting before the period in paragraph (2) ''; or (3) such assistance, license, sale, or transfer is for the purpose of demilitarizing or disposing of such cluster munitions''.

(d) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7054(b) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied for purposes of this division by inserting before the period in paragraph (2) ''; or (3) such assistance, license, sale, or transfer is for the purpose of demilitarizing or disposing of such cluster munitions''.

(e) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7063 in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''September 30, 2014'' for ''September 30, 2013''.

(f) Notwithstanding section 1101, sections 7070(a) and 7072(a) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''headings'' for ''heading'' and substituting '''Global Health Programs', 'Economic Support Fund', and 'International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement' for 'Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia' ''.

(g) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7070 in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by adding the following:

''(d) Funds appropriated by this division under the heading 'Economic Support Fund' may be made available, not withstanding any other provision of law, for assistance and related programs for the countries identified in section 3(c) of the Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–179) and section 3 of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511) and may be used to carry out the provisions of those Acts: Provided, That such assistance and related programs from funds appropriated by this Act under the headings 'Global Health Programs', 'Economic Support Fund', and 'International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement' shall be administered in accordance with the responsibilities of the coordinator designated pursuant to section 601 of the Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–179) and section 102 of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511), and shall be made available in amounts consistent with the amounts made available under the heading 'Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia' in fiscal year 2012, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations.''.

(h) The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101–167) is amended—

(1) in section 599D (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''and 2012'' and inserting ''2012, and 2013''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2013''; and

(2) in section 599E (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

(i) Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7041(h) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by including the following before the period: ''Provided, That prior to obligating funds made available by this Act for assistance for Syria, the Secretary of State shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: Provided further, That such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations''.

(j) Notwithstanding section 1101, the fifth proviso under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting: ''Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading in this Act may be made available for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of loan guarantees for Jordan and'' for ''Provided further, That up to $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2011 under this heading in Public Law 112–10, division B, may be made available for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of loan guarantees for''.

SEC. 1707. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following accounts under title VIII in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be as follows: ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $3,210,650,000, of which $918,435,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection (to remain available until expended); and ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', $1,272,200,000, of which $1,261,400,000 is for the costs of worldwide security upgrades, acquisition, and construction, as authorized: Provided, That funds made available under this subsection shall be used for operations at high threat posts, security programs to protect personnel and property under Chief of Mission authority, preventing the compromise of classified United States Government information and equipment, and security construction or upgrade requirements at Department of State facilities worldwide, including for Worldwide Security Upgrades.

(b) Of the unobligated balances from funds appropriated under title VIII in division I of Public Law 112–74 under the heading ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' and designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, $1,109,700,000 are rescinded.

(c) Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations providing an assessment of security requirements at United States diplomatic facilities worldwide, including those facilities considered expeditionary in nature; a comprehensive plan for addressing such requirements; and a detailed description of Embassy security improvements to be supported from funds made available by this section: Provided, That such report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Office of Inspector General'' under title VIII in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$59,151,000'' for ''$67,182,000'', and by substituting ''$6,000,000'' for ''$19,545,000'' for the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction; and by substituting ''$49,901,000'' for ''$44,387,000'' for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

(e) Notwithstanding section 1101, the levels for the following accounts under title VIII in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be as follows: ''International Disaster Assistance'', $774,661,000; ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', $1,152,850,000; and ''Economic Support Fund'', $3,119,896,000.

SEC. 1708. Notwithstanding section 1101, title VIII of division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by inserting the following at the end of section 8004:

''SEC. 8005. Funds appropriated by this title under the headings 'Diplomatic and Consular Programs', 'Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance', and 'Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs' may be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated by this title under such headings: Provided, That such transfers shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That the transfer authority in this section is in addition to any transfer authority otherwise available under any other provision of law.

''SEC. 8006. Funds appropriated by this title shall be made available for assistance for Jordan, in addition to amounts otherwise made available by this Act.''.

TITLE VIII

TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1801. (a) Notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, the level for limitations on obligation and liquidation of contract authority shall be available in the following accounts equal to the level of the contract authority subject to such limitation appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund in Sections 1101, 1105, 1107, 1110, 1121, 31101, 32603, and 51001 of Public Law 112–141 for fiscal year 2013:

(1) ''Department of Transportation—Federal Highway Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses'';

(2) ''Department of Transportation—Federal Highway Administration—Federal-Aid Highways—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)—(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)—(Highway Trust Fund)'';

(3) ''Department of Transportation—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration—Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs—(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)'';

(4) ''Department of Transportation—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration—Motor Carrier Safety Grants—(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)''; Provided, Section 131 of Division C of Public Law 112–55 is hereby deleted; and

(5) ''Department of Transportation—National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—Operations and Research—(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)''.

(b) Section 120 of division C of Public Law 112–55 shall not apply to amounts made available by this division.

(c) During the period covered by this division, section 1102 of Public Law 112–141 shall be applied—

(1) in subsection (b)(10), as if the limitation applicable through fiscal year 2011 applied through fiscal year 2012; and

(2) in subsection (c)(5), by treating the reference to section 204 of title 23, United States Code, as a reference to sections 202 and 204 of such title.

SEC. 1802. Notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, the language under the heading ''Department of Transportation—National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—Highway Traffic Safety Grants—(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)'' shall be applied to funds made available by this Act as if the language read as follows: ''For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59 (as amended by section 31106 of Public Law 112–141), and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, $554,500,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): Provided, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2013, are in excess of $554,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59 (as amended by section 31106 of Public Law 112–

141), and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, of which $235,000,000 shall be for 'Highway Safety Programs' under 23 U.S.C. 402, $29,000,000 shall be for 'High Visibility Enforcement Program' under section 2009 of Public Law 109–59 (as amended by section 31106 of Public Law 112–141), $265,000,000 shall be for 'National Priority Safety Programs' under 23 U.S.C. 405, and $25,500,000 shall be for 'Administrative Expenses' under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 of the funds made available for 23 U.S.C. 405 for 'Impaired Driving Countermeasures' (as described in subsection (d) of such section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States.''

SEC. 1803. (a) Amounts provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Transportation—Federal Transit Administration—Formula and Bus Grants—(Liquidation of Contract Authority)—(Limitation on Obligations)—(Highway Trust Fund)'' are available for payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340 (as amended by Public Law 112–141), and 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141: Provided, That, notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, the proviso under such heading shall be applied to funds provided by this Act as if the proviso read as follows: ''Provided, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112–141; and 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141 shall not exceed obligations of $8,478,000,000.''.

(b) Notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, for necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 112–141, $102,713,000, to remain available until expended, of which $4,000,000 shall be available to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5329.

(c) Notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, amounts provided for ''Department of Transportation—Federal Transit Administration—Research and University Research Centers'' shall be available for necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312–5314 and 5322, as amended by Public Law 112–141: Provided, That, of the amount provided under this heading, not less than $35,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5312.

(d) Notwithstanding section 1101, the language under the heading ''Department of Transportation—Federal Transit Administration—Capital Investment Grants'' in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as if the language: '', of which $35,481,000'' and all that follows through the end of the first proviso were deleted.

(e) Section 601(e)(1)(B) of division B of Public Law 110–432 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 1106 of this division for ''4 years after such date''.

SEC. 1804. Section 112 of division C of Public Law 112–55 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by treating such section as if it were amended by striking ''49 U.S.C. 41742(b) shall not apply, and''.

SEC. 1805. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Homeless Assistance Grants'' shall be $2,033,000,000: Provided, That the level for project-based rental assistance with rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms shall be $0, and any unobligated amounts appropriated under such heading for such purpose in fiscal year 2012 or in any prior Act shall be applied in fiscal year 2013 by making any such amounts available for any purpose under such heading: Provided further, That the first proviso shall be applied by striking ''$250,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

SEC. 1806. Notwithstanding sections 1101 and 1104, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account'' shall be $12,200,000: Provided, the second proviso under such heading in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$976,000,000'' for ''$360,000,000''; Provided further, section 184(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 is amended to read as follows:

''(d) GUARANTEE FEE.—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i).''.

SEC. 1807. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance'' shall be $14,939,369,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2012), and, notwithstanding section 1111, an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: Provided, That of the amounts available for such heading, $1,375,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (3) under such heading in title II of division C of Public Law 112–55: Provided further, That in applying paragraph 1 under such heading in such Public Law to 2013, under the penultimate proviso strike ''(4) for incremental'' and all that follows up to the colon and insert ''(4) for PHAs, that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate participating families from the program due to insufficient funds''.

SEC. 1808. The heading ''DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING, HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND (RESCISSION)'' in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall be applied by striking ''(RESCISSION)'' in the heading and by replacing all of the language under such heading with the language under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–117 and by striking ''2010'' in such replacement language and inserting ''2013''.

SEC. 1809. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Public Housing Operating Fund'' shall be $4,262,010,000: Provided, That such heading shall be applied in fiscal year 2013 by striking '', of which'' and all that follows up to the period.

SEC. 1810. Section 216 in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall be applied in fiscal year 2013 by striking ''September 30, 2012'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

DIVISION G—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 3001. (a) There is hereby rescinded the applicable percentage (as specified in subsection (b)) of the budget authority provided (or obligation limit imposed) for fiscal year 2013 for any discretionary account in divisions A through E of this Act; and

(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the applicable percentage shall be—

(1) for budget authority in the nonsecurity category (as defined in section 250(c)(4)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, in—

(A) divisions A and E, 2.513. percent; and

(B) division B, 1.877 percent; and

(2) for budget authority in the security category (as defined in section 250(c)(4)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), 0.1 percent.

(c) Any rescission made by subsection (a) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary account and each item of budget authority described in such subsection; and

(2) within each such account and item, to each program, project, and activity (with programs, projects, and activities as delineated in the applicable appropriation Act or accompanying reports covering such account or item).

(d) This section shall not apply to amounts designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act; and

(e) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying the account and amount of each rescission made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3002. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, a sequestration order issued by the President pursuant to section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is in effect, the reductions in each discretionary account under such order shall apply to the amounts provided in this Act consistent with section 253(f) of that Act, and shall be in addition to any reductions required by section 251(a) of that Act.

SEC. 3003. (a) The head of any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act shall submit annual reports to the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, regarding the costs and contracting procedures related to each conference held by any such department, agency, board, commission, or office during fiscal year 2013 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than $100,000.

(b) Each report submitted shall include, for each conference described in subsection (a) held during the applicable period—

(1) a description of its purpose;

(2) the number of participants attending;

(3) a detailed statement of the costs to the United States Government, including—

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services;

(C) the cost of employee or contractor travel to and from the conference; and

(D) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to the conference; and

(4) a description of the contracting procedures used including—

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the departmental component or office in evaluating potential contractors for the conference.

(c) Within 15 days of the date of a conference held by any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act during fiscal year 2013 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than $20,000, the head of any such department, agency, board, commission, or office shall notify the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, of the date, location, and number of employees attending such conference.

(d) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this or any other appropriations Act to an Executive branch agency may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a conference described in subsection (c) that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(e) None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for travel and conference activities that are not in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M–12–12 dated May 11, 2012.

SEC. 3004. (a) If, for fiscal year 2013, the amount of new budget authority provided in appropriation Acts exceeds the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act on new budget authority for any category due to estimating differences with the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall increase the applicable percentage in subsection (c) with respect to that category by such amount as is necessary to eliminate the amount of the excess in that category.

(b) Subject to subsection (a), there is hereby rescinded the applicable percentage (as specified in subsection (c)) of—

(1) the budget authority provided (or obligation limit imposed) for fiscal year 2013 for any discretionary account in divisions A through F of this Act;

(2) the budget authority provided in any advance appropriation for fiscal year 2013 for any discretionary account in any prior fiscal year appropriation Act; and

(3) the contract authority provided in fiscal year 2013 for any program subject to limitation incorporated or otherwise contained in divisions A through F of this Act.

(c) For purposes of subsection (b), the applicable percentage shall be—

(1) for budget authority in the nonsecurity category (as defined in section 250(c)(4)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), 0 percent; and

(2) for budget authority in the security category (as defined in section 250(c)(4)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), 0 percent.

(d) Any rescission made by subsection (b) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary account and each item of budget authority described in such subsection; and

(2) within each such account and item, to each program, project, and activity (with programs, projects, and activities as delineated in the applicable appropriation Act or accompanying reports covering such account or item).

(e) This section shall not apply to—

(1) amounts designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act; or

(2) the amount made available by division F of this Act for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act.

(f) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying the account and amount of each rescission made pursuant to this section.

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.'

MOTION TO CONCUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 20, 2013, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 0920

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We present now the bill to fund the Federal Government for the remainder of the fiscal year. This legislation provides funding for essential Federal programs and services, helps maintain our national security, and takes a potential government shutdown off the table.

The House passed a very similar version of this bill just 2 weeks ago, and yesterday the Senate passed their version of this legislation. Now it's back before the House today for our final stamp of approval.

I'm sure I don't need to remind the Members of the deadline that we face here. The existing continuing resolution expires next Wednesday, so it's vital that we get this bill to the President for his signature straightaway.

The total funding provided in the bill remains at $984 billion, the level required by the President's sequestration order.

To summarize the contents of this bill briefly, Mr. Speaker, it contains full funding for the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, exactly what the House approved the other week. Without the additional flexibility provided in this bill, the Pentagon could face severe funding constraints, even beyond sequestration, potentially jeopardizing our national security.

In addition to addressing our military equipment and readiness needs, it also provides for the quality of life and health of our troops and veterans. We've added an additional $2.5 billion for the VA to ensure our Nation's warfighters receive the benefits they have earned for their service.

The Senate added to the bill we passed three additional full-year appropriations bills to H.R. 933, the ones for Homeland Security, Commerce, Justice and Science, and Agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these were the bills that passed the House, by large margins, with bipartisan backing, and are now, by the Senate, reinserted into the CR for the balance of the year. And it pleases this Member and this chairman that those bills were picked up and certified into the CR that we're passing today.

This funding will support critical law enforcement agencies, protect our Nation's borders and food supplies, and provide important agriculture and rural development investments. We've ensured that critical government services, like food and nutrition assistance programs, remain available to those who need them most.

These updated spending and funding levels will help keep our economy on the path toward recovery, supporting U.S. trade, manufacturing, and job creation. In the other departments and agencies covered by the bill, both the House and Senate made limited, technical changes where absolutely necessary to prevent extensive waste of taxpayer dollars and to avoid any serious and irreversible damage to government programs, and to provide strict oversight of this spending.

The Senate added a number of additional what we call anomalies or exceptions beyond what was included in the initial House draft. I don't think all of the Senate additions are absolutely necessary, but there's no reason to oppose them, not strong enough in this to oppose this legislation.

However, the Senate did not add some important matters, and I want to reiterate briefly what they are. The Senate did not add additional funds for ObamaCare. The Senate did not add additional funding for the flawed Dodd-Frank law. The Senate did not remove important Second Amendment protections, and they did not dismantle important oversight and funding conditions that help ensure the wise and appropriate use of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, all said, this bill is the product of thoughtful, bipartisan conciliation and hard work. We stayed in close touch with Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY as they managed the bill in the Senate. As a result, the Senate added no poison pills to the bill that passed the House last week.

Even if a continuing resolution is not the most preferable way to fund the government, I believe this bill is the best we can do under these tricky circumstances, and I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on the other side of the Capitol for working closely with us and the committee over the past few weeks.

We still face a long haul for the rest of the year. It may seem far down the line, but the beginning of fiscal 2014 is only 6 months away, not to mention the other fiscal challenges that we face.

Passing this continuing resolution today lays the groundwork for a path forward. It takes a looming fiscal deadline off the table to allow us to finish the rest of our work and ensures our government keeps its doors open through all of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this body know that the real work of the body is done by staff. In the case of the Appropriations Committee, I can say that 10,000 times. The staff that worked this bill and worked on the committee business, both on the majority and minority side, put in long hours on weekends and all-night sessions and the like.

They are the people who don't get enough praise. This bill, of course, is no different. The staff has worked across the aisle and across the Capitol to make this bill what it is today.

And I want to especially thank the chief clerk. The head of the staff, Bill Inglee, who sits beside me here, has run the committee staff since we've had the chance to chair the committee. I can't say enough good work about him and all of the staff, both sides of the aisle, who have labored so hard with a great heart to make these bills possible. So I want to thank Bill Inglee, especially, for the great work that he has given to the Nation through his work in clerking for the Appropriations Committee.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to do the right thing by the American people and support this legislation and take a shutdown of the government off the table.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress 25 years ago and joined the Appropriations Committee a few years later. With a strong sense of responsibility and optimism, with hard work and bipartisanship, this committee has the power to transform lives;

To ensure that whether you are from the poorest block of urban America or a penthouse in Manhattan, with hard work, you can achieve the American Dream;

To research treatments and medicines so that we can cure the most tragic illnesses like cancer and HIV/AIDS and childhood disorders like autism;

To give every youngster the opportunities my grandchildren have, not let hardworking parents struggle to find child care or afford pre-K, or think about how they're ever going to pay for a college education;

To invest in the initiatives that have made this Nation great, bolstering our economy, giving Americans jobs, building our infrastructure, teaching our children, and protecting our communities.

□ 0930

While the bill we consider today represents a great deal of compromise, it fails these tests; but with the current continuing resolution expiring in just 6 days, we have run out of options, my friends, to avoid a government shutdown.

When the House first considered this package, I voted against it, in part, because it included just two bills—Defense and Military Construction—leaving every other government agency to live under a continuing resolution from fiscal year 2012. The Senate, wisely, added three additional full-year spending bills to the measure we consider today—Agriculture; Commerce, Justice, and Science; and Homeland Security—and amended the bill to help other agencies adapt to current needs. Senate Appropriations Chairwoman MIKULSKI and I were in constant contact throughout the negotiations. I'm satisfied she got the best deal she could at this time.

Yet I remain deeply dissatisfied that sequestration is not addressed and will slash the very priorities I believe all of us came here to fulfill. This $68 billion in detrimental cuts will diminish services Americans depend on, job growth, and our overall economy. According to CBO, 750,000 jobs—more than a third of the jobs we created last year—will be wiped out by sequestration. This package lacks vital assistance to fully operate and promote Federal health insurance exchanges needed to give millions of uninsured Americans health care. It also provides inadequate funds to enforce financial reforms to protect consumers.

The majority sets a dangerous precedent by refusing to fund the implementation of laws they simply don't like but cannot overturn. Health and financial reform are the laws of the land, and the health care law has even been affirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

The American people face serious challenges—children who will lose Head Start, diseases for which we will decrease research, unsafe roads and bridges, and a food supply that could be less safe. We cannot relitigate partisan battles. We should instead forge ahead toward compromise and practical solutions.

In that spirit, I'm pleased the bill includes the administration's full request for embassy security to protect Americans working abroad. In addition, it fully funds our commitments to Israel, our only and vital ally in the Middle East.

H.R. 933 will support 20,757 claims processors to help address the shameful Veterans Administration claims backlog, which delays care to our Nation's veterans. The bill also directs the VA to report to Congress on progress to reduce the backlog, which I intend to follow closely. Transportation funding is also increased to meet the levels authorized under the MAP–21 plan, and critical highway and motor carrier safety programs are included.

Mr. Speaker, despite its imperfections, I will support this bill to avert a government shutdown, which would be disastrous for our economy. As we finally put fiscal year 2013 behind us and move on to 2014, it is my sincere hope that we can work together to stop sequestration's mindless cuts before American jobs and livelihoods are lost.

Once this bill is passed and we have avoided a government shutdown, we must ask ourselves, Why are we here? We're here to ensure every family has access to high-quality health care and every child has the opportunity to learn, grow, and thrive. We're here to protect the safety and economic security of Americans and to leave our world and our country better than we inherited it for our children and grandchildren.

We are failing, and we must do better. Let's restore the sense of responsibility to improve the lives of our constituents and the prosperity of this great Nation.

I want to close by thanking Chairman ROGERS and the wonderful staff on both sides of the aisle. We've all tried to work across the aisle. I hope we can do so as future bills are discussed and as we face a new challenge.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. To my friends on the Appropriations Committee, I do want to congratulate you for working together. This is a positive sign for this Congress. But the reason I stand today here in this Chamber is that 8 months ago yesterday, 12 people were murdered in an Aurora theater. Fifty-eight were shot and hundreds were traumatized. Three months ago, 22 kids were killed in Newtown, Connecticut. We have yet to have a single hearing on mental health, on gun safety, on background checks, on whether we limit the number of rounds in a magazine on military-style assault weapons.

I rise today because in this bill there is substantive legislation, which I believe is out of order in an appropriations bill, that deals with tracing of guns used in crimes and the prohibition to use any information that might be gained from tracing guns used in crimes and any kind of study to figure out where these are coming from.

And so I dare say that the Appropriations Committee held a hearing on gun safety or magazines or even on this tracing that's in the bill at section 514, pages 169 and 170. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject that this House has got to take up. It can't just be part of some appropriations bill where there's never been real testimony and where we have substantive legislation.

So I appreciate the work that you have done on the appropriations piece, but I don't appreciate the piece where it's substantive legislation concerning gun safety.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the ranking member and the distinguished leader of the committee that funds health, education, and labor, the Congresswoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which has only marginally improved since the last time we voted on it. This makes deep, permanent, indiscriminate, and harmful sequestration cuts that threaten our economic recovery. These are automatic across-the-board cuts. It hurts our economic recovery and the health and well-being and future of millions of American families.

Both the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke have argued that the sequestration could cost us as many as 750,000 jobs. And that is not all.

□ 0940

This resolution will make unnecessary cuts to vital programs that support families around the country. And these cuts will weigh heaviest on the people we should be helping the most to get back on their feet, the most vulnerable American families still struggling from the Great Recession.

A vote against this resolution is not a vote for a government shutdown. Speaker BOEHNER has pledged on multiple occasions that he will not let the government shut down. You don't have to support this resolution and sequestration to avoid a shutdown.

If you vote for this resolution, you are voting to undermine the Affordable Care Act by not providing funding to fully implement and ensure access to the health care marketplaces. You are voting to cut $400 million from Head Start. That means cutting early learning and development services from 70,000 children.

You vote to cut $282 million from critical job training programs, cutting services from hundreds of thousands of unemployed and dislocated workers, veterans, and students.

You vote to slash $730 million from Title I grants, cutting Federally funded education services from 2,500 schools and 1 million disadvantaged children. You vote to cut $580 million from special education grants, shifting the cost of educating 30,000 kids to the State and to local education agencies.

You vote to cut more than $1.5 billion from the National Institutes of Health, slowing the pace of research and reducing the number of medical advances we make each year—advances that have the potential to save lives.

You vote to cut $115 million from the Childcare Development Block Grant, further exacerbating the shortage of Federal child assistance by cutting services for 30,000 children.

The list goes on. On top of deep cuts that have already become law, this resolution goes even deeper into every responsibility of good government—public health, research, safety, transportation, you name it. It also includes four egregious provisions related to firearms that would continue to blindfold law enforcement and hamper our ability to combat gun violence.

This is not what the American people want from us. We need to pass a bill that creates jobs, grows the economy, and protects the middle class, seniors, and the most vulnerable. The resolution before us today does none of these things.

You know, whenever we are drafting a budget or debating legislation in the House of Representatives, these are the principles that inform my work as a Member of the Congress.

On Tuesday, in Rome, Pope Francis I asked ''all those who have positions of responsibility in economic, political, and social life'' to also ''be protectors.'' We need to be protectors. We need to continue to carry that vision of service with us and hope that all elected officials heed what the newly invested Pope has called for and work to ensure that our service is truly a service to others.

We need to not put American families at risk. I urge my colleagues to oppose this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about one small part of the continuing resolution, but one that has a huge impact on constituents in every district in this Nation: military tuition assistance, a popular program used by hundreds of thousands of troops to further their education and become better leaders, both in uniform and back in the civilian job market. Military tuition assistance, Mr. Speaker, is what the administration chose to cut because of sequestration.

The administration didn't have to end this program, but they did. The administration clearly decided to try and make sequester cuts as painful as possible, and our military men and women were being made to suffer the consequences. Instead of cutting waste, they ended a popular benefit for members of the armed services. This administration would rather renege on a promise made to soldiers, airmen, and marines than work together to prioritize spending and get our fiscal house in order.

Thankfully, through bipartisan efforts in both Chambers, we were able to right a wrong. Today's vote compels the administration to keep our government's promise to America's servicemen and -women—and quite frankly, it's a shame it ever had to come to this.

I thank every Member of this body that has worked to restore the military tuition assistance program. It's a small part of this package, but a huge one for our troops.

I urge support of the bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude our discussion, I just want to make it clear that I look forward to continuing to work with my friend, Chairman ROGERS, and hopefully we can consider each bill as we address the needs of fiscal year 2014.

I agree with my dear friend, Congresswoman DELAURO, on the problems with this bill and the accounts that we have not funded adequately. I do hope as we move forward we can work in a bipartisan way to, yes, continue to root out waste, fraud, and abuse, but also address the many needs of our constituents, all the people of the United States of America, and people around the world who look to the United States as a beacon of hope and opportunity.

So I again feel that I will support this bill because we cannot allow the government to shut down in 6 days, but I look forward, with optimism, that we can work together to address the many needs that we have not considered appropriately in this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will be brief. But I wanted to point out to the body the rarity of what we're doing here today.

This bill funds the government for the balance of the year. The House and Senate picked up earlier approved appropriations bills—some of the 12 of the bills—and incorporated them into this CR. So it's sort of a hybrid bill. A part of it funds the agencies without any particular change from 2012. Then, in these five bills that earlier had passed the House and the Senate committee, now incorporated in this bill, it funds those agencies with full-year funding, with full-year instructions.

The rarity of coming together as we are a week or so before the ending of the CR to pass a new CR, by agreement with the Senate, with the myriad of details involved in these bills—tens of thousands of decisions, actually, that were made a part of this bill—it is remarkable that we're at this point where I think the bill will be approved with a great majority as it was in the Senate—the Senate vote was 73–26, and I think the vote here will be similar. But that's remarkable. It's due to good staff work, number one—dedicated work. It's due to Members of both bodies who were able to listen to their colleagues, understand everyone's needs involved in this process, and for the most part we found conciliation and ability to come together around these common provisions that are good for the country.

This will allow our military a lot more flexibility in how they spend the money we give to them—all the while it's a meager amount compared to what they need. Nevertheless, they're given flexibility, and with the other agencies like Veterans and Homeland Security, with Border Patrol, with veterans' pension cases and trying to help relieve that workload, and all of the agriculture needs of the country included in this bill, as well as the Commerce, Justice, Science part. So we are properly funding things like the FBI and the DEA, the law enforcement agencies, the Commerce and Trade Divisions, as well as all of the others included in the bill.

□ 0950

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I'm proud of it. I'm proud of the fact that we were able to do all of this, frankly, as smoothly as it has gone. That's a tribute to the work of people like NITA LOWEY, the new ranking member on the full committee, and the work of Senator RICHARD SHELBY, the ranking Republican on the Senate side, and, of course, the new chairman of the committee over there, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI.

All of us worked together, and we were determined to produce a product that would be good for the Nation, number one; but, as it turns out, I think it's good for this body and the Senate. We have proved that when we set our mind to it, we can get complicated, hard things done. And that's what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on H.R. 933, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against H.R. 933. This bill includes reckless, across-the-board spending cuts known as the sequester, which have a disproportionate impact on critical programs that serve those in our Nation's most vulnerable communities. Although the Senate amendment to the bill strengthens certain programs, they are still subject to sequester level cuts. Because Congress is unwilling to act responsibly, drastic cuts are set to go into effect with this bill, and hundreds of Iowa kids will bear the burden of lawmakers' inaction by no longer having access to Head Start services. Investments for children's education will be cut. Additionally, the bill could impact other everyday services such as the closure of hundreds of air traffic control towers throughout the country, including three in Iowa. Along with the harmful cuts that the sequester brings, the Defense Appropriations portion of the bill continues to fund $87 billion towards the war in Afghanistan. We need to bring our brave men and women serving in uniform home rather than continue to fund a war that has lasted longer than a decade.

Although I oppose the bill in its current form, there are many provisions in the bill that I do support. I applaud the 1.7% pay increase for military personnel. I support the continuation of a pay freeze for Members of Congress. I support the increased funding for Head Start and the FEMA disaster relief fund over the House bill, though it's still not enough. I also support the increased funding for embassy security following the needs identified after the Benghazi attacks. I am also pleased to know that the bill provides for substantial foreign aid to our ally Israel.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, while the Continuing Resolution we vote on today is a marginal improvement over the version that passed the House, it still fails to replace sequestration and underfunds our Nation's critical needs. House Republicans have repeatedly blocked legislation to replace sequestration and save the 750,000 jobs that the Congressional Budget Office tells us would be lost this year alone under that failed policy. And now we are voting on a Continuing Resolution that keeps those cuts in place for the rest of the year.

I appreciate the Senate's efforts to improve this bill, updating appropriations plans for the several other Departments and including marginal funding increases for several important priorities, including the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, Head Start, transportation safety, and local law enforcement. It brings transportation funding in line with the MAP–21 policy that passed last year, freeing up more than $720 million for important infrastructure projects. And it includes a necessary extension of the TANF program, which was set to expire at the end of this month.

However, by continuing sequestration and failing to update seven of our appropriations bills to reflect current policy and priorities, this bill shortchanges vital programs. It cuts more deeply into environmental programs than even the House bill, making it more difficult to keep our air and water clean and healthy. It underfunds implementation of the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform, hampering efforts to expand access to health care, improve consumer protections, and rein in the excesses of the financial industry.

This legislation also continues to scapegoat federal employees, extending their pay freeze through the end of the year. While I believe Congress can afford a pay freeze, the federal workers who care for our veterans, protect our borders, conduct research into life-saving treatments and innovative technologies, and inspect our Nation's food supply cannot. These hardworking federal employees have already had their pay frozen for two years and contributed more than $100 billion to reduce our deficit. They should not be denied a partial 0.5 percent cost-of-living increase.

Unfortunately, our choice today is between this legislation and a total government shutdown. While I would have liked to see a much better bill before us today—one that responsibly replaces the sequester and makes the necessary investments in critical programs and personnel—I will vote for this bill because a government shutdown would be even more damaging for our economy and the civil servants who work on behalf of our country every day.

But once this bill has passed, and we have avoided yet another manufactured crisis, we must work together to address our most important priority—the economy and jobs. We know from Europeans that austerity does not work—it is time to craft a responsible policy that addresses our jobs deficit and puts our Nation on a path to long-term sustainability.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents the lowest common denominator. I am extremely disappointed that it does not prevent the unnecessary cuts of the sequester and that it fails to fund many programs that are vital to Oregon and the Nation.

At this point, however, this bill is the best that we can do. I am voting for it in order to avoid a government shutdown. With this most recent manufactured crisis behind us, I hope that Congress can come together and get serious about making the investments that will implement healthcare reform, rebuild and renew America's crumbling infrastructure, help our neediest families, and protect public health and the environment.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, rise today to address a matter of great concern not only for my congressional district, but for the future of science research in the United States. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, has been a leader in fusion energy research for decades, and I would like to clarify congressional intent regarding the continued operations of its Alcator C–Mod fusion energy experiment.

While the President's Fiscal Year 2013 budget request contained a substantial increase for the international fusion energy project ITER, based in France, it dramatically reduced domestic fusion energy funding as a trade-off. As part of this effort, the President's request would schedule the Alcator C–Mod tokamak for closure. I want to be clear: at no point in the appropriations process has Congress approved of or authorized this closure.

The Continuing Resolution before us today, H.R. 933, directs the Department of Energy, DOE, to continue virtually all policy and funding provisions included in currently enacted appropriations legislation for FY 2012 for DOE, including its Office of Science. The Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee has previously expressed profound concern regarding the need to maintain a balance between domestic and international funding in the Department of Energy's Office of Fusion Energy Sciences, as well as the need to maintain the US fusion talent base and leadership. Although the President's budget for FY 2013 proposed a major shift in funding from domestic fusion programs, including for the C–Mod fusion facility, neither the House nor the Senate Appropriations Committee approved those changes. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the Appropriations Committee that funding for all major domestic magnetic fusion activities should be continued under H.R. 933, just as they were in FY 2012. Under this Continuing Resolution, the Office of Science should neither start nor stop programs, subprograms, or activities, including those within the Office of Fusion Energy Sciences. In MIT's case, this means that over the course of FY 2013, the Department should provide sufficient funds for operations and research for C–Mod and other domestic fusion facilities consistent with FY 2012 levels, minus sequestration.

MIT's emphasis on American innovation in fusion energy and the training of our next generation of fusion energy scientists is vital to the overall success of our Nation's program. Congress has not approved a closure of the Alcator C–Mod tokamak, and its continued operation through FY 2013 is provided for in H.R. 933.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendment to the Continuing Resolution before us today to continue funding our government in a more prudent manner than was seen in the House Republican measure. I believe that funding of our Nation's most essential programs must continue at a responsible level, and I'm disappointed in the constant partisan politics being played with the important financial matters of our country.

While I still believe that this constant week-to-week, Continuing Resolution funding of our government is irresponsible and incomplete, it is necessary to ensure that our seniors and veterans can continue to receive the important benefits that they deserve, ensure proper funding for our state and local law enforcement programs that protect our communities, and a continued investment in scientific research that will help us to lead the world in discovery and opportunity.

I'm disappointed that this Continuing Resolution does nothing to address the harsh automatic budget cuts of sequestration, does not

reinstate proper funding of the much-needed protections authorized in the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform laws, and leaves in place broad cuts to environmental protection and food safety and inspection that keep us safe.

But, simply put, this measure will prevent a government shutdown and keep our Nation moving forward, and I believe it will allow us ample time to come together on a 2014 budget that I know the American people are owed and deserve. We cannot afford to keep bringing this great Nation to the brink of the fiscal cliff for nothing more than purely misguided political reasons. It does nothing but further jeopardize the certainty that the American people need, now more than ever, to ensure that their family or small business can find success and prosper.

While at it's very core I find this measure incomplete, I will support it and hope that my colleagues agree to come together, craft a budget that properly funds our Nation that can be signed into law by the President, and work each and every day hereafter to put our country back on a path to fiscal responsibility and prosperity.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this continuing resolution.

The action we are taking today will restore some semblance of regular order. The CR, with the inclusion of 5 of the individual bills, is preferable to no appropriations process at all.

Perhaps this catch all bill for the remainder of 2013 will break the logjam and signal restoration of regular order for 2014 bills, a return is long overdue. This is the Congress' rightful Constitutional role and duty—open hearings, normal amendments, and full floor consideration of all 12 appropriations bills.

Two weeks ago as the House first considered the CR, I had hoped to see significant improvement through the process of its consideration. This hope was not fully realized. Though some areas were improved, significantly the inclusion of 3 additional bills, in other areas the CR does not adequately address national needs. The Energy and Water Development jurisdiction is just one example of where the CR falls short.

Congress' failure to do our jobs and pass discrete annual appropriation bills limits our ability to respond to changing realities within government programs as well as our ability to perform appropriate oversight.

The bill does not address the sequester. These unnecessary, indiscriminate reductions will cut economic growth by one-third. Though economists predict sequestration will cost 2 million jobs, not passing the measure would cost even more.

We cannot continue to make decisions whose adverse impact falls primarily on the middle class and those who are the most vulnerable in our country. Our Nation is at its best when we ensure that opportunity is available to everyone, opportunity which is the bedrock of the American dream.

The measure, though far from perfect . . . gives some confidence, albeit late, to the 2013 budget, the public, and the markets so that normal federal transactions can occur—with clarity.

While I believe improvements could and should be made, the alternatives carry a higher risk. I will therefore reluctantly support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 20, 2013, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the previous order of the House, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0955

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, amendment no. 5 printed in House Report 113–21 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to start off by thanking all of our hardworking staff, and I would like to include for the RECORD a list of all the staff members on the Republican side of the aisle who put such work into this. I want to recognize in particular one member of our team, our health care policy expert, Charlotte Ivancic. She was there for our first budget, and this marks her last budget, as she is now joining Speaker BOEHNER's team. Charlotte devoted long hours to working with Medicare actuaries, and she was instrumental in the bipartisan collaboration with Senator WYDEN and former Clinton Budget Director Alice Rivlin. She always understood that our hard work is for a higher purpose. Her husband, Nick, and their two boys, Otto and Jack, are what motivate her work, and that passion has been contagious. It's been an honor to work at her side.

I want to thank all of the hardworking staffers—on both sides of the aisle—for helping to elevate this important budget debate.

We wish her very good luck.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Alex Stoddard, Andy Morton, Austin Smythe, Brian Bolduc, Charlotte Ivancic, Conor Sweeney, David Logan, Dennis Teti, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, James McKitrick (intern), Jane Lee, Jenna Spealman, Jim Herz, Jon Burks, Jon Romito.

Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Marsha Douglas, Mary Popadiuk (intern), Matt Carter, Matt Hoffmann, Nicole Foltz, Paul Restuccia, Stephanie Parks, Ted McCann, Tim Flynn, Tim Azarchs (intern), Trent Johnson (intern), Vanessa Bazan (intern), Vanessa Day, William Allison.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL RYAN'S STAFF

Allison Steil, Andy Speth, Aubrey Yanzito, Ben Erickson, Casey Higgins, Chad Herbert, Danyell Tremmel, Donald Schneider, James Scimecca, Joyce Meyer, Kevin Seifert.

Lauren Schroeder, Matthew Varvaro, Megan Wagner, Rick Jacobson, Robert Swift, Sarah Peer, Smythe Anderson, Susie Liston, Teresa Mora, Tricia Stoneking.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE ASSOCIATE STAFF

Abby Gunderson, Rep. Rigell (VA); Alexis Alber, Rep. Hartzler (MO); Andrew Shaw, Rep. Garrett (NJ); Annie Boyajian, Rep. Walorski (IN); Brian Lenihan, Rep. Black (TN); Brittan Specht, Rep. McClintock (CA); Bryan Blom, Rep. Duffy (WI); Christy Paavola, Rep. Ribble (WI); Colby Hale, Rep. Williams (TX); Courtney Titus, Rep. Rice (SC); David Malech, Rep. Campbell (CA).

Deena Contreras, Rep. Calvert (CA); Jerry White, Rep. Messer (IN); Jon Oehmen, Rep. Flores (TX); Keith Studdard, Rep. Blackburn (TN); Kevin Kincheloe, Rep. Lankford (OK); Kyle Cormney, Rep Price (GA); Megan Wenrich, Rep. Rokita (IN); Meyer Seligman, Rep. Nunnelee (MS); Nick Myers, Rep. Woodall (GA); Steve Waskiewicz, Rep. Cole (OK).

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

Over the last couple days, we've had a spirited debate on the budget. We have deep differences on this issue, but

I want to commend Chairman RYAN for the way he conducts the business of the Budget Committee. The debate is lively but always civil, and I thank him for the way he has run the committee.

I also want to thank all the other members of the Budget Committee for their full participation in this debate and to the staffs, both Republican staff and Democratic staff, who work so hard for their service to our country. I want to commend our team who has been working very hard and ask that their names be included in the RECORD along with the members of the Republican staff.

Mr. Chairman, these budget resolutions are mostly comprised of lots of numbers on lots of pages, but we know that behind these numbers are key decisions about the future direction of our country and our priorities and values as a nation.

I was disappointed that yesterday this House did not pass our Democratic budget alternative that presents a solutions-based approach to address our challenges instead of an ideological approach. Today, I'm going to ask the House to vote against the Republican budget because of its uncompromising ideological approach, and I will explain more about that in a moment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MINORITY STAFF

Abernathy, Sarah
Ballis, Ellen
Capstick, Kathleen
Carasso, Adam
Cummings, Ken
Griffin, Jocelyn
Frey, Bridgett
Kahn, Tom
Kamal, Najy
McDowell, Shelia
Meredith, Diana
Miller, Erin
Overbeek, Kimberly
Robb, Karen
Russell, Scott
Stephenson, Beth
Zegers, Ted

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire of the gentleman from Maryland as to how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am the only speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

□ 1000

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and congratulate Mr. RYAN and our members of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

We have a budget here that will, in fact, balance over the next 10 years after having a debate with our colleagues across the aisle and across the building and downtown who all have budgets that never come to balance.

I don't know where ''a balanced plan'' can be called ''a balanced plan'' if we never get to balance. The fact is that we've done the hard work of bringing this plan forward.

This budget does more than just balance. It helps improve the lives and concerns of the American people and addresses things that are important to American families such as fixing the Tax Code. Lowering rates means more jobs and higher wages for the American people.

Voting for this budget means supporting the Keystone pipeline, and American-made energy means more jobs and lower energy prices for the American people.

Repealing ObamaCare and supporting patient-centered reforms means more jobs and lower health care costs for the American people; and protecting and strengthening Medicare means a secure retirement for older Americans.

Cutting waste means more fairness and accountability for hardworking taxpayers.

Doing all of this means preserving the American Dream, which is what we were sent here to do.

We've balanced the budget before. In 1997, a Republican Congress working with a Democrat President, Bill Clinton, came together to put forward a plan that would, in fact, balance the budget. And we did. For 4 years we ran a budget surplus.

The President has an opportunity during this critical debate to come forward and to help make this part of his legacy like it has become part of the Clinton legacy, working together on behalf of the American people to solve what we know is a crisis in our country. We can't continue to spend money that we don't have. It's as simple as that.

When you've spent more money than what you've brought in for 50 of the last 60 years, no American family can do this, no business can do this, and no government can do this without bringing on a debt crisis that is sure to imperil the future of our kids and our grandkids.

Vote for the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'm going to reserve the balance of my time since I have the right to close and we have no more speakers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to urge our colleagues to vote against this Republican budget for a variety of reasons.

First of all, this is an uncompromising, ideological approach to our budget issues. We've just been through a major national campaign where both Presidential candidates, President Obama and Governor Romney, agreed on one thing, and that was that the people in this country faced a fundamental choice in the direction we were going to take. The American people voted, and they resoundingly rejected the approach that is now taken once again for the third year in a row in this Republican budget.

This budget, as we've heard over the last couple of days, fails on a number of counts. Number one, it adopts the European-style austerity approach that we've seen slow down economies in many parts of Europe. We should instead be focusing on job growth and putting people back to work rather than a budget, like this budget, which will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working by the end of this year. That's according to the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. It will result in more than 2 million fewer people working next year.

It also fails the test of taking a balanced approach because it is founded on the failed idea that giving another round of tax cuts to people at the very high end of the income scale will somehow trickle down and lift up all the other boats. We know that hasn't worked, and yet it is pursued once again such that everybody in the Republican budget is asked to sacrifice except folks at the very top, everybody else, including middle class Americans who will see their tax burden go up in order to finance tax breaks for people at the very high end.

We Democrats offered an amendment in the Budget Committee to say don't increase taxes on middle class Americans, and all our Republican colleagues voted ''no.'' It is based on the idea that we should dramatically cut investments that are important to help our economy grow.

We know we have an aging infrastructure problem. We know we need to modernize our national infrastructure to compete in the global economy; yet this cuts our infrastructure and transportation budget by over 20 percent when we just got a grade of D-plus from the American Society of Civil Engineers and when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

It makes it harder for students to go to college. The Republican budget will double the student loan interest rate in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

In the part of our budget where we make important investments in science and research and education, it more than doubles the sequester cut.

It violates important commitments we've made to our seniors. It reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole so that seniors with high health care costs will pay thousands of dollars more over the period of this budget. It turns Medicare into a voucher program so seniors are faced with the risk of rising health care costs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it's based on this false idea that you can claim to balance the budget in 10 years when you claim also to be getting rid of ObamaCare when all they do is get rid of the benefits of ObamaCare, but this budget only reaches its claim of balance because they keep the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to reject this approach and to adopt the balanced Democratic approach to dealing with these national challenges.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this budget is constructive. It reveals each side's priorities. It clarifies the divide that exists between us.

We want to balance the budget; they don't. We want to restrain spending; they want to spend more money. We think taxpayers have given enough to Washington; they want to raise taxes by at least a trillion dollars. Take more to spend more. We want to strengthen programs like Medicare; they seem to be complicit with its demise. We see ObamaCare as a roadblock to patient-centered health care reform; they see it as a sacred cow. We think our national security is a top priority; they want to hollow out our military. We offer modernization, reform, growth and opportunity; they're clinging to the status quo: more taxing, more spending, more borrowing.

This plan recognizes that if we cannot handle our out-of-control debt, we will lose control of our future. We cut wasteful spending, and we balance the budget.

This plan recognizes that concern for the poor is not measured by how much money we spend in Washington, but instead how many people we get out of poverty. We reform antipoverty programs so that they work. We help strengthen communities and families. We recognize the need for a vibrant economy.

The Stanford economist that looked at this budget last week said 500,000 jobs right away; $1,500 more in take-home pay for families in the first year; 1.7 million jobs and $4,000 in better take-home pay on average for a family in the 10th year.

This plan will protect and strengthen Medicare; and it begins, yes, by repealing ObamaCare because that does great damage to Medicare.

Again, the House is leading the way.

We have a jobs deficit. We have a budget deficit. These are the byproducts of a leadership deficit. We still have no budget from the President in violation of the law. He gets his NCAA bracket in on time, but still there's no budget. This is the fourth time in 5 years. He set a new record this year, 2 months with no plan while we have trillion-dollar deficits and a debt crisis on the horizon.

They have time for the attacks, but no time to offer serious solutions. His party leaders are unfortunately failing to offer a serious account of our challenge: no serious plan to grow the economy or create jobs, no plan to ever balance the budget. Take more, trillions of dollars more to spend more in Washington. That's what got us in this mess in the first place.

□ 1010

So what can be done?

The good news is that we now have a vehicle for regular order. The Democrats derailed the budget process each of the last few years and stopped governing when they stopped budgeting. At least we now have a budget process that's moving. We've brought them back in the game this spring. That's a good thing.

So what's going to happen in the weeks ahead?

We will make the case for our priorities. Whether the gentleman from Maryland wants to acknowledge it or not, we have divided government. The American people elected a Republican majority in the House, and our job is to make the case for our policies, find common ground where it exists and see if we can make this divided government work, and that is what we intend to do. We owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget. That's what we are delivering today, and I urge the support of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the disastrous budget put forward by the House Majority. Once again, the Majority has put forward a plan that slashes deeply into our commonsense priorities and tries to balance the budget on the backs of seniors, women, and the most vulnerable.

A budget is about more than just numbers—it is a reflection and embodiment of our values and priorities as a society. Our budget should advance our moral responsibilities as a nation to provide for the common good. I just attended the installation of Pope Francis in Rome, where he stressed the importance of working "to protect all of God's people and embrace with tender affection the whole of humanity, especially the poorest, the weakest, the least important."

But the budget before us, like the previous iterations composed by Chairman RYAN and supported by the House Majority, once again fails this critical moral test. In fact, it gets it exactly backwards. To pay for expanded tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, two-thirds of the nondefense cuts over ten years here come to programs that serve low- and moderate-income families.

If this budget were to become law, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that two million jobs will be lost next year alone. That is not all. Millions of students would lose the access to college education that comes through Pell Grants. 190,000 children would lose access to Head Start. National Service programs like Americorps would be ended.

Medicaid would be slashed by nearly a third, cutting families off from access to health care. Food Stamps by nearly 18 percent, with up to nine million people cut off from assistance they need so they do not go hungry. Both would be converted to an inadequate block grant. The health reforms we passed would all be rolled back meaning the donut hole will reopen, women would once again have to pay more for the same insurance as men, and children with preexisting conditions could lose their coverage.

Seniors would have to pay more during retirement for health care. The Child Tax Credit would expire in 2017. And middle-class families would pay $2000 more a year in taxes, all to pay for a $200,000 tax cut for millionaires.

The American people already roundly rejected this Reverse Robin Hood plan last November. Instead, they want us to use the budget as a vehicle to create jobs and grow the economy. I urge my colleagues to respect their wishes, and to vote against this latest iteration of the same old Republican budget.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I will vote today for H. Con. Res. 25, authored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, because we have a duty to address our nation's looming fiscal obligations. As I have repeatedly said, we cannot continue to kick the proverbial can down the road.

I want to be clear: I would prefer to vote for a bipartisan budget modeled off the Simpson-Bowles plan. It could be improved by incorporating changes in existing law and other proposals, such as the discussions between the president and Speaker BOEHNER, and plans offered by Alice Rivlin and Pete Domenici, and Rep. RYAN and Sen. WYDEN. Like the Ryan plan before us today, I do not agree with every line in the Simpson-Bowles plan. However, I continue to believe that a budget based on this model is the only plan that can put our nation on a sustainable, long-term path to replace sequestration and reform our nation's entitlement programs so they will exist for future generations.

For more than six years, I have forcefully spoken out about the dire need to get our nation's fiscal house in order. I have made thoughtful and serious recommendations for a way forward and have voted for substantial legislation to get our nation back on solid financial footing.

When I came to the floor to vote for last year's budget, we were $15.5 trillion in debt. Today, we are over $16.7 trillion in debt. It's projected to grow to $26 trillion in 10 years—that's a $10 trillion increase. Our unfunded obligations and liabilities are now projected to be over $71 trillion. We've just had our fourth straight year of trillion dollar deficits. Four straight years.

And while this year's deficit is projected to be about $845 billion, that's still unsustainable. The reduction in the deficit can be mainly traced to new tax revenues from the "fiscal cliff" deal versus new spending restraint. I opposed this measure because it failed to seriously address government spending—in fact, it contained new spending—and did not include reforms to strengthen and secure entitlements. While the measure addressed many immediate issues, its adoption is making it more difficult to make needed, comprehensive reforms to our long-term obligations and liabilities and to stop sequestration.

The amount of debt we owe is staggering. Consider that this past August, the Congressional Budget Office predicted we'd be spending $570 billion on interest payments to service the debt in 2022. However, the February picture is shocking: $795 billion to serve the debt in 2022. Let me repeat—in August, the Congressional Budget Office predicted that we would be spending $570 billion to service the debt in 10 years. Their updated February numbers predict we will be sending $795 billion out the door in 2022 to service the debt, a $225 billion increase within six months. In six months, the projections have changed to reflect that the Congressional Budget Office thinks we will be spending close to $11 billion in interest payments per week to more than $15 billion per week. Fifteen billion dollars each week. And they predict that in 2023, 10 years from now, we will be sending $857 billion out the door. That's roughly $16.5 billion dollars per week.

What accounts for these changes? We have been borrowing at historically low levels. I have repeatedly noted my concerns that interest rates on our debt load could increase, and

the Congressional Budget Office predictions are starting to reflect this.

That is money that could be invested in our national defense, repairing our roads and bridges or life-saving cancer research.

Notably, this debt is increasingly held by foreign countries. In 1970, 6 percent of debt held by the public was in foreign hands. In 1990, it was 19 percent. But today, 48 percent of our publically held debt is in foreign hands.

Just who are our bankers? Nations such as China, which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith, and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia, which funded the radical madrasahs on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Quite frankly, this borrowing is unsustainable, dangerous and irresponsible.

And what does this mean for individual Americans? Chairman RYAN points out that a 1 percent increase in the interest rates would mean an extra $400 per year in interest payments for the average family.

That is why I have been urging the president and Congress to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren.

That is why I have been working with my colleagues, through my assignment as chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that funds the departments of Commerce and Justice, to cut $95 billion in federal spending during fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012, including more than $11.5 billion from my subcommittee alone.

That is why I repeatedly voted against the payroll tax holiday, which stole directly from the Social Security Trust Fund. The 2012 extension took $93 billion and brought us nearly a month closer to the statutory debt limit. With that one vote, we practically wiped out all the $95 billion in savings from the cuts enacted during the last Congress.

That is why I also do not and never will sign pledges to lobbyists. My loyalty is to the Constitution, to the people of Virginia's 10th District, and my family.

I have been speaking out about the need to get our nation's fiscal house in order since President George W. Bush was in office.

In 2006, I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address our debt and deficit. I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. It said everything should be on the table for discussion: all entitlement spending, all domestic discretionary spending, including defense spending, and tax reform, particularly changes to make the tax code more simple and fair and to end the practice of tax earmarks that costs hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations, just as was done in the base closing process.

I was glad to have been joined in this effort by my good friend and colleague JIM COOPER of Tennessee. Our legislation served as the blueprint for the president's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Last year, I spoke in support of and voted for a full substitute amendment, offered by Mr. COOPER and former Representative LaTourette, to the budget that was based on the commission's recommendations. While I was disappointed that this amendment did not pass, I still believe a plan based on this model is the most appropriate and realistic path forward, and I am committed to finding bipartisan solutions.

Last month, I offered a bipartisan amendment to H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, that would require the president to incorporate the Simpson-Bowles recommendations into his budget submission to Congress. This amendment received 75 bipartisan votes.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called ''The Moment of Truth,'' the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed, as well other ''sacred cows,'' including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the president, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The president failed the country. And the Congress has also failed. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the president must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests that are holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the president also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions of dollars in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

Absent a bipartisan budget, I vote for the Ryan budget today because it is a credible path forward, if imperfect.

Like last year's proposal, this budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates and for the repeal of the costly health care reform law.

Further, it proposes a balanced budget in the next 10 years. I have consistently voted for a balanced budget amendment to the constitution every time the measure has come before the House—in 1982, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1995 and, more recently, in 2011.

The Ryan plan also points out that we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is again silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN continues to pull back the curtain on the mandatory spending ''elephant in the room,'' which we can no longer ignore.

I do not agree with everything in this proposal, and will work to improve future legislation that may be considered as a result of its adoption. For example, I regret that this proposal does not offer more on ways to address Social Security and tax reform.

I am also troubled that this resolution unfairly targets the federal workforce. While there are many federal employees in the capital region, it is worth noting that more than 85 percent of the workforce is outside of Washington.

It is also worth noting that more than 65 percent of all federal employees work in agencies that support our national defense capabilities as we continue to fight the War on Terror. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. CIA, FBI, DEA agents, and State Department employees are serving side-by-side with our military in the fight against the Taliban.

Let's also not forget the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents who are working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants and drugs across our borders.

Or the medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

Or the VA doctors and nurses treating veterans from World War II to present day.

Or the FDA inspectors working to stop a salmonella outbreak. These are all federal employees.

Mr. Chair, enough is enough. It is simply wrong to claim, as the Ryan budget erroneously continues to do, that these public servants ''have been immune from the effects of the recession.''

This budget also could be improved by providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do so in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, ''He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord.'' And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. Matthew 25 says that if we ignore the poor and hungry, it is the same as ignoring him. But this budget resolution is an outline for future action, not an enacting piece of legislation that carries the weight of law.

The budget also seeks to shore up our defense capabilities by finding alternative savings to prevent the across-the-board cuts (sequestration) resulting from the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction's bipartisan failure of leadership, which, regretfully, represents the larger failure of the President and both political parties.

For the first time in four years, the Senate has proposed a budget resolution. While I do not agree with their proposal, and therefore voted ''no'' on the Mulvaney amendment to demonstrate my opposition to it, it is good for our country that the Senate has finally put forth a written document. Its voice in this debate is needed. I am disappointed that the president has failed to even offer his own budget. This abdication of responsibility has not been seen since the Harding Administration.

This budget recognizes that our fiscal challenges must be dealt with in a timely manner. It is a first step in the process. This is a blueprint that can be molded and changed, but it is a blueprint that committees will use to get to work. I hope this outline will spur the authorizing committees to move forward on comprehensive tax and entitlement reform legislation.

The Appropriations Committee has already led the way in enacting legislation cutting discretionary spending. Only 16 percent of federal spending this year will be non-defense discretionary. Two thirds of our spending is on autopilot, and reforms are urgently needed. We must reform our nation's spending habits to ensure America has the ability to nimbly respond to crises and is able to make the investments needed to spur private growth and American ingenuity.

We, as elected representatives, have a duty to lead. We have a duty to put forth ideas within the public sphere and engage in debate. I'm ready to make the tough choices today. I vote for the Ryan budget so that the House can get to work.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the House Republican budget.

The Path to Prosperity will balance the budget over the next ten years without raising taxes on the American people.

Furthermore, the House Republican budget will help American job seekers by repealing Obamacare. The Obama health care law contains over a trillion dollars in new taxes on employers, medical device makers, families buying health insurance and others.

Throughout my district, small business owners and CEOs are sitting down with their accountants. They are trying to figure out how they are going to do business next year with this massive tax in place. That is creating uncertainty and impeding job creation.

Repealing Obamcare is critical to getting our economy growing again.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 25, the House Republicans' ''Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2014.'' I oppose this irresponsible budget resolution because it continues the reckless approach to fiscal policy that that the House majority championed for years, with disastrous results.

I oppose the resolution before us because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class. I oppose the resolution because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract in our America by turning Medicaid into a block grant.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the backs of seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, we Democrats have a better way. We understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures. Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, beginning in 2024 all Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by $5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to ''wither on the vine.''

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year. The Republican plan would reopen the ''donut hole,'' forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than $2,970 for the year. Seniors reaching the prescription drug ''donut hole'' would pay an average of $828 more in prescription drug costs in 2014 and approximately $13,000 more from now through 2022.

5. Under the Republican budget, 2,445,462 Texas seniors would be forced to pay for preventive health services. By repealing health reform, the Republican plan will require that the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2012 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

6. The Republican budget slashes $31.71 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

7. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve 91,717 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, this budget could have invested in programs that help strengthen the middle class, reduce poverty, and strengthen our economic recovery. Instead, the Republican budget makes deep cuts to the area of the budget helping low-income families put food on the table and make ends meet. These are families who are already struggling with unemployment, lower wages, and just simply trying to make ends meet.

The House Republican budget will push millions more Americans into poverty and put a large number of low-income children, seniors, and people with disabilities at risk. It guts Medicare and Medicaid and calls for massive cuts to food assistance, all in order to protect tax breaks for special interests and for multimillionaires who are not even asking for them.

The Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, shortsighted, reckless—but ''fair and balanced'' is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and Congressional Progressive Caucus, which were made in order by the Rules Committee, are each worthy of support because they fairly balance the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

Specifically, the Alternative Budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, CBC, and CPC:

help create more jobs now;

replace the sequester;

make key education investments;

invest in research and development and clean energy;

invest in long-term infrastructure;

preserve Medicare as we know it;

protect health reform's benefits for seniors;

protect Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes;

preserve Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP);

reduce the deficit through a smart, targeted, and steady approach provides tax relief for working families and ends tax breaks for the wealthy;

take a balanced approach to reducing the long-term deficits and debt; and

put the budget on a sustainable path.

Mr. Chair, under the Democratic budget, the deficit would fall from 7 percent of GDP in 2012 to under 3 percent of GDP by 2015, and to 2.4 percent of GDP in 2023. The balanced plan put forward by the Democratic Caucus will bring the budget into primary balance in 2017 and complete balance by around 2040—about the same time as the House Republican budget last year.

The Democratic Budget Alternative will generate 1.2 million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans' ''austerity first'' plan by investing $200 billion in creating jobs up-front, strengthening the middle class, creating greater upward mobility, and ensuring opportunity for our children and future generations.

Included in the Democratic proposal is $50 billion to fund jobs that address immediate surface transportation priorities and $10 billion to establish an infrastructure bank, as well as tax incentives to support small businesses and manufacturing.

Additionally, the Democratic budget immediately ends the sequester, which would otherwise cost the economy 750,000 jobs by the end of the year, and replaces it with deficit reduction resulting from a balanced approach combining responsible spending cuts with increased revenues by cutting tax breaks for special interests and wealthy individuals without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

Finally, Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, let me note my disappointment that an amendment I offered which would have made this dreadful budget resolution a little less hurtful was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

The Jackson Lee Amendment to H. Con. Res. 25 would put the Congress on record in support of current funding levels for crime prevention grant programs administered by the Department of Justice. The first and most important obligation of government is to ensure the safety of the people and nothing is more destabilizing to communities and inimical to job creation and economic growth than crime. That is why it is counterproductive to cut investments in crime prevention under the guise

of balancing a budget to spur economic growth.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values. As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

''The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.''

For that reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility. To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a ''moral test.''

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards. The Democratic alternatives do not. For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 25 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this ill-conceived and unwise measure.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 25 and in support of the Van Hollen substitute.

The majority has offered a budget that literally doubles down on the sequester. This would be a disaster for El Paso. It would mean twice as many Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) furloughs as they are already facing and longer lines at our bridges into the foreseeable future. Nearly 100,000 jobs in the El Paso region depend on the $80 billion in yearly cross border trade with Mexico. Longer lines at our ports of entry equals less trade and fewer jobs for El Pasoans. The majority budget includes a nearly $100 billion cut to Pell Grants for low-income students. At the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), 65% of students use Pell Grants to afford their education. It would mean deep and irresponsible cuts to programs my constituents rely on, including Medicare. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has said the majority budget will result in 750,000 job losses this year. I cannot vote to put the future of so many El Pasoans at risk.

We need a credible, long-term plan that does not compromise the economic recovery now taking place. Although far from perfect, the substitute budget offered by Mr. Van Hollen comes closest to this goal. It fully replaces the sequester with a balanced mix of cuts and revenues and stabilizes our finances by reducing the deficit by $1.8 trillion over the next ten years. If passed, this budget would prevent the 750,000 job losses associated with the sequester. Ending the sequester will also prevent furloughs for 20,000 El Pasoans, including our Border Patrol agents and civilian employees at Fort Bliss. The Van Hollen substitute also ensures we maintain a strong national defense while acknowledging that our military will be downsizing as the result of two wars ending. I support it as the most reasonable budget offered; however, the Van Hollen substitute fails to offer a solution to strengthen Medicare and Social Security for the long-term.

We need a real budget that can get buy-in from both political parties. Instead of playing to the fears of the political extremes, why not work to find the middle and compromise? I came here to represent the interests of El Pasoans and govern responsibly. I hope that we can put the political posturing of this budget debate behind us and start finding real solutions.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, as the Ranking Member of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, I am voting ''no'' on the Continuing Resolution sent back to us by the Senate. This bill underfunds several important programs and initiatives, and does not provide adequate funding to continue the implementation of the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank. Moreover, this bill compounds that harm by allowing the sequester to continue.

I am particularly disturbed by serious problems in the Financial Services and General Government section of the bill.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is flat funded at fiscal year 2012 levels, before taking into account the effects of sequestration. This funding level will greatly harm the continued implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). This is a critical year for the ACA as the state exchanges prepare to go live, and as part of that effort, the IRS had asked for an additional $254 million in funding to help administer several upcoming ACA tax credits and tax changes. Failing to provide this funding will hamper IRS efforts to continue the implementation of these important efforts—which will help individuals and small businesses—and will create more confusion by not providing the IRS with the resources to answer taxpayers' questions.

In addition, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is flat-funded at fiscal year 2012 levels despite a requested $94 million increase. This funding level, further reduced by sequestration, will hinder the SEC in the continued implementation of Dodd-Frank, and will harm its enforcement duties. The SEC still needs to implement several of the most important Dodd-Frank rules and reforms, and this funding level will only slow that effort. This bill prevents the SEC from being the strong ''cop on the beat'' that we need to ensure that the abuses that helped cause the fiscal meltdown don't recur.

Moreover, our Federal Public Defenders, who are part of the Federal Judiciary budget, actually receive a small increase of $9 million above the fiscal year 2012 level. However, this amount is less than they requested, and not enough to offset the overwhelming impact of sequestration. Our Federal Public Defenders provide indigent criminal defendants with their constitutionally protected right to counsel, and the effect of the CR and sequestration will substantially damage their ability to do their utmost to help their clients.

Lastly, federal employees are once again asked to endure a pay freeze. Our federal employees have already contributed an incredible amount of money to deficit reduction, and another federal pay freeze will only prevent the recruitment and retention of a qualified and committed workforce.

In reality, while this bill purports to maintain finding levels at the FY 2012 level, sequestration means further damaging cuts to these and other accounts. We need a solution that will prevent important services that all Americans depend on from being impacted, and allows all agencies the flexibility to address the current effect of the sequester. This bill fails in that regard.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the most important action we can take to provide for the long term health and prosperity of our nation is getting people back to work, and ensuring that those who are employed, stay employed. This can only be done by enacting a budget that achieves fiscal balance without imperiling economic progress. Unfortunately, the Republican budget fails this most basic principle. It will cost nearly 2 million jobs next year alone, and that's on top of the 750,000 jobs that will be lost due to sequestration this year. In Rhode Island, we have finally started to recover from the Great Recession that began in 2008, and our unemployment rate has dropped below 10 percent for the first time since 2009. For five years, Rhode Islanders have held on by their teeth, and the Republican budget would undermine the important gains we have made.

The prosperity of our nation is predicated on a healthy middle class—both parties can at least agree on that. Yet the Republican budget would put our middle class families, the drivers of our economy, further in debt by shifting the burden of paying for tax breaks for the wealthy onto working Americans and their kids.

We have seen this budget before. It's the same plan Governor Romney ran and lost on in November; it's the same budget Chairman RYAN brought before us in 2012. It is a budget that works for the most privileged, at the expense of every day Americans. It raises taxes on working families by as much as $3,000, shifts costs to future seniors by turning Medicare into a ''premium support'' program, cuts state Medicaid funding for low income and disabled individuals, and doubles the cuts to programs that help our veterans find work, keep my constituent's homes heated, and save children from going hungry.

There's been no shortage of posturing on the budget, and a surplus of half-truths floating around. What's been in short supply, it seems to me, are the facts.

It is a fact that federal spending over the past three years has grown at its slowest pace since the Eisenhower administration. It is a fact that we have already cut $2.4 trillion from the budget over the next ten years—and the Democratic alternative budget would increase that reduction to over $4 trillion. It is a fact that we have cut nearly three dollars in spending for every dollar of revenue, greater than the ratio of cuts-to-revenue proposed in Simpson-Bowles. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, it is a fact that half of the projected budget deficit for 2013 is a result of automatic stabilizers, like unemployment insurance.

There's another important fact here that my Republican colleagues appear to be ignoring. They seem to think that if you reduce budgets for our schools, housing agencies, workforce training programs, veterans services, the Social Security Administration, and the FBI, the services these agencies provide to our communities won't diminish. Their workload certainly won't—in many cases it's on the rise—yet they will have fewer staff and fewer resources to serve our constituents and communities.

This is not a budget I can support in good conscience, and it is not a path that will lead to economic stability. Democrats have offered a fair and balanced approach that keeps the promises made to our seniors, preserves our

social safety net, and asks all Americans to pay their fair share in reducing the deficit. Rhode Islanders understand these choices, Americans understand these choices, and they responded loud and clear last November as to which direction they wanted our nation follow. The Republican budget is not what the American people voted for, this is not what Rhode Islanders want, and it is not what our children, our business owners, and our communities deserve.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget developed by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN. This budget would not only jeopardize seniors, families, and the most vulnerable in our society, it would also destroy jobs and put our Nation's economic recovery at risk. In fact, some estimate that 2 million American jobs could be lost in 2014 under the Ryan budget.

The Ryan budget would protect the wealthy while severely harming seniors and the American middle class. Millionaires would receive an average net tax cut of $200,000, while middle class families could see their taxes rise by an average of $2,000. This approach is neither equitable nor balanced.

The Ryan budget would cut the crucial programs our families rely on by slashing non-defense discretionary spending by more than $1 trillion below the level of the 2011 Budget Control Act caps. This budget denies Americans access to life-saving health care by ending the Medicare guarantee, drastically cutting the Medicaid program, and repealing the Affordable Care Act. These cuts would immediately raise health insurance and prescription drug costs for women, while reducing access to care and support for nursing home residents. The Ryan budget could also result in an 18% cut in help with child care expenses to families working hard to make ends meet, and could cause about 200,000 children to lose access to Head Start in 2014 alone.

We all know that tough decisions must be made regarding the deficit, but our budget must not be balanced on the backs of women, children, seniors, and middle class families. Instead, we must invest in our children, in our students, and in our families to move our Nation forward. We must ensure that all Americans have access to health care. And we must invest in our infrastructure to create jobs and pave the way for a stronger economic future. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ryan budget and work together to create jobs and protect middle class families.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 25, the fiscal year (FY) 2014 budget resolution. Once again, this body is considering another misguided budget that asks seniors and middle class Americans to make great sacrifices so the wealthiest among us can get a tax cut. While supporters of this budget claim they deserve credit for producing a budget that balances, this is not a balanced plan, nor a serious one.

The Republican budget is a slippery, dishonest collection of old, failed ideas that the American people roundly rejected in the last election. Some say that this budget plan represents a serious attempt to reform Medicare; in fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. It ends Medicare as we know it by creating a voucher program which would shift costs to our seniors. It also repeals the Affordable Care Act which is already providing critical benefits to those in need across our country and that has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional. By reopening the Medicare prescription drug coverage gap, beneficiaries would see their costs increase by over $13,000 from now through 2022. This is not the treatment our seniors deserve, and I know we can do better for them.

Instead of making critical investments in our economy to promote growth and create jobs, vital domestic programs would face drastic cuts. The entire mandatory Pell grant program would be cut by $98 billion over 10 years, virtually eliminating the program. Student loan rates would rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent in July, which would have a negative impact on college students across the nation. The budget also doubles down on the disastrous sequester and goes even further than that by cutting an extra $55 billion from domestic discretionary spending in FY 2014 alone. To top it off, the top tax rate would be lowered to 25 percent, costing our nation nearly $6 trillion over 10 years. In order to pay for these disastrous proposals, critical tax deductions for middle class families would be eliminated, leaving the average family with an increase of $3,000 in their tax bill. The priorities of this budget are completely backwards.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for offering a balanced approach in the Democratic substitute budget. This budget replaces the sequester, makes investments which are critical for economic growth, and puts our nation on a sustainable fiscal path. It gives critical support to transportation, education, and small businesses programs which will have a real impact on middle class families and help maintain the upward trajectory of our economy. The Democratic budget also includes $50 billion for immediate surface transportation projects which will create jobs today, in addition to vital tax incentives for the manufacturing sector which has been so critical to our economic recovery. All of these important goals are achieved while continuing the Medicare guarantee for our seniors and generating enough deficit reduction to eliminate the sequester, thereby avoiding losing 750,000 jobs which would occur if sequestration is allowed to continue.

If my Republican colleagues are serious about producing a balanced budget then let us set aside this partisan rhetoric and recycled ideas and come to the table willing and ready to make tough decisions for the benefit of our country. American families across the country make tough decisions about their family's budget on a daily budget. Whether it is postponing that new car purchase, refinancing their homes, or cutting back on the types of groceries they buy, American families do not have the luxury to return to past bad ideas. They have to make the tough decisions now or face losing their home, missing a tuition payment, or having their heat turned off. Instead of debating political documents such as this one, Congress must put aside the political games and come together to find common ground to put our nation on a sustainable fiscal path in the long term while making much needed investments in the short term. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Republican budget.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, for far too long, Washington has failed to take its spending problem and its budgetary responsibilities seriously. That ends now. With our nation's debt exceeding $16.7 trillion and billions more added to the debt every day, I am proud to finally help put our nation on a significantly different, more-prosperous path with my support of this year's House Budget from Chairman PAUL RYAN.

This is a responsible budget that will promote a healthier economy, encourage growth and opportunity for all Americans, help create jobs, and avert a debt crisis. This budget will enable us to avoid austerity measures and painful cuts that are inevitable if we fail to reform the status quo.

This budget balances our nation's finances in ten years, because it's wrong to keep spending money we do not have. This budget cuts wasteful spending and repeals Obamacare. This budget forces the government to live within its means, because it's unfair to leave young people and the next generation with a future of debt and decline. This budget moves us closer to pro-growth tax reform without raising taxes—because families and small businesses should be able to keep more of their hard-earned income instead of having it wasted by Washington bureaucrats.

Importantly, this budget protects and strengthens Medicare for current and future generations of retirees. Last year, I made a promise that I would not support changes to Medicare for people age 55 and older—those born before 1959. Today, I made good on that promise with my support of PAUL RYAN's budget. However, let me be clear: Congress, the President, and the American people cannot again afford to ignore fixing our broken entitlement system this year. The problem with Medicare's looming insolvency gets dramatically worse and more costly each year we delay fixing it, and the current solutions will no longer be sustainable or available if we fail to act this year. If we want to avoid forcing Medicare changes and dramatic cuts for individuals nearing retirement, we need both sides of the aisle to get serious immediately.

This House plan presents a clear vision of what we need to do to balance the budget and foster a healthier economy for today and the future. In fact, according to an analysis conducted by two Stanford economists, the House Budget "would boost the economy immediately," and "raise gross domestic product by one percentage point in 2014, equivalent to about a $1,500 increase in annual income for each U.S. household." Additionally, these economists estimate that ten years from now, "the entire plan would raise GDP by three percentage points, or more than $4,000 for each U.S. household."

By contrast, the budgets proposed by Democrat leaders in Congress are full of budget tricks, accounting gimmicks and empty promises. Their budgets ignore the entitlement crisis—the most significant driver of our debt—increase taxes and stimulus spending by trillions of dollars, and never balance—ever.

I ran for Congress because we have a solemn responsibility to pass on a better future to our children, just like our parents did for us. Today, I am pleased that we took a vital step to turn things around and finally put us on a more responsible, prosperous path for the future. But our work and responsibilities continue. The United States can and will remain the greatest country on Earth for generations to come, but it will require a fresh approach to Washington's old ways of doing business.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, and, pursuant to House Resolution 122, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the previous order of the House, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 25 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 207, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—221

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

NAYS—207

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Amodei
Engel
Miller, George
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1044

Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. SMITH of Washington changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. STIVERS and STOCKMAN and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to concur.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 109, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—318

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)

Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—109

Amash
Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Crawford
Crowley
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Farr
Fleming
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jones
Kennedy
Kildee
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Posey
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Amodei
Engel
Miller, George
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1054

Ms. WATERS and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to concur 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 (Mr. CAMPBELL). 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.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, March 25, 2013.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SERVE AS CO-CHAIR OF THE TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, of the following Member to serve as co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission:

Mr. WOLF, Virginia

□ 1100

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Research Service, the nonpartisan research arm of Congress, recently issued a report confirming a startling trend over the last 5 years: the amount of oil and natural gas being produced in this country is down on Federal lands and up dramatically on private and State lands.

The 1.1 million barrels per day increase in oil production from 2007 to 2012 that continues to make national headlines did not come from our national Federal lands. The boom in shale gas production that's providing unprecedented economic opportunities across my district and continues to make national headlines did not come from Federal lands. In fact, Mr. Speaker, natural gas production climbed 40 percent on State and private lands, while falling about 33 percent on Federal lands.

America's energy resurgence is before us today due to the innovation of our private sector, hardworking American men and women from all walks of life, but their efforts are hindered by the actions of this White House, as demonstrated by these figures.

With what has been accomplished by private individuals on privately held lands, just think how much sooner America can be energy independent if this administration joins this effort.

INSPIRING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACT

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. The National Institutes of Health faces significant cuts to basic scientific research funding this fiscal year. These cuts threaten America's capacity to cure diseases, treat chronic and acute conditions, and find new technologies that advance the health of people worldwide.

That is why I am introducing the Inspiring Scientific Research and Innovation Act. It will restore and supplement this funding by appropriating $3 billion for the remainder of fiscal 2013.

NIH is the single largest source of biomedical research. It funds research efforts at the NIH campus here in Bethesda, at medical centers, cancer centers, and universities across the Nation. The agency generated $57.8 billion in economic output nationwide in 2012 alone. This work often takes years and affects every family in America touched by serious health conditions and chronic disease. Failure to adequately and consistently fund this research means lost lives, lost science, and lost economic opportunity.

The funding I propose will not increase the Federal deficit. It is paid for by eliminating tax breaks for corporate jets. We must be clear about our priorities and our values as a Nation.

So the choice is clear: scientific advancement and curing disease or taxpayer support for corporate jets. Choose NIH.

MONTANA'S TIMBER INDUSTRY

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

Mr. DAINES. Montana is well known for its millions of acres of forestland.

As a result, acreage that would normally be privately owned and generating tax revenue to help fund local services is instead locked away by the Federal Government.

In 1908, President Teddy Roosevelt signed legislation ensuring that impacted communities will receive 25 percent of the receipts for timber harvests occurring on Forest Service lands. Because Montana has some of the most abundant forests, this commitment to robust timber harvesting also helped to provide jobs for thousands of families in my home State.

Sadly, timber harvests have plummeted by 90 percent in many areas due to out-of-balance Federal policies. Montana was previously home to 30 mills. It is now home to just seven. This means far fewer jobs for Montanans.

The Secure Rural Schools program has provided short-term relief, but revitalizing our timber industry is the only permanent solution to the problem President Roosevelt recognized 100 years ago. This is my number one priority as a member of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands. I look forward to championing this issue.

CONGRATULATING THE STUDENTS RUN L.A. PROGRAM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to literally take a minute to congratulate all of the runners and the families and the supporters of the Los Angeles Marathon. But the unique and beautiful thing about the Los Angeles Marathon is that close to 3,000 young people on this past Sunday finished 26.2 miles—26.2 miles. In preparing to do that, millions of miles were walked and run by the children of Los Angeles.

I'd just like to say thank you to the Students Run L.A. program because they literally got my daughter off the couch last October. And Alina Cárdenas ran her first marathon, and never before had she run a marathon or been a runner; so did her little cousin, Kyle Herrera, as well.

So I just want to congratulate and thank all of those young leaders for doing a wonderful job and all of those men and women who helped them get there.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ANDY ATHENS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a great American and a dear friend, Mr. Andy Athens, who passed away last week at the age of 91.

Since coming to Congress, Andy's counsel and wisdom have been invaluable to me in my role as cochair of the Hellenic Caucus. His presence will be greatly missed by my colleagues and me on Capitol Hill.

Andy was a veteran of World War II, the chairman of Metron Steel, the first and longest tenured president of the World Council of Hellenes Abroad, and the founder of Orthodox Christian Charities.

Andy's contributions to the Greek Orthodox Church must also not be overlooked. He was a tireless advocate for the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and his devotion was an inspiration for all of us in the Orthodox Church. He was truly an example of how Christ instructed us to live.

Mr. Speaker, the Hellenic and Orthodox communities have lost an unparalleled leader, but we can rest assured his dedication and love for America, Greece, Cyprus, and the Orthodox Church will continue in the many lives he touched. May his memory be eternal.

CELEBRATING THE HONORABLE LORETTA L. WOOTTEN

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the many life achievements of the Honorable Loretta L. Wootten, one of Delaware's most devoted public servants. This March as we celebrate the remarkable contributions women have made throughout our Nation's history, I'm proud to recognize Loretta, someone who has broken ground for women in Delaware.

Loretta emerged as a strong leader early in her political career by helping Delaware's own JOE BIDEN win his first bid for the United States Senate in 1972. Since then, she has been a trusted adviser for many Delaware leaders.

In 1986, Loretta became the first woman elected as Register in Chancery in Delaware, a position which she held for four consecutive terms. After retiring in 2000, she once again answered the call of her community by serving as Kent County Clerk of the Peace, which she continues to this day.

In addition to her numerous professional accomplishments, Loretta is a devoted wife to her husband of 51 years and a loving mother and grandmother. She is someone who has earned the respect of everyone in our community and helped make Delaware a better place for future generations. It's a privilege for me to call her a friend and work with her.

□ 1110

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people saw today that their House of Representatives is serious in dealing with our crushing debt and deficit.

We took some big steps toward that today. Just minutes ago, we passed a budget that balances within 10 years and yesterday rejected plans that were offered that would never balance a budget. Just minutes ago, we approved a spending plan for the rest of the year that puts us on a path toward balancing that budget.

Mr. Speaker, American families for the past few years had to tighten their belts. Since the beginning of the year, they had to tighten their belts an extra 2 percent with that payroll tax increase in January, and it's about time we did the same belt-tightening in Washington. That's what we did today.

IN RECOGNITION OF ERIN DIMEGLIO

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, Erin DiMeglio was a freshman at South Plantation High School. She was a manager, a water girl, and a trainer's assistant for the varsity football team.

Last spring, Erin was invited off season to work out and earned a spot on the varsity football team. Then something historic happened. Erin's number was called, and she became the first girl in Florida to ever play quarterback in a regular-season varsity high school game.

She's been featured on TV and radio shows all over the country, but that's not all. Erin, who was a senior in high school, received the Florida Achievement Award from the National Commission on the Status of Women, a designation meant to empower and recognize women statewide for their achievements.

Erin is breaking barriers and inspiring girls and a new generation of trailblazing women. She said that she's trying to prove that girls can do anything that guys can do. She's right. If you want to do something, go and chase your dream, follow your passion and work hard.

On this Women's History Month, I want to recognize Erin and the strides that women have made.

END GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, recently the government came out with a 106-page regulatory and safety reform plan for ceiling fans. I did not know ceiling fans were such a hazard to America's health, but apparently they are.

So what's going to happen? That $40 ceiling fan that you've been buying and putting on your back porch will now go to $400 because we have to keep these

busybody bureaucrats employed. We have to keep them happy because of these hazardous fans.

Now, my friend, Joe ''Cut Spending'' McCutchen was recently talking to me about the big problem that is too much government, too much spending and interference in our lives. That's why today I supported the Ryan budget and yesterday the Republican Study Committee budget.

These budgets call for tax reform, for health care reform, for less spending and regulatory reform of job-killing regulations like the new 106-page document on ceiling fans.

Let's hope the Senate passes a tough budget. But if they do not, with or without that, let's continue to work on spending cuts, reducing the size of government and ending government interference in our lives.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS: THE ANNIVERSARY OF OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the majority leader for allowing me to participate in this hour this afternoon. I may well be joined on the floor by some people who wish to speak on the very important occasion of the 3-year anniversary of the signing into law of the President's takeover of American health care, the so-called, inappropriately titled, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I'd just point out that I did attempt to have the word ''affordable'' stricken from the title 3 years ago, but I was overruled in that endeavor.

It was indeed 3 years ago, March 21, the first day of spring of 2010. The first 3 months of 2010 had seen some pretty unusual activity here in Washington as this bill ground to its eventual rendezvous with destiny in the east room of the White House on the 21st of that month.

Many may recall that during the year of 2009, there was, in fact, at least what gave the semblance of some debate over here in the people's House, over here in the committees of the House of Representatives. But when this bill got over to the Senate, it was drastically changed, all debate was concluded, and then it was simply a matter of convincing enough Democrats to vote for the Senate bill, and it was eventually signed into law.

I do want to spend some time going through the history of how we got here because I do feel that that is important and people need to understand how a very bad process, a very flawed process gave rise to a very flawed law, which now, 3 years later, we see right on the cusp of the full implementation of this thing, is really going to have a profound and detrimental effect on our country from the standpoint of our economy, our workforce and our job-creation situation with small businesses. Certainly the practice of medicine itself is going to be negatively impacted by the many pages of regulation that are now proceeding in a torrent from the Federal agencies since the President's reelection.

First, I want to take a moment and recognize someone who has been a leader on trying to bring to the surface some of the problems contained within the President's Affordable Care Act, a fellow physician, an anesthesiologist from Maryland. I want to recognize the gentleman from Maryland for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much, and I appreciate you yielding some time to me on this important occasion.

As the doctor from Texas has said, Mr. Speaker, we are going to ''celebrate''—and I put that in quotes—the third anniversary of the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

I will tell you a lot of things haven't changed in the past 3 years unfortunately, even though we were promised that things would. For instance, as many Americans know, we were promised that premiums were going to go down magically. What did we find? Premiums went up. They continued to rise. The Affordable Care Act was the wrong solution if the problem was rising health care premiums.

Now, other things have happened in the past 3 years that really haven't changed much. One is that the American people still don't like the Affordable Care Act. We know that in poll after poll after poll, a clear majority of Americans wish this bill just simply didn't exist, yet it still does.

More seriously than even that, over the past 3 years we've had a jobless recovery, and a large part of the blame has to be on some of the policies that were put in place 3 years ago, the cornerstone of which was the Affordable Care Act.

We know, for instance, that there's a new term in the United States now. We thought the 49ers were a team that played in the Super Bowl. No. Now the 49ers are those small businesses that don't have 50 employees yet, created by people who want to grow businesses, who want to employ people, but they know if they hire that 50th employee, a whole lot of the Affordable Care Act and its mandates and regulations and costs and taxes kick in. So they're going to be stuck at 49 employees.

As some of them say, instead of hiring that 50th or 51st or 60th employee, they'll buy a piece of equipment, they'll find some other way, they'll stop growing that business rather than bring upon themselves the effect of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, we know that it doesn't stop there. America is the land of opportunity. This is why people strive to come to this country. There is a ladder of opportunity. You get on that bottom rung and you keep on climbing in this country, and the sky is the limit.

Mr. Speaker, one problem with the Affordable Care Act is it's knocking people off the bottom rung. They're trying to get on, and they're on that bottom rung and they're getting knocked off. What do I mean by that?

□ 1120

Last year, the President, for instance, bragged on 230,000 new jobs. What the President didn't mention is there were actually over 300,000 part-time jobs created and about 100,000 full-time jobs lost. We created jobs. We created part-time jobs. I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but, for me, that's not economic recovery. That's not economic growth. That's not the job creation this country deserves.

We have to ask ourselves: Why would employers stop hiring full time and now hire part time? It's a simple answer. The Affordable Care Act makes it unaffordable for those employers to hire a full-time employee because they know, if they hire a full-time employee, they bring all the rules and regulations and mandates and taxes of the Affordable Care Act into their businesses. So what's their solution? They don't hire the 50th employee, and the employees they hire are part time.

Now, I would offer that's not the way to get out of this economic mess we're in and that we ought to be for job creation. We all know that the problem with the Affordable Care Act is that it has destroyed and it is continuing to destroy jobs. Honestly, the jobs that it destroys the most are the jobs for the people who need them the most—for the people who are on that bottom rung or who are starting to get on that second rung of the ladder and are getting knocked off.

This isn't the kind of recovery America deserves, but it's a logical conclusion from a bill that was poorly thought-out. We remember what the passage of that bill looked like—the deals that had to be made in order to make it a single-party bill. Remember, this was not a bipartisan effort. This was not getting everybody together—all Americans of all political parties and all ideas—and saying, How do we solve this problem in the best way that can unite us? This was a bill to advance a political agenda; and, unfortunately, it caught up the American economy in that agenda.

As the doctor from Texas, I'm sure, is going to talk about, it didn't have to be this way. There are many other ways to solve the problems that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we have problems with health care in this country. We know that it costs more than other countries. We know, for instance, that someone who has a preexisting condition does have difficulty finding insurance coverage. Yet we also know that the majority of States solve that problem at the State level. They don't need the big hand of Washington reaching into the States and imposing a solution in their States that simply may not work—in this case, imposing a solution on these States and the businessmen

and -women in the States that is strangling job creation in the United States, and we know the figures.

What has been unique about the last 3 years—and I'll put it in quotes—of our ''recovery'' is that, for the first time in my life and for the first time in many Americans' lives, it is a jobless recovery. Sure, the stock market continues to rise, and businesses continue to do well; but that doesn't trickle down to the people who need those jobs, because the Affordable Care Act destroyed jobs and is continuing to destroy jobs in this country.

I am a physician. I won't even get into the effect it's having on our health care delivery system, because I could talk for hours on that and on what physicians tell me and hospitals tell me. Mr. Speaker, most people don't realize that the changes that are going to come with the Medicare cuts in this Affordable Care Act may shut down one in seven hospitals in the United States. Now, think of that. In Maryland, that's five or six hospitals. What neighborhoods are going to be willing to say, Yeah, take my hospital?

This is unaffordable. It's unaffordable to our health care system; it's unaffordable to the way we deliver the best medical care in the world to our citizens; and it's certainly unaffordable to our economy, because jobs ought to be ''job one'' of this legislature. And if we really felt that, we would either stop the Affordable Care Act right now or at least delay its implementation way into the future when we can have a discussion about how to do this right.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman, the doctor from Maryland, for participating with us today.

He used an interesting phrase. Now, instead of the trickle-down economics that Republicans have been criticized for for so many years, it looks like we've got bubble-up poverty that is coming from the Affordable Care Act, and its devastating effect on employers and employees across this country is certainly something I hear about every time I go home to the 26th District in north Texas.

In fact, 2 weeks ago, I was on a panel in Irving, Texas, with a variety of business owners, hospitals, insurance interests. They were talking about the coming implementation of parts of the Affordable Care Act. We've heard all along from the people who run the small shops—the restaurants, the franchises—of the difficulty that this onerous bill is going to place upon their shoulders, but I was hearing from people that I had not heard from before—car painters, metal shop fabricators, those people who have those shops at between 40 and 60 employees, those who are above 50 employees who are looking for ways to reduce their workforces, and those below 50 employees who understand that they must never do so.

The gentleman also brought up the ''49ers,'' the businesses that will not go above 49 employees. There are also the ''29ers,'' the employers who will not keep somebody on the payroll for longer than 29 hours lest it trigger all of the other requirements of them under the Affordable Care Act. Then you've got the employers on the other side of the question, the large employers, who are looking at a cost of providing health insurance for their employees, which is steadily going up in spite of the assurances of the President and of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Those costs are going up every year. They're looking at those costs that are rising. They're looking at the fine under the employer mandate. Some are doing some simple math and are saying, I could save a lot of money—I mean a lot of money—by simply moving my employees off employer-sponsored insurance and into the health exchanges; and that, as a consequence, would balloon the cost for the Federal Government for delivering on this legislation.

We do hear a lot about the effect on the economy. The doctor was right to touch on the effects on the health profession, itself; but there is virtually no aspect of American life that will be untouched by this legislation. Every man, woman, and child amongst us for the next three generations is going to be affected by, again, a law which became law as a result of the worst type of process.

We are very fortunate now to be joined by another person who, for the time that she has been in Congress, since 2006, has been a leader on the dangers and the perils of letting your government control your health care; otherwise they can control every aspect of your life. I am happy to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much, Representative BURGESS, and I should say ''Dr. BURGESS'' as well. I thank you for your first-class understanding of how devastating ObamaCare is in the lives of real people, and I thank Dr. HARRIS, who just gave his remarks as well.

This is an issue that impacts every single American who is watching us right now, Mr. Speaker; and I hope there are people all across the country who have tuned in to hear what's happening on the House floor, because this is really an update of sorts.

It has been 3 years since the President of the United States signed this devastating bill. Let's just remind the American people of what President Obama said that we could take to the bank. Again, this bill was voted on right here in this Chamber. It was about midnight when it happened. It was midnight on a Sunday night, and I think it was on March 21 the night that it was signed. The President told all of the American people, in fact, that we've got to hurry, hurry, hurry and pass this bill because, if we do that, then the average American household will save about $2,500 a year on its health insurance premium.

I'd vote for that. That would be a great thing to do. I want every American to save money on his health insurance; but, Mr. Speaker, just the opposite happened.

People have been having increases in their health insurance premiums of well over $2,500 a year, so the President was off by a factor of about $5,000. That also doesn't take into account the fact that, under President Obama's leadership, the average American household has actually lost almost $5,000 of income.

So if you couple both the loss of income under this President's leadership and the fact that the President, with all due respect, didn't tell the American people the truth about how much they would save on health insurance premiums, that has a devastating impact on American households. Particularly, this is really hurting the senior citizens whom we love and whom we care about. Why? Dr. HARRIS told us. Dr. BURGESS told us: President Obama took over $700 billion out of—where?—Medicare.

□ 1130

Over $700 billion has come out of Medicare. And where has it been shifted? Into ObamaCare. Who does that hurt? That hurts the people we love, that hurts the senior citizens of this country.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, about who else is devastatingly impacted by ObamaCare. We were all told that we're going to get 30 million new people free health care. Gee, whoop, that sounds great. Let me tell you who's not going to get health care. Let me tell you what ObamaCare has deep in its pages, and nobody read this bill. Why didn't they read it? It isn't because Members of Congress were too lazy to read it, it's because, unfortunately, the Democrats that controlled the House of Representatives, the Democrats that controlled the Senate, didn't even bother to give the Members the bill in enough time to even read the bill. In the Senate, they had maybe a couple of hours. Here in the House, we had very little time to read the bill. Nobody could read the bill. Maybe that's why the former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, said, famously: We have to pass the bill to know what's in it.

Well, now we know what's in it. And we also know who's going to be hurt. And more than anyone in this bill, it is women who are hurt by ObamaCare. It is children who are hurt by ObamaCare. And even worse, Mr. Speaker, it is the poorest women and the poorest children who are going to be hurt, and I want to tell you how just very briefly, and then I will yield back after that.

We have found out in this bill that if an employer offers health insurance to their employee who, let's say, is the husband in the home, and he offers health insurance to that husband, the employer doesn't have to offer that insurance to the wife and the children.

He can fulfill his obligation to the Federal Government just by offering health insurance to the husband. Today the wife and children are also getting that health insurance. So once he makes that obligation, then the wife and children are on their own. But do you know what the wife and children have to do under the law? They have to buy the very expensive health insurance, not what they want, Mr. Speaker, but what the government tells them they're forced to buy.

How are they going to buy that health insurance? Well, we're told, gee, they can go to a health care exchange. No, they can't. They can't go to a health care exchange because the health care exchange subsidies won't be available to the wife and children because the husband is covered. Isn't that a sneaky deal to pull on American women and on their children.

Now, what about if that wife, let's say, lost her job, as Dr. BURGESS said, because now we're seeing people who were working over 30 hours a week pulled down to 29 hours a week. So let's say the woman, the mom, lost her job and she's on unemployment. If you're on unemployment, are you relieved of the burden? This mom, is she relieved of the burden of paying the tax for health insurance? No. So she has to continue to pay a health insurance tax. While she is on unemployment, she can't go to the State-subsidized exchanges and get her health insurance.

What's her option, Mr. Speaker? She has to take her aftertax income, which is much reduced because she first has to pay taxes on that income, and then she has to go out and buy health insurance without any government subsidy in the market. Well, isn't this interesting. Government tells her what policy she has to get.

The cheapest policy, under the bronze plan, under these subsidies, is $20,000 a year. So where, tell me, Mr. Speaker, and I should ask the President of the United States, who came up with this brilliant idea, where, Mr. Speaker, where are poor women supposed to go to buy health insurance they can afford? Not in the ObamaCare regime. Where is she supposed to go with her very sick child who's lost his health insurance from the employer, that his daddy provided for him because his daddy had a job, his daddy had health insurance. That young child had health insurance. That child was very sick with a disease, and he could count on insurance because his daddy had a job. His daddy provided health insurance. But now under ObamaCare, that employer may no longer give that health insurance.

So I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, this is devastating for moms across America, for children across America, for senior citizens across America. I wish it wasn't so. I wish we were standing here with a better story. The fact is, we tried.

Dr. HARRIS is on this floor. We now have been joined by Dr. ROE from Tennessee. We have three doctors here in this Chamber. He tried to provide better health care for the people in Tennessee and the people in America. Dr. BURGESS has tried all over this country to say there's a better way. We can get more women and children covered. We can make sure more seniors are covered. We can do this thing. Preexisting conditions, we can solve it. But no, that wasn't good enough for our President. It wasn't good enough.

You see, what he demanded and insisted upon was that the government have 100 percent control over health care. One hundred percent control? The American people lose control? What did they get? They get health care, health insurance, I should say, that's more expense than anything they've ever paid for before, and they get less for it. Well, what a deal, Mr. Speaker. What a deal. The American people, especially vulnerable women, vulnerable children, vulnerable senior citizens, now get to pay more and they get less.

That's why we're here, because we're saying let's repeal this failure before it literally kills women, kills children, kills senior citizens. Let's not do that. Let's love people. Let's care about people. Let's repeal it now while we can, and instead, do what Dr. BURGESS has been trying to do for years, what Dr. ROE has been trying to do for years, what Dr. HARRIS has been trying to do for years: get the highest possible quality health care to the greatest number of American citizens at the lowest possible price, especially to vulnerable women and vulnerable children and vulnerable senior citizens.

As people of faith—I'm a born again believer in Jesus Christ, and I believe that as part of my duty as a believer in Christ and what He has done for me, that we should do for the least of those who are in our midst. That's my personal belief and my personal conviction, and that's why I want our government to create the space so that we can help people. Because I guarantee you one thing, Mr. Speaker: this doesn't help people. But the good thing is, Dr. BURGESS, we can. And that's why I want to thank you for your leadership in the Health Care Caucus. I want to thank Dr. HARRIS for his leadership in the Health Care Caucus, and I want to thank Dr. ROE for his leadership in the Health Care Caucus, and all of the other doctors and all of the other Members who were busy waving a big red flag before ObamaCare passed, because don't anyone ever forget: this was not a bipartisan effort. This was President Obama. This was the Democrat-led Senate and the Democrat-led House. This was one party that gave us this terrible bill.

Now let it be both parties that come together to help women, help children, and help senior citizens. And God bless you for what you're doing. Thank you so much, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for coming and participating. You have a way of saying these things that none of the rest of us are capable of, and your voice is an important one in this debate.

Thank you for recognizing that there were alternatives and there were suggestions. There were ideas that were emanating from the Republican side of the aisle during this entire what passed for debate on the Affordable Care Act.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if I recall, you wrote a book called ''House Calls'' just exactly on that topic by Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I tried to get the word out there. The fact of the matter is, those of us who were here remember the summer of 2009. For most of us, it is indelibly etched on our memories because we went home that summer to our August town halls, and they were unlike anything anyone had ever seen.

I went to Denton, Texas, the town where I grew up. Normally if I can get three dozen people there, the staff is high-fiving all around because we got the word out and we got a good turnout for the town hall. I had 2,000 people show up that morning. We weren't ready for 2,000 people. I had to move the entire event outside and stand under the August sun in Texas on a platform, on a riser with a handheld microphone and a little portable speaker because people wanted to be heard.

□ 1140

They didn't want to hear from me. They didn't care what my ideas were. They wanted me to know what they thought. And they thought: do not do this, do not take a system that is arguably working for 60 to 70 percent of the country and destroy it, because then we will have nothing. So keep the system as it is working and don't trouble those waters because it's not necessary. But if you really have to do something, if you just have to do something, would you help us with cost, because we're concerned about cost. We see cost going up every year. We do wonder at some point if we will be priced out of the system.

So they sent us back here at the end of the August recess with a very clear message: don't mess up the system that's working and help us with cost.

So the President comes to the House of Representatives that September—many of you will remember that—and he was going to lecture us on why we needed to do his plan and his bill. I honestly thought when the President asked for time to come and address a joint session of the House and Senate here in the well of the House, I thought maybe he was going to say: Okay, I heard the American people, let's hit the pause button, let's hit the reset button, let's do something differently from what I've been talking about.

But, no, we doubled down on it. He said: Let's go faster, we've got to get this done. And, again, it was because we have to have control over you, Mr. and Mrs. America, because otherwise we're afraid we'll never get it. Because,

do not forget, at the time the President's chief of staff said: Do not let a good crisis go to waste. The country was in economic turmoil. We got a great crisis out there. Let's just take everyone's health care while we're at it, and then we will have that control established, and the people will never get it back once we've taken it.

But the people told us: Don't mess up the system that works. And when you stop and look at it and you take a step back, you actually had a system of employer-sponsored insurance, whether you liked it or not, that was working arguably well. Polls showed that 65 to 67 percent of people said: Okay, this is what we've got, I like this, I can deal with it, I understand it, it's what I've always had.

You also had people who did not have those large-group employer policies. They were the small-group market, the individual market. That's where we should have focused our energy. Those were the individuals who actually needed the most help. Those were the people who needed the protections in the marketplace that, perhaps, they lacked.

The President made a big deal of 12 million to 18 million people in this country with preexisting conditions. How many people signed up to the Federal preexisting program right before the Supreme Court ruled on the Affordable Care Act? 65,000.

That, as the gentlelady from Minnesota points out, was a manageable problem. That could have been dealt with in an afternoon. The best way to deal with it was to help those States that already had a preexisting program or reinsurance, help them fund those programs that they historically have had trouble funding. Those States that just cannot or will not do one, provide them an alternative stream to bring those patients into their Medicaid system, or even the system that's provided for State employees. But it was doable.

Instead, we have a new Federal program that, guess what, today if you try to sign up because you've got a preexisting condition, you're turned away. They ran out of money. They didn't plan enough.

So before the exchanges kick in January 1 for the next 8, 9, 10 months, those people are out in the cold, the very people that the President said he was setting out to protect. The population was small; it was manageable. It could have been handled without the Federal takeover of health care from everything in your pill box to your Band-Aid box.

I see we've been joined by one of the outspoken leaders on this issue, the doctor from Tennessee, Dr. ROE. Dr. ROE, I appreciate your service in the Congress, and we're anxious to hear your thoughts on the third anniversary of, If You Like What You Have, You Can Keep It.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to speak again here on the House floor about health care, something that I've dedicated my life to, as many of us have here on the House floor—Dr. BURGESS, Dr. HARRIS, and others.

I think the thing that has bothered me so much about this, and the reason I've made a choice to come to Congress, is to work on health care. There are many other things I wanted to work on, but this was primary. And I've brought a wealth of experience from our State that tried health care, a program called TennCare, where we reformed our Medicaid program in the '90s and then re-reformed it in the mid-2000s when we realized it didn't work.

What happened? What was the argument? Well, the argument and the promise. What was the promise that the President and the opposing party made during the health care debate? We want to include—which is a good thing—more people in health care, provide coverage for more people.

As Dr. BURGESS just pointed out, we had 160 million people in the private insurance market that needed a little tweaking, but didn't need to be blown up, as we are seeing has happened right here. We have our Medicare patients, 47 million of them, already covered.

Medicaid, which we tried to reform in Tennessee, is an entirely different issue because Medicaid doesn't provide, in my opinion, the best quality of care for lower-income people.

There are studies out there. I read one this morning: 900-and-something-thousand patients who were uninsured actually got better health care outcomes than those patients covered by Medicaid. There is something wrong with a plan that you're expanding that doesn't work now. So I think that was one of the things.

What did we find out in Tennessee? What did we discover? Well, we found out we were spending $2.5 billion a year on TennCare in our State; 10 years later we were spending $8.5 billion, over three times what we started out. Half the people that got on TennCare had health insurance and dropped it. This is exactly what you are going to see in the market.

And quality of care went down. Why did it go down? Because when Medicaid paid less, doctors saw less, patients lost access. That is one of the great concerns I have here now, is that right now we don't have enough primary care people, and you are going to see access lost in this State.

I certainly think we have a plethora of ideas about how to improve the health care system. Three years ago, I stood out with MICHELE BACHMANN at midnight outside this Capitol with thousands of people who passionately did not want the Federal Government making their health care decisions. They're still out there. When you go home, you will find out that 55 percent of the folks do not want this and they want it reformed. They want health care reform; they do not want this plan.

I appreciate the opportunity to be down here and speak on this extremely important issue on the third anniversary of ObamaCare.

Mr. BURGESS. I'm so glad that you came to the floor because you bring up an important point. I actually want to ask you a question on one of the things that you brought up.

Many people forget that access to an insurance policy, access to a Federal program, is not the same as access to a physician or access to care. In other words, you can show up with a card, and if there's no office open that takes that card, you're about in the same shape you were before the card was produced. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. There's no question, Dr. BURGESS. What we saw happen in our State was—the way governments always fix their problem when they overpromise—is they put a plan out there, more people sign up than they thought, as will happen in the exchanges and the subsidies and so forth; and when that happens, the way they balance the budget is they cut the providers—the doctors, the nurse practitioners, the hospitals, the home health care. The people that actually give the care get cut.

They finally cut it enough that it doesn't cover the cost of the care. And when that happens, the providers can no longer afford to see you, which means if you lose access, even if you've got the prettiest looking card in the world but you can't get a doctor to see you, the quality of your health care goes down, and ultimately it increases the cost because the severity of your problem which goes undiagnosed, untreated, is more severe to take care of. And then you show up in the emergency room, which is exactly the wrong place. We saw this over and over in our State.

For instance, in New Jersey right now, I think 60 percent of the primary care providers don't take Medicaid. What good does it do to expand Medicaid in a State when you don't have providers that will see those patients.

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman would yield for a further question.

Then where do those patients go for their care? You just said it, but I would love for you to repeat it.

Mr. ROE. If you look at Massachusetts, we were told that the number of ER visits were going to go down. They didn't. They went up. That's exactly where they end up. They end up in the emergency room for primary care, which is where they should not be.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, if the gentleman will yield, Doctor, if I recall correctly, on the floor of this House we heard over and over again the problem with the cost of health care in this country is those people who are uninsured. Those free riders who won't bother to buy insurance, they show up at the emergency room. It is the highest delivery point cost. They're the ones that are driving up the cost of care. I heard this in the Supreme Court

the second morning in the oral arguments. The Solicitor General made this very point. It's the free riders that are driving the cost up.

Listening to you, it almost sounds as if patients for whom Medicaid is provided as the point of coverage, if there are no providers to provide that coverage, they do what they've always done. They go to the emergency room, the highest cost point for the access for care. How are we solving that problem by increasing that population?

□ 1150

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Dr. BURGESS, one of the great frustrations I've had in my short 4-year political career here—this is my third term—was there were nine of us in the Physicians Caucus when I showed up here. Not one of us was asked about this bill. I spent my life out there in the private world, 31 years, practicing medicine, providing care for patients, not bureaucracies and this, but actually seeing one patient right after another, delivering their babies, operating on them.

And what happens is, when you have a public program that promises more than it can produce, guess what? You get that patient in the hospital, and because it doesn't pay for the cost of the care, what happens? You shift that cost to the private sector, not only taking in inflation, but that cost shifting, to force it up. And you were led to believe it was the ''free riders.'' It's the public programs that are the biggest problem there, that are forcing those shifts in costs, and hospitals are caught in a dreadful situation.

They agreed to take the cuts in Medicare because they thought they were going to get an increase in insured people. It turns out what Congresswoman BACHMANN brought up about how can you lose your private insurance, there may be as many people that lose their private insurance as we increase in Medicaid, which is a failed program now.

How bad is that when you take people who had insurance they liked, and they lost it, and now they are forced to no program or a Medicaid program that is fading?

Mr. BURGESS. As the gentleman also points out, no, members of the Physicians Caucus, the Doctors Caucus, were not frequently or ever consulted on this issue. But I know people—and I know, Mr. Speaker, I must refer my comments to you—who might just be casual observers of the conversation this morning and would say, Well, the two doctors are self-serving. Of course you want to be in charge, because that's the way you are.

But the Governors have a big footprint in the delivery of health care in this country. Where were the Governors? Why were the Governors not down in the East Room of the White House? Why weren't the special interests, why wasn't Pharma, why weren't the insurance companies, why wasn't the Service Employees Industrial Union down at the White House making these decisions and not the Nation's Governors? That's one of the great mysteries that may never be answered, but it's a question the American people should ask themselves. Because in all 50 States in this country, the Governors have an enormous health care footprint. They're the ones that administer the State Medicaid programs. They administer the programs for their employees' health insurance. They have their State prison programs. They have an enormous interest in the cost of health care. The Governors should have been invited from the get-go. It is a travesty that they never were. It's political malpractice that the Governors were not involved in the development of this policy.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. One of the things I noticed with our Democratic Governor, Phil Bredesen, who is a health care specialist and was the Governor of our State of Tennessee 8 years during the 2000s, the Obama administration would have been well-served to pay attention to Governor Bredesen, because Governor Bredesen was forced with a situation where he had to balance a budget. The health care costs were eating up this budget, and he had to cut the rolls. That's how the Governor elected to take care of this. After they cut the providers until there weren't any providing, he then had to cut the rolls from the TennCare program. That was very painful and hard to do.

And I would certainly warn Governors out there, when you massively expand these rolls, let me tell you, politically that was very difficult for the legislature and for our Democratic Governor. My hats are off to him for the decisions he had to make. Those were not easy for him to make. And you're absolutely right, the Governors are really the thought processes and the experiments in the local governments and State governments that you can actually do something and see whether it works instead of this massive mess that we have.

I just got a schematic of this yesterday. It's a 21-page—and I should have brought it down here on the House floor—schematic about trying to figure out whether you qualify for health insurance.

Let me tell you how it was when I hired somebody in my office. When I hired a new employee, guess what I did? They came in said, Dr. ROE, do you have health insurance? I said, Yes, we provide health insurance; go sign up on the way out. It took 5 minutes.

This thing is going to take you a week to go through to figure out whether you belong in the Medicaid box, whether you belong in the private insurance box, whether you're going to get it at all, whether you get the subsidy or you don't. It's maddening. And it provides nothing to increase the quality of the care that we are required to do to give to our patients.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

The gentlewoman from Minnesota mentioned the effects on the economy, and the effects of this law on the economy are profound. We just passed a budget for the next fiscal year in the House of Representatives. I'm grateful that the budget didn't allow space for the reformation of this health care law, the removal of this health care law.

But I think we're also joined by another gentleman from Texas who wanted to speak briefly about some of the economic effects, and I'm happy to yield to my friend, Mr. GOHMERT, from Tyler, Texas, to speak on the economic effects.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I'm so proud of the doctors in our caucus—yourself, Dr. HARRIS, Dr. ROE, Dr. GINGREY. We've got so much knowledge and wisdom when it comes to health care, and we had those resources not consulted at all but, rather, dictated to by people that didn't have a clue what they were doing.

And all those promises that were made, such as you can keep your insurance, we now know millions have not, will not. You were told if you like your doctors, you can keep them. I have talked to doctors, as I know you all have, who say, because of the ObamaCare bill, they're going to go ahead and retire early. Their patients will not get to keep their doctor. ObamaCare ensures that they will not get to see the doctor that they wanted.

The Obama overlay does harm to people getting to see their doctor, does harm to people having insurance, avoiding these kind of disastrous Federal intrusions, filling out all of this staff. That's one of the big problems with ObamaCare. It allows the Federal Government to have all of your medical records. They'll know all of your deepest secrets. I'm glad I don't have any. But people should have a right to privacy. All these left-wingers that are always out there—and often we side on the same side when it comes to privacy—all of a sudden where are they? They're not making noise about the violation of privacy.

With all of that overlay on everything else, this happens at a time when our economy is still struggling. Yes, the report was unemployment went down one-tenth of 1 percent, but that was because a far greater number didn't even look for work, they're so depressed financially, mentally, and psychologically.

And then this week we hear that Cyprus was just going to siphon off 6, 9, 10 percent of people's bank accounts, just siphon it off as a tax, taking people's money. This is like a bank robbery. They go into the banks and rob them, and the only reason they don't go to prison for robbing these bank accounts is they make the laws and say it's going to be legal for us to rob people of their bank accounts.

But I've heard over and over, Could what is happening in Cyprus happen here in the United States? And I just wanted people to think, as we finish today, and understand it has been happening every day. This President's Federal Reserve Chairman helped him get reelected by printing massive amounts of money, creating massive amounts of money. They're not printing; they just add the numbers. Every day they are taking from people's bank accounts by printing more money, creating more money, devaluing the money they have in their bank account. They create 10 percent more in money by adding those numbers. They've just taken that right out of their bank accounts. They devalued their home values; they devalued their bank accounts.

So as people wonder this week if what happened in Cyprus could happen here, they need to know it's already happened. What happened in Cyprus was not only the euro; they would be doing what this administration is doing, just printing money like crazy to get themselves out of debt. That allows them to keep spending, run up the cost of health care, but we're printing more money to deal with it.

So on top of all of this suffering and the disastrous effect on health care, you have this financial overlay of this administration taking money out of every bank account every day.

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman actually will yield for a technical correction, I don't think it's necessary any longer for the Fed to print money. They created an electronic transaction. So no trees are harmed; no ink is wasted in the process of this activity.

□ 1200

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would yield, yes, actually, I used to say just exclusively ''they're printing more money''—and there are commercials that say that. Then I had a meeting over at the Fed and I found out, Oh, no, we couldn't possibly print all the money we create every day; we're just adding numbers into the system. So I am correct, though, that we're still printing a little more, but we're just adding numbers. We don't even bother to take the paper anymore.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for his participation. Being as he's from Texas, I also feel compelled to add that that 0.1 percent growth, you subtract out the jobs created in Texas this year—somewhere between 200,000 and 300,000—we're in a recession without the State of Texas as a part of the Union. I know the gentleman is grateful for the service of the Governor and State legislature, as am I. They've done a great job in the State.

I'd like to recognize another fellow physician, Dr. GINGREY, a member of the committee, outspoken leader on this issue, and one who never ceases to have great ideas on the right ways to do things if we are going to talk about health care and health care delivery in this country.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my physician colleague and co-member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, for giving me just a few minutes.

My colleague from Minnesota, the gentlewoman, Mrs. BACHMANN, earlier talked about the health care law and the just few days that we had—I think it was maybe 3 days in the House and a matter of hours in the Senate—to read the bill. She is absolutely correct on that. But the thing that is even more egregious is in the rules and regulations of that process that's been ongoing over these past 3 years by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and what they have done in the interpretation of the law—probably five times as many pages as the 2,700, I think, in the original bill, and we're finding out new stuff every day, Mr. Speaker.

The gentlewoman talked about the fact that an employer could give full coverage and meet the requirements of ObamaCare and not get fined, but not offer any coverage for spouse and children. They're just kind of left flapping in the breeze with no care.

Another thing that just recently came to my attention in reading the rules and regulations is in regard to something called ''age banding,'' colleagues. This age banding rule that typically health insurance companies use—their actuaries, after all, study the risk of a policy to a policyholder—obviously older people in their late fifties, early sixties, with multiple system diseases in some instances, to be able to pay their bills and honor those claims, the premiums are going to have to be higher than they are for these young 28 and 27-year-old, 10-feet tall, bullet-proof healthy young men and women, for whom the premiums should be much lower.

But ObamaCare comes in and says, oh, no, they can't be more than three times higher, when traditionally every State it's been a 5:1 ratio. What it's going to mean is young people—the very ones that we wanted to have health care—the CBO just came out and said 7 million of them now have no health insurance at all because they're either unemployed, underemployed, don't live with mom and dad, are not poor enough for Medicaid, not old enough for Medicare, and what in the world are they going to do?

Because of this age banding rule, a young lady, 27 years old, making $33,500 a year, her health insurance premium goes up $800 a year. So these are some of the things that we're talking about.

I'll conclude my remarks by saying this: The people in the 11th District of Georgia—which I've proudly represented now for going on 11 years—they say to me, PHIL, what are you going to do? We know January of 2014 is fast approaching. Should we just give up? Is it a done deal? And I say to them, and they say to me: Don't quit on us, doctor. Don't quit on us. We know that you know there are things that you can do as a Member of Congress, whether it's defund, take—not a paring knife, but a hacksaw to certain sections of this bill. And with every breath in you, we want you, as long as you are a Member of Congress, to keep fighting this monstrosity. That is my pledge to the people of my district, and the people of Georgia, and the people of this great country.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

I'd like to point out that the continuing resolution just passed by this House a few moments ago to fund the government for the rest of the year actually contained an almost $1 billion reduction in the implementation fund. It also contained a $360 million reduction to the Department of Treasury for their implementation of their rules.

So there were some serious blows dealt to the implementation side—not by Republicans; this was a pretty bipartisan vote. I think it had 320 votes at the end of the voting period. But this reduction is seen, in a bipartisan fashion, as being important because the gentleman is right: the torrent of regulations that has come out since the President's reelection has been nothing short of just astounding.

No wonder the Governors wouldn't participate. The administration hid the ball until Election Day, and then said, oh, now we're going to give you the rule for essential health benefits. In other words, they wouldn't tell the Governors what you are going to be required to cover, what you are going to be required to pay for. The Governors had no way of knowing until 2 days after Election Day. And then they said: You've got to be nuts; we're not going to sign up for that. So Health and Human Services said, okay, you've got another month. They said: You've got to be nuts; that's Christmas, Thanksgiving. Everybody's on vacation, nobody can evaluate it. So they gave them another month, and then they finally said time's up.

So 26 States said we're not going to do an exchange. The Governors just flat refused. You wouldn't be honest with us about what was going to be required, so we're not playing ball with you. And that is the right decision for them to make. I applaud that decision.

We're closing down on the final moments of the hour. I do want to point out to people this is not a filibuster; this is a regular activity of the House of Representatives. We can come to the floor and talk about a topic that the majority leader and the leadership allowed us the time to talk about—the 3-year anniversary of the signing of the Affordable Care Act. Who could ever forget the Vice President standing up and saying ''this is a big darn deal'' down at the White House, but—third anniversary of a big darn deal.

The gentlelady from Minnesota is recognized for her comments.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Dr. BURGESS, thank you so much.

I just wanted to add this point to the whole debate that we're having today,

that the unintended consequence of all of this is that we've now created a class system in America for health care. We can't overstate this enough. Before, we just had health care in America, and you tried to find the best doctor and you tried to find the best possible care. But now what ObamaCare creates is this: it's a class-based health care system where we segment patients into three different classes.

Here's one. Here's the one that no American wants to be in. It's the Medicaid ghetto. That's where the lowest possible care, where very few doctors will be available to offer this kind of care, the Medicaid ghetto. Then there's going to be the socialized medicine in the exchanges. Then, finally, there's going to be concierge care for those who are going to be at the top of the heap.

So it won't be the same type of medicine that's available for everyone. We will have different class systems in health care. And guess who's going to get hurt the most? You're exactly right—senior citizens, women, and children. I want to explain just briefly how that will be.

You see, 56 percent of the people that are unhealthy today in America are in households that make less than 133 percent of the poverty level. So if you're sick, you're in a lower-income household, and without employer coverage—and employers, as was stated before by Dr. GINGREY, about 7 million people are going to be thrown off their very good coverage they have now. Over half of our unhealthy citizens will be stuck in Medicaid, and that doesn't provide adequate access. I can tell you from my State of Minnesota, people who are on that scale have to go from rural Minnesota, maybe travel a couple hundred miles to the Twin Cities—which they can't—to find anyone who will offer them the care they need.

Here's the other thing: About 2.5 times as many women than men get their coverage through their husband's coverage. For all of these people who are going to lose their employer-sponsored health coverage, it's more likely to have 2½ times more women. If they're unemployed and out of the labor force, they're in trouble; they're up a creek without a paddle. Because the problem here is going to be that women and children are in jeopardy of not having an option. Even if they make 400 percent more than the poverty line—which really sounds like a lot of money—you're not going to have the availability of getting on the health care exchange. You may not even get in the Medicaid ghetto. So, in other words, you have to pay the tax—which they call a fee—you have to pay the big tax as a woman and as a mother of these children, but you're not getting any health insurance for it.

□ 1210

It is a bad deal, and that's why I thank you, Dr. BURGESS, for what you've done.

Mr. BURGESS. Not only are you not getting health insurance, you're fined on top of it. You pay a fine, and you're still uninsured. At the end of the day, you're still uninsured.

Ms. BACHMANN. That's right. So, Mr. Speaker, it's the worst of all worlds. Your husband is having to pay for this very expensive insurance for himself, and the employer may be having a match on that, but you're out in the cold, your kids are out in the cold, and you're paying a tax on top of it to add insult to injury. Women are going to suffer, children are going to suffer, and seniors are going to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be people who die because of this. In this body, let it be said today that we don't want to see anyone die or anyone hurt or anyone denied. That's exactly what this bill is going to do, which is why we have to repeal it.

The day after this bill was passed, I introduced a bill to repeal, and every single one of the Republicans in this House has voted to repeal ObamaCare. Now, hopefully, we're going to have another vote again soon because we love people, we care about people, and we want them to have the health care they need.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentlelady for her comments.

Where has the press been on this? Can you imagine if 500,000 children lost their health insurance under a Republican President? That would be the headline. We wouldn't hear anything else out of the press for a week. If people still showed up for the Federal preexisting program and the President said, ''No, no more, we're out of money,'' if it were a Republican President, that's all we'd hear about: the Republican President has prevented people from signing up to his own preexisting program that he started.

People need to be aware of what is happening. These things have been insidious. It's been 3 years. There's been a lot of information. It's complicated. I don't understand it anyway. Why do I have to be involved? You have to be involved. As the gentlelady just said, it is going to affect you and your family. Every man, woman, and child in this country for the next three generations is going to be affected by this very bad bill.

It was the worst of processes. This was a bill that came over here from the Senate. The House really never debated this thing. The House passed a bill, H.R. 3590, in July of 2009, but it was a housing bill. H.R. 3590 got over to the Senate. HARRY REID said, I need a bill number for my health care bill. Here's H.R. 3590. What does it do? Oh, housing. Strip all the language out. So he amended it: strike all after the enacting clause and insert. And what was inserted? The rest of the health care law.

The Senate had to digest it and pass it in a few days' time right before Christmas Eve. A big snowstorm was bearing down on Washington. They all voted for it to get out of town—60 votes in the Senate. It passed.

NANCY PELOSI said, What is this thing? It's garbage. I haven't got 100 votes for this over in the House. But over the next 3 months, they twisted enough arms and they broke enough knees that this thing finally got the votes 3 years ago yesterday, and 3 years ago today it was signed into law. It was signed into law to the detriment of the entire country.

I thank the gentlelady for joining me. I thank all the other Members who are here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to recognize our Special Order hour not only to talk a drop about the budget plans we had this week, but more importantly, this is an hour to honor organized labor in this country and what organized labor has done for the middle class and for so many millions and millions of people across this country.

This week, the Congressional Progressive Caucus put the Back to Work budget before this body. The Back to Work budget is based on a simple concept: the number one problem facing this country is not the deficit, it's the need to improve the economy and create jobs, and the single best way you can address the deficit is to get people back to work. The Back to Work budget did just that. It would have created 7 million jobs, it would have brought unemployment down to 5 percent within 3 years, and it still would have trimmed $4.4 trillion from the deficit.

What it did is it invested directly in the very things that create jobs—in infrastructure, in police and fire, and in teachers and in other services that are vital to this country—because we've been told by the Congressional Budget Office, the single entity that is a nonpartisan agency that both parties rely heavily on, that this year one-half of our deficit is caused by economic weakness, and three-quarters of the deficit in 2014 is caused by economic weakness.

Now, what is economic weakness? That means unemployment and underemployment. If you get the people of this country back to work, you will solve most of our problems in trying to deal with the deficit. So rather than make the end-all goal solving the deficit but completely ignoring the economy—and as the Republican budget, we saw that, on the floor today, actually could cost 2 million jobs in this country in the next year—we need right now to be investing in those jobs so that people are getting back to work

and supporting their families and becoming taxpayers. When they pay, we'll stop that trajectory and the deficit that we have caused by this weakened economy.

So that's the answer. That's what we need to focus on, and that's why the Congressional Progressive Caucus put the Back to Work budget out this week. It really is the premise of what we really want to talk about, which is our support for the working men and women of this country and the support for organized labor. Because when we put our emphasis on jobs, we're recognizing the very hard work that labor has done in this country.

I just want to share a few historical parts that labor has done which are so important in this Nation.

First of all, we have the weekend because of organized labor. In 1870, the average workweek for most Americans was 61 hours. But many workers, including children, put in 10- to 16-hour workdays 7 days a week. Many workers didn't have a single day off for a week or two in a row.

In response, labor unions in the late 19th century and the early 20th century organized massive strikes demanding shorter workweeks. They fought so that Americans could be home with their loved ones instead of constantly toiling for their employers with no leisure time.

By 1937, these labor actions created enough political momentum to pass the Fair Labor Standards Act. The FLSA created a Federal framework for a shorter workweek that included room for leisure time. So the reason we have our weekends, our days off during the week, is because of the effort a century ago by people in organized labor.

Also, unions helped to end the lack of child labor laws that we had in this country. Child labor was prevalent before the growth of the labor movement. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, child laborers were commonplace in factories, shops, and other workplaces across this country. American children as young as 5 years old worked in large numbers in mines, glass factories, textiles, agriculture, canneries, home industries, and as newsboys, messengers, bootblacks, and peddlers. In fact, children were often preferred because factory owners viewed them as more manageable, cheaper, and less likely to strike.

In many factories, children were forced to climb on and crawl into large, dangerous machines because they were the only workers small enough to do so. These dangerous child labor conditions often caused the problem with people losing fingers, arms and legs of children that could easily get caught and mangled in devices.

Beyond the equipment, the environment was a threat to children as well as the factories that put out the fumes and toxins. When children inhaled toxins, they would often suffer from illness, chronic conditions or disease. And harvesting crops in extreme temperatures for long hours was considered normal for children. The labor movement spearheaded the fight against the child labor practices that were going on.

As early as 1836, union members at the National Trades' Union convention made the first formal public proposal recommending that States establish a minimum age for factory work. That year, Massachusetts enacted the first State law restricting child labor for workers under 15. Over the next several decades, the efforts of labor movements successfully achieved minimum age laws in other States. In 1881, the AFL proposed a national law banning all children under 14 from employment.

In 1892, the Democratic Party adopted the AFL's child labor platform and began to push for national child labor laws. Finally, in 1938, Congress included minimum ages of employment and hours of work for children in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Unions have spearheaded the fight for the Family and Medical Leave Act. Labor unions like the AFL–CIO federation led the fight for the 1993 law which requires State agencies and private employers with more than 50 employees to provide up to 12 weeks per year of protected leave for workers to leave for a newborn, a newly adopted child, a seriously ill family member, or the worker's own illness. Thanks to the labor movement, employers are required by the FMLA to continue group benefits, including dental and optical benefits, during family or medical leave.

□ 1220

The law also requires that employees can't be retaliated against for merely taking their federally protected leave; and under the law, when they have completed their family or medical leave, they must be allowed to return to the same or an equivalent position with equivalent pay, benefits, and working conditions.

Here's another thing that organized labor has done for the American people: they've pushed throughout their career for workplace safety. It's not just for children, but for adult workers.

Efforts by the Federal Government to ensure workplace health and safety were minimal until the passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, better known as OSHA. The laws were so lax that in places for some employers, it was cheaper for the employer to replace a worker injured in the workplace than it was to introduce safety measures. There was little recourse or relief for the survivors of dead workers or injured employees. In the early 1900s, labor unions had pressured many States to enact workers compensation laws that discouraged employers from permitting unsafe workplaces.

Prior to OSHA's enforcement, 14,000 workers died each year from workplace hazards and 2 million more were disabled or harmed during those years in these unsafe workplaces. It wasn't until the 1960s that the movement began for a comprehensive workplace safety law once again backed by the labor movement. That law went into effect on April 28, 1971, declaring Congress' intent ''to ensure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources.''

Those are just some of the benefits that we have seen because of organized labor's efforts over the last century and a half.

They also were instrumental in passing the Social Security Act of 1935. They were instrumental in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. And their support for World War II was unmatched in making sure that we had workers to deal with what we needed to back home while we had so many people fighting for our country overseas.

Those are just some of the efforts, but there's more. Part of being a part of organized labor has meant so much for this country. If you are a union member, let me just offer a few of the things that you're more likely to have because you're part of a union. One, you will earn higher wages. Union Members earn 30 percent more than their nonunion counterparts. So you'll have a better chance at a living wage, the ability to support your family because you are a part of a union.

You'll have more on-the-job training. Union workers are more likely to have access to formal on-the-job training, making employees more skilled and adding to productivity.

And something I should have mentioned from the beginning is I have been a small business owner for 25 years, over half of my lifetime. I opened a small business when I had hair and it was dark. It was a long time ago. But my business has also been a union business. I have a union specialty printing business. I can tell you one of the very important reasons why many of us who choose to have unions in our businesses is because we know the value of what I just talked about, that training.

Many unions have an apprenticeship program where you can get the very best, most qualified and skilled employees to be able to come to your place from day one. One of those other benefits for me as a small business owner is they're more likely to stay in my business so that I don't have the turnover of constantly training new employees. I have the benefit of someone who is going to stay with me for a long time.

Another thing, if you're a member of a union, you have safer working places. Union workers are more likely to be trained on health and safety rules, and union workplaces are more likely to enforce OSHA standards. You're also more likely to receive workers' compensation. Union members get their benefits faster and return to work more quickly. When workers are injured, the union helps workers through

the often complicated process of filing for workers' compensation, and they protect the workers from employer retaliation.

Finally, you have a better chance as a union member to have health insurance. Nearly 80 percent of the unionized workers receive employer provided health insurance compared with 49 percent of nonunion workers. Union members are more likely to have short-term disability and life insurance coverage.

Those are just some of the benefits that you'll see for union workers. Now, specifically, I would like to talk about some of the problems that unions are facing today because there are several very significant issues. Not only is it in the States and in the Halls of Congress that they're having a hard time making sure that we continue to protect workers and the unions that are working to protect those workers, but very specifically within agencies.

I would like to read a story—I believe it's The New York Times—about a situation that just happened this year in the State of New York. I'm just going to read parts of this article, but I think it will be especially significant. This was written in mid-February. So this happened at the end of January of this year. I'll read it from the beginning, and I'll take a few breaks in here.

The article is: ''At Cablevision, Norma Rae Has Been Escorted Outside.''

Cablevision claims to take pride in its open-door policy for employees. So two weeks ago, a tight-knit band of cable television installers gathered at a company depot in Brooklyn to pick up route shoots and put ladders and tools in their vans when they trooped inside to ask a vice president for a couple of minutes of his time.

Last winter, these workers overcame fierce management opposition and voted to join the Communication Workers of America only to spend 9 months in rancorous contract talks. They wanted to ask the vice president if Cablevision was serious about a contract agreement or if they only wanted to break their union.

They waited for 20 minutes to talk and then 20 more.

La'kesia Johnson, 44, grew restless and walked to the front office. The manager told her to go back inside. Then the vice president walked in and asked essentially, ''Who is supposed to be working now?'' Every worker, 22 in all, raised a hand. ''Ladies and gentlemen,'' the vice president said, according to multiple accounts, ''I am sorry to tell you that you've all been permanently replaced.''

''What?'' Ms. Johnson said, ''Replaced? You just fired us? You don't even know what we want.'' Ms. Johnson said the vice president looked at her and stated, ''I don't care what you want.''

The article goes on to talk about unions:

Unions win just 50 percent of elections when they successfully negotiate an initial contract just half of the time. The National Labor Relations Board is a dog missing teeth. If workers engage in an illegal strike, the board legally must seek a court injunction. If a company illegally fires workers, the board takes months to investigate and cannot levy any fines.

It goes on further:

I asked Charles R. Schueler, a company spokesperson, about the firings. He said that ''22 employees refused to go to work after multiple requests to do so.'' The workers, I noted, all said they intended to work that day. He repeated his original statement. He also said that Cablevision negotiated in good faith. He then said, ''That leaves us with the issue of your conflict. Are you ready?'' The reporter said. Sure. You, he said, are a vice chairman of the Communication Workers of America union.

He's got me, sort of. Like most reporters of The New York Times, I'm a member of the Newspaper Guild, which is a part of the Communication Workers of America, which has about 140,000 members in the Northeast. I receive no union pay, and I have no duties. I'm also a Knicks season ticket holder and a Cablevision cable customer. I pay far more to Mr. Dolan's companies than I pay to my union in dues.

Ms. Johnson feels guilty. She's persuaded her colleagues to risk being fired. She speaks of waking in the middle of the night and of bills piling up. Her husband is a freelancer. They depend on her health benefits. ''It's stressful. The air in our house is very thick,'' she says. ''Sometimes I break down,'' Ms. Johnson said, and asks herself if she's been selfish. ''But my husband reminds me: 'You have a home family and a work family. You must be loyal to both.'''

What's so significant about this case is the anti-worker attitude that Cablevision brought forth to its workers who voted by law to form a union. It was on January 30, over a year after 282 cable television technicians voted overwhelmingly to be represented by the CWA, that they illegally locked out and fired 22 technicians who were engaged in legally protected legal union activity.

After waiting more than 40 minutes, as the article explained, they were told that they were permanently replaced. Since then, five have been called back to work.

''Permanently replaced'' usually refers to workers who are on strike, but none of these workers were on strike. In fact, some of the workers that were fired were already in the field on their jobs. This is a violation of Federal labor law which follows a year of management's delays and refusal to bargain in good faith with the elected union.

□ 1230

They illegally gave raises to every Cablevision technician except those in Brooklyn who voted to form a union in an attempt to blunt the Communications Workers of America's union-organizing drive that they were having in the Bronx. They left Brooklyn consumers behind with slower Internet speeds, and they publicly stated that they would disinvest in Brooklyn because of the unionization vote. They refused in negotiations to agree to even the most basic union contract demands, such as the union security clause and just cause for discharge and discipline.

Rather than negotiate a fair contract, Cablevision spent millions on anti-union lawyers to fight the union, and that's more than it would have cost to settle the contract. All Cablevision employees want is to be able to organize and be treated with respect and fairness, and all Cablevision seems to want to do is spend millions of dollars to take away those very rights. That's just one problem that we've seen with attempts to bust unions.

The reason we've seen that is due to a provision that has also happened just recently with this Senate in its blocking appointments to the National Labor Relations Board, which is the board that oversees what's going on. We've heard the case of the Brooklyn Cablevision story, but here is why it is especially significant. The reason Cablevision had that confidence in treating its workers so poorly is that it was part of a strategy of illegal firings and a lockout of the workers that stems from larger, recent judicial rulings in Washington, D.C., as part of a larger anti-worker strategy.

On January 25 of this year, in the Noel Canning ruling, a three-judge panel of Republican appointees to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit overturned a National Labor Relations Board unfair labor practice decision because the court deemed that three NLRB members who helped to decide the matter ascended to their positions due to unlawful recess appointments by President Obama in January of 2012. The ruling went on and destroyed the NLRB's ability to enforce U.S. labor law. As a result, Cablevision's firings were executed without fear of reprisal. Cablevision is merely the first company to recognize and to act on the fact that that ruling can be exploited by anti-worker corporations.

The real problem we have is that we can't get the appointments to the NLRB that the President has tried to make because the Senate has refused to place the people. They have taken advantage of the quorum of Senate-confirmed members, and they've made it exceedingly difficult to appoint these because of the 60-vote rule that they have in the Senate. Due to the GOP's unprecedented obstruction and use of the filibuster and secret hold, they essentially have made it impossible for people to be appointed to the NLRB so as to actually enforce the labor laws that are the law of the land in this country.

Now, it's not just the communication workers who have this story. I have a union in my State of Wisconsin, the Operating Engineers, who had a very similar story; and this is repeated across the country. These are workers with Local 139, with Proppant Specialists, which is a company in Wisconsin that has had a 3-year fight of trying to form a union in violation of U.S. law. The company has stopped them from being able to proceed.

They started back in October of 2010. They filed for a petition for election in April of 2011. They had an election in June of 2011 and voted to form the union, at which time people filed objections to some of the votes. That went

on for a period of time until the board decision on April 3, 2012. They certified the election on the 9th of April of last year and said that, indeed, the election after a year was a fair election. There are supposed to have been immediate timelines to have started negotiations for a contract with the union. It's the law of the land. Instead, the company refused to. They sent a letter to the union, declining the union's request for bargaining late in that month of April. The union then filed a complaint against the employer in May, and the investigation by the labor board had started at that point.

The problem is without the teeth of the NLRB, to this day, 3 years after starting this process, the workers who voted to form a union still don't have that right to the union that they have by the law of the land in this country because of what has happened with the NLRB.

Simply, we have to do something to fix this. We have to make sure that the President can appoint the people he has to appoint to the NLRB and make sure that those appointments are confirmed so that they can do their valid, prescribed-by-law jobs to ensure that workers have that right to unions when they vote on that.

Now, we know, if you had the Employee Free Choice Act in place in this country, you wouldn't have to worry about this because it would be very clear that they would be able to negotiate that contract and get that done. The problem is if that were the law of the land, despite support from a bipartisan majority of the House and a strong majority in the Senate, those same 60-vote filibuster rules would hold up the ability for us to pass an Employee Free Choice Act in this country.

So what has happened?

We have this toothless law which now is going to allow for more and more abuse that we're going to see. This isn't the only law that we've seen like this that has been abused. We've also seen an abuse in the State of Wisconsin, my State.

I was in the State legislature for 14 years before coming this year to be a Member of Congress. Two years ago, we had what we refer to in Wisconsin as the ''uprising.'' Newly elected Governor Scott Walker at the time had a provision to fix the budget. We were slightly in deficit. We were not prescribed by law to fix it, but were close to that point. He decided to have a budget fix; but within that budget fix, he went way farther and attacked the middle class and the workers of the State of Wisconsin. He proceeded to, in that budget fix, put in a provision—one that, I think, the employees have said since they would have agreed to—for them to pay more for their pensions and health care, although that normally would happen through the bargaining process. Then he went as far as to take away their rights to collectively bargain for public employees, and he took away their ability in how they paid their dues to their unions.

What does paying your dues to a union have to do with a shortfall in the State budget of Wisconsin? Absolutely nothing—but Governor Walker abused his job in order to go after the public unions.

We have had collective bargaining laws in Wisconsin for over a half a century—and guess what? We've had labor peace for over a half a century in the State of Wisconsin, only until Governor Walker 2 years ago decided to take that attack on those public workers and their ability to bargain for the most basic rights. When you're talking collective bargaining rights, you're not just talking their wages, their health benefits, their pensions. You're talking their right to bargain for their workplace safety conditions.

I have visited many prisons in the State of Wisconsin, and I used to serve on the corrections committee. Those correctional officers work and put their lives on the line every day for the safety of my family and everyone else's in the State of Wisconsin. When they see a blind spot and when there's not a camera and when there's a security risk, they have to have that right to be able to negotiate for those safety concerns; but that was taken away. That's collective bargaining. It's simply someone's right to bargain for the most basic concerns, like worker safety.

So in Wisconsin, Governor Walker did that. We had the uprising. We call it the ''uprising'' because, within days of his announcement, we had 10,000, 20,000, 40,000 people come each day to protest the Governor's decisions. On one Saturday, we had 100,000. On another weekend, they estimated it could have been as high as 180,000 people who showed up around the State capitol and in the State capitol in order to protest losing their rights as employees to bargain for their laws.

What's interesting is that we knew when this fight happened that it was going to be a long and hard battle, but even more so, the Governor tried to be very strategic. He did this against all public employees, but he excluded police officers and firefighters because—let's face it—after 9/11, politically, those are two organizations that are viewed very respectfully by the public. So he tried to basically divide and conquer, but to the police and firefighters of Wisconsin, to their credit, they stood with every other worker and said, An attack on one of us is an attack on each and every one of us. Because they stood with us, it was a stronger, more cohesive effort. You had schoolteachers and State workers and correctional officers and people who worked for the DNR—the Department of Natural Resources—and every State agency standing with police and firefighters and families across the State.

Yet it wasn't having the rallies with 10,000 and 20,000 and 40,000 people that mattered; it was having the 800 people in Bayfield, Wisconsin. Now, if you haven't heard of Bayfield, Wisconsin, don't feel bad. We sometimes say this is a map of Wisconsin. At the very tippy top of the State of Wisconsin, almost in Canada, is a town called Bayfield, but they had 800 people in this small community rally to show their support for workers.

□ 1240

So that is what is so important.

We saw the other consequences of this law. It was the private unions that also saw this problem because they knew what would happen. Just like the problem happening right now to the communication workers in New York, they knew this would happen in Wisconsin.

If first you take away the collective bargaining rights of the public employees, what kind of a signal is that to those companies that have negotiated in good faith with their workers to form private sector unions? Well, sure enough, we know exactly what happened. Within months, we saw unions, private sector unions across the State, start to start a fight with their union. In one particular case, we had a crane company, Manitou Crane, where they had one division, one of the unions that negotiates a contract with them in dispute, and they were going to stop production and do unpaid leave for members of other unions. Now, you can't do that. You shouldn't do that. But they went ahead to try to force that on the other workers in order to try to bust that union.

Mr. Speaker, those are the problems that we're seeing right now in this country.

There's another really strong example that we are seeing right now in this very body on a very regular basis, and this is the fight we're having on behalf of our United States Postal Service. There has been no question that there has been an attack on the Postal Service. And what happened essentially is a number of years back under the Bush administration, they had this idea to take the Postal Service, the Postal Service alone and no other agency in the Federal Government, and make them prepay their retirement system 75 years into the future.

Let me give you an example what that means. That means they're prepaying the pension of someone who is not born today for their retirement a half a century down the road. No other agency, no private company would do that; but we are requiring the Postal Service. So when you hear the Postal Service is losing money, almost every single dollar of those losses is due to the prepayment of this unusual requirement that only the Postal Service has to pay.

So what happens, the response, clearly I think this is an attempt to try to privatize the system. This is to completely take away a system that I think so many people have relied on for so many years in this country. But this is what we see happening.

Recently, we saw there was a move to go from 6-day delivery to 5-day delivery. When you start to cut back on

delivery, it has real ramifications on people, on what they're going to receive and the timeliness of what they're going to receive.

As a small business leader, again for 25 years of my life, many small businesses, especially in rural communities, count on the United States Postal Service to help them conduct their businesses so that they can hire the workers who work for them.

Here's an example. There's a place in Wisconsin called Brooklyn, Wisconsin. It's just outside Madison, Wisconsin, maybe half an hour. The people of Brooklyn, Wisconsin, need a post office even more than the people of Brooklyn, New York, because in Brooklyn, New York, there may be other alternatives. There may be stores that provide similar types of services, not necessarily mail delivery, but other types of delivery that they can go to. But in Brooklyn, Wisconsin, they don't have that luxury. That post office means everything. That small business operating out of Brooklyn, Wisconsin, having that means they can be in business and be able to hire the people in Brooklyn, Wisconsin. And that's Brooklyn. If you go to other rural parts of my district in Lafayette County, in Lafayette County, I guarantee, they have a problem with broadband so they can't necessarily even do an Internet-based business, so that post office means everything to them.

So when we see some of the attacks that are caused by this absolutely ridiculous requirement to pre-fund pensions into the future, 75 years into the future, that's why they are having financial difficulties. So there is a bill that I'm on, and others, called the Postal Service Protection Act of 2013. That act would not only maintain the 6-day delivery service we currently have, but it would also give the United States Postal Service the ability to reform its funding structure for their employee pensions. It also would direct them to use revenue to create innovative postal and non-postal products and services to generate new revenue sources.

Let's face it, we know things keep changing in how we are able to communicate and get information out to potential consumers for businesses, and to get out to your neighbors and friends. But allow them the ability to do that because if they can, they can make up for those shortfalls. But this absolutely unfair requirement they have puts more than 1,700 United States Postal Service workers in my Second Congressional District of Wisconsin—it puts their jobs in jeopardy. And for seniors and small businesses and those who live in rural areas, and those who rely on the Postal Service, it means a lot to have that post office, that 6-day delivery, and to have a service that's strong and affordable like it is in this country.

So, the Postal Service is yet one more of these attacks that we've seen.

The bottom line is thanks to organized labor—they have fought so much for the people of this country, for the middle class—one might argue the reason we have a middle class is because of exactly what they've been able to do. Fighting for the very things that we talked about, things like a smaller work week, giving us that weekend, as I discussed at the beginning of this Special Order time that I've had to talk about labor, has been absolutely crucial.

We have seen the child labor laws that at one time put children as young as 5 years old in this country, their lives and limbs, at risk. In large part it has been corrected because of the labor movement over the years.

The fight for family medical leave, which is so important to families now. If you have a child, you adopt a child, you have a family member who is seriously ill and you want to spend that final time with that loved one, the reason we have that law in place is because of the efforts of organized labor and others.

The fact that we have work place safety through the OSHA laws, which is so important, that you can go to work and not have to expect because of that work to have less of a lifetime, that's been created because of labor's efforts, and so much more.

Now, I'm a proud member of the Painters and Allied Trades, the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades. I'm a business owner and I'm a union member because I'm proud of the workers that I have. When people are paid a fair wage, you get much more of a result for your business. I know that I have long-term employees because, instead of trying to nickel and dime them and not treat them right, by paying a living wage, I get more than that back in return.

And one of the other challenges that unions have faced is this current economy, which is exactly why the Congressional Progressive Caucus introduced the back-to-work budget. Until we get people back to work, we have all of the other economic woes that are surrounded by that. The Painters and Allied Trades are part of the building trades within the union. There are public employee unions, there are private sector unions. But the building trades are the folks who are the bricklayers and the laborers and the operating engineers and the painters and the electrical workers and the carpenters. I could go on and on, and I apologize for the ones that I'm not listing, but those people who work every day in construction, which is one of the markets that's been the hardest hit through this economy, when the economy is good, people who work in the trades are working and they're doing well. But when the economy gets the sniffles, people in construction get a cold. And when the economy gets a cold, people in construction get pneumonia.

It's simply that much of a direct effect from how our economy is doing, which is exactly why we should here in this body not only support the labor laws that we need to and appoint the people to the NLRB so we can enforce the laws we have in place and expand the protections for workers that we need to do in this very body, but we need to get the economy going so that more people are working. Because the more people who are working, that is going to strengthen and support the economy.

I've listened to people on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side, with their budget presentation this week. I know that they are very serious about wanting to address the issues that they address, from deficit reduction to some of the other issues. The problem is that they are going about it in completely the wrong way. You can reduce the deficit best by getting people back to work. In the Progressive Caucus budget, the back-to-work budget, we do just that. We invest in infrastructure. We invest in putting police and fire back to work. We invest in putting teachers back in the schools. We invest in infrastructure so that those people in the construction industry who are hit with double the unemployment that everyone else is right now can get back to work.

□ 1250

And I can tell you, from firsthand experience, why that investment means something. When Congress, several years ago, passed the Recovery Act and passed the dollars that came to communities to invest in communities, we saw the benefit in the State of Wisconsin.

I was the cochair of the Joint Committee on Finance, the committee that writes the State budget for the State of Wisconsin, and we had to approve every single dollar that came through Wisconsin to make sure it went efficiently to build roads, repair schools, and the other services that that funding helped provide.

And when we did that, we had a report from the road-building industry and the vertical construction industry—not exactly your most progressive or liberal organizations—that said 54,000 jobs were saved or created in the State of Wisconsin because of the recovery dollars and our State budget that year, but it was predominantly the recovery dollars.

So I was surprised when I sat in this room for my first-ever State of the Union Speech, and heard President Obama talk about the need for more investment in infrastructure, just like the budget the Democrats proposed, just like the budget the Progressive Caucus proposed.

When you talk about that investment, I saw a press release from our Speaker of this House who said that no jobs were created in this country from the last recovery dollars. Well, fortunately, the very next week, in the Budget Committee, which I serve on, we had Dr. Elmendorf, the head of the Congressional Budget Office, who is our official, nonpartisan, number-crunching agency, and I asked that question.

Is this true? Is this true that no jobs were created because of those recovery dollars?

And he said, according to their statistics, up to 3.3 million jobs were saved or created in this country because of that investment. So it wasn't just the 54,000 jobs in the road-building industry back home, much less the other industries. It is the nearly 3.3 million jobs that were helped because of our influx of cash because, at that time, face it, the economy was down.

If people aren't working, they're not spending money. If they're not spending money, businesses can't grow. If businesses can't grow, they can't hire workers. In fact, just the opposite, they were laying off workers, and it has a cumulative spiral effect down.

But because of those recovery dollars we were able to hold off how deep we fell and, since then, under this President, we have had consecutive job creation happening to try to make up for those very deep losses that we had at the end of the Bush administration.

But we still need to grow even faster, and that's why we need to continue to work this. When we continue to work hard on creating jobs, we are helping people to be able to help pay taxes and to bring the revenue in so that we can solve our deficit. That is the single best way to solve the deficit.

And again, that same Congressional Budget Office that we all go to, on both sides of the aisle, to get our facts and figures that we work off of, they're the ones who said three-quarters of the deficit we'll have in fiscal year 2014, that we just voted on a budget in this House today on, is caused by economic weakness. In other words, unemployment and underemployment. You fix that, you solve the deficit.

So we don't need to take away the Affordable Care Act and take away all of the benefits that you're going to have from the Affordable Care Act; the fact that an adult child at 26 can still be on a parent's policy, that if you have a preexisting condition, you still have access to health care in this country.

You don't need to repeal that in order to solve the deficit. In fact, just the opposite. We have savings in there that will help reduce the rising cost of health care, because that's a challenge.

I think everyone in this room would agree that we have a challenge of rising health care costs, but we can address that very primarily by keeping that law in place.

But the Republicans have taken that away. In fact, the Republican budget, it's been estimated, would cost 2 million jobs next year if it were to become law. We need a very, very different process and a very, very different place for this country to be.

As a small business owner, I have been an advocate in this House of saying, you can be pro-business, you can be pro-labor. I have a union business. And you can be a progressive. None of those are incompatible.

Again, to me, one of the smartest things that I was ever able to do, as a small business owner, was to have a union shop, because it allowed me to hire some of the best and most talented people, to offer them a fair wage so they can support their families, offer them good benefits so they have health care and are in a better place for their families. And it's a mutual respect that we have that allows it to continue.

It's so important that we have that respect for the people who work in this country, for the middle class, and for those who are aspiring to be in the middle class. That is the backbone of the country we have to fight on.

So when the Republican version of the budget, instead, is going to take trillions of dollars and put it on the backs of the middle class, it's the reason why the Democrats, instead, were looking at getting rid of some of the loopholes that are out there, whether it be the subsidies to Big Oil that we still do, the corporate jet loophole, that they still fund tax breaks for corporate jets, the fact that we give tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas, none of that makes sense.

So the Democrats are working hard to try to take care of that, because we know that the backbone, again, is people getting to work in America, and part of the strength of that is the union movement that we have.

So I would hope that people would really realize that it is because of the labor movement that we have been able to benefit so very much from what has been able to support the middle class in this country.

There is so much more that unions are facing across the country, whether it be collective bargaining laws, the right to work less for less laws that we just saw happen in Michigan and other places. It's those sort of laws that sound good on the surface but really hurt the American worker. When you hurt the American worker, that's a serious problem.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, again, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, we are so proud to have spent a little time to talk about the middle class and the American labor movement and what it's done for America.

We salute our brothers and sisters in organized labor, thank them for their efforts, and vow to continue to fight on behalf of the middle class, and to make sure that they all have protections and standards by following our laws and passing more laws that give workers a voice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LABOR, LABOR LAW AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, again it's my privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this great deliberative body. And I listened to the presentation in the previous segment, it brought a number of things to mind that I expect I'll address because there certainly is a different viewpoint, as we all know.

But before I get into the breadth and depth of the topic matter, I'd be very pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ADDRESSING SECURITY CONCERNS

Mr. PERRY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call attention to legislation addressing security concerns that were drawn out in the aftermath of the September 2012 attack on our consulate in Benghazi, Libya. As you know, terrorist attacks carried out that year took the lives, needlessly, of four brave Americans.

In December, the Accountability Review Board released its findings and recommendations. This Board found that, prior to the Benghazi attack, some senior State Department officials demonstrated, as they coin it, a serious lack of management and leadership ability that contributed to the inadequate security posture at the consulate.

Now, while this Board can recommend disciplinary action against State Department employees who are found to breach a duty, they also concluded that poor performance in the course of one's employment does not amount to such a breach of duty, which I find fascinating and completely unacceptable. As completely unacceptable as that is, it also requires legislation to change that.

So, while I disagree that it should require legislation, it does. And with that in mind, I have drafted a bill, with the help of the honorable gentlelady from New York (Ms. MENG) that adjusts these criteria.

With this legislation, if the Board finds that a State Department employee's unsatisfactory performance or misconduct has significantly contributed to a security incident, the Board can recommend that the employee be disciplined appropriately. I would ask, at this time, that all our colleagues join us in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his presentation here. And as I listened to his presentation, the Benghazi incident comes to mind. And whether this is relevant or not is a question that I'm not necessarily prepared to answer, Mr. Speaker.

But I do want to make a statement on Benghazi. And I would remind people that we lost an Ambassador, we lost other brave Americans. We had multiple injuries and casualties there that perhaps, they run in numbers that might be counted in the dozens.

□ 1300

The public doesn't yet know a single name of any of the survivors. None of those on, let me say, our side of this argument of the incident in Benghazi know a single name of the survivors. We don't know the depth of the injuries that took place—and some of them were severely injured. They've been kept under wraps. They've been told, purportedly by the news, Mr. Speaker, that they should not speak and talk about what happened in Benghazi.

Now, I remember when Osama bin Laden met his justifiable end. This administration couldn't wait to come out before the cameras and tell us how that all unfolded and couldn't wait to tell us about every detail that wasn't classified on the end of Osama bin Laden's rein as the head of al Qaeda. They even showed us a picture of the situation room and who was in it. We saw the expressions on the faces of the people in the situation room, including the President, including the Secretary of State, including the Secretary of Defense. And we knew when they came into the situation room, when they heard the reports, how the decisions were made in that White House, and we knew when people left the situation room perhaps to go do something else. I don't remember any of them just simply going to bed.

But what we don't know is this—and this is what this Congress needs to put together. We need a committee that's comprised of the best individuals that we can find from the relevant committees here in this Congress, or any other individuals in this Congress that have special expertise that would raise their knowledge base and their credibility to the point where we can get the maximum report coming out of this Congress.

The circumstances that we have today on looking into the Benghazi incident and the events that flowed from that are several committees that have part of the jurisdiction. The Select Committee on Intelligence has part of the jurisdiction, and they've held some hearings and they have some knowledge. We don't know what that is. Much of it is classified. Much of it just isn't disseminated because that's not the nature of the Select Committee on Intelligence to disseminate information to the public.

Another area might be our Judiciary Committee, under the jurisdiction of what was lawful and what wasn't lawful on what took place there and what might we have been able to do. The Foreign Relations Committee has some jurisdiction. Armed Services has some jurisdiction. That's four committees that I can name off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker. Each of them have taken some kind of look into this.

But here's what happens. If you take a situation like Benghazi, or any major incident, and you break it down into four components and you assign, or the jurisdiction of each committee chair would look at this and claim jurisdiction, which they rightfully can do in this Congress, they would take their component of it, study it. They might write out a report, and it might be complete and it might be completely accurate. They can send that out, the unclassified portion, to the American people. That report goes out. Say that's the Select Committee on Intel.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee can meet and they can call the witnesses that they choose to and gather that information and perhaps write a completely objective and completely truthful report and send it out to the public, all of that that's not classified. The same thing can happen with the Armed Services Committee. The same thing can happen with the Judiciary Committee or any other committees that might have some jurisdiction.

But, invariably, what you have are silos of information—a silo of information coming out of the Select Committee on Intel, part of it classified that would stay in there; a silo of information coming out of Armed Services, out of Judiciary, out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. And these silos of information, just like silos, don't match up. You can't square the circle with the information that comes because there are gaps in their jurisdiction and because there are gaps in the expertise that doesn't match together like a hand in glove or a finely machined gear. And even if they did match perfectly, you would still have four reports from four different committees presented to the public. Each one would have to be deciphered by whom? Scholars? The press? Who might it be?

So if we are going to get to the bottom of Benghazi, we've got to put together a selected committee that represents all of the jurisdictions in the United States Congress and all of the oversight in the United States Congress. And if we do that, then we have the kind of committee, a commission, that is similar in nature to that of the 9/11 Commission, or the Warren Commission, which produced, in the end, one composite report, a book, Mr. Speaker, that the American people can look at, that they can count on it being factual, they can count on it being objective. They can count on it, and they can critique it if they have information out there that challenges it.

The Warren Report was challenged, but it stands still as an accurate representation of the facts of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. The 9/11 Commission stands alone. That report stands alone as the broadest and most objective and complete report that Congress could put together. And we have acted and reacted on recommendations from the 9/11 Commission.

We need to do the same thing with Benghazi. If we do not, Mr. Speaker, history will forever question whether there was a coverup on what happened in Benghazi. In fact, we already know there has been. We know that the administration went out and sent Susan Rice out to five different talk shows on Sunday, just several days later, to tell us that all of this violence that erupted in the streets of Benghazi came about because of a movie, a video that was produced.

Now, as far as I know, the individual that exercised his First Amendment rights to produce that video may still be in jail. That's the only punishment that's come out, that I know of, from Benghazi. I think he should be released. But that's the first story.

And then we've got different stories that were brought out of the administration, pried out, because usually the press, but sometimes an American citizen, found that information, got it out on the Internet, the press found it, and we've been picking up pieces of Benghazi for 6 months. And we still don't have the truth. The people who survived Benghazi need to come before this Congress, under oath, and tell us their story.

Now, if there are components of this that are classified, if our national security is at risk, then Members of this Congress should be called into a classified setting and told these are the reasons why we're covering this up. If this administration came open with Members of Congress, we would honor the reasons for a classified standing, but they have not. They tried to cover it up in the first place. They tried to convince us it was a video.

Since that time, the argument was made that there was no military relief that could have come into Benghazi because it was logistically not possible. That, I would say, is questionable at best. Piece after piece needs to come out into the public, Mr. Speaker. And I'm a strong advocate for FRANK WOLF's proposal that we set up that committee to examine all of this and produce a report for the American people.

And so that's simply triggered by my questions when I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. And I would expect that you would ask to yield if any of that was inaccurate.

I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SACRIFICE OF NORTH CAROLINA'S MASON VANDERWORK

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Marine Corps veteran Lance Corporal Mason Vanderwork of Hickory, North Carolina.

After multiple tours of duty defending liberty abroad, this 21-year-old hero gave his last full measure of devotion this week in service to our country. We can never adequately thank him or his loved ones for all they have given, nor can most fully grasp the weight of freedom's burden on young servicemembers and their families. But in spite of our incomprehension, our hearts go out to Lance Corporal Vanderwork's wife, Taylor; his mother, Melissa; and his sister, Katelyn.

What I have learned of Mason is striking.

Before graduating from Hickory's St. Stephen's High School, where he was regarded for his work ethic on the field and off, he knew he wanted to join the ranks of America's Marine Corps. Days after graduating, that's exactly what he did. Friends and neighbors recall his kindness and the high caliber of his friendship. They know him as a good man with a drive to become an even better man.

How sad we are for this great loss. In this time of tragedy, the country is sobered by the breadth of Mason Vanderwork's sacrifice and mourns alongside the people of Hickory. May we remember his loved ones in our thoughts and prayers and commit them to the care of Almighty God.

□ 1310

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, and saying a prayer myself: God bless that marine and the United States of America.

As we do this transition here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take up some of the topic of the previous speaker in the Democrat hour who spoke about labor and labor law. It was a strong message from often the opposite side of my viewpoint, and I'm compelled to speak to it in this way, and that is this:

First of all, labor is a commodity; it's a commodity like corn or beans or gold or oil. That labor is the supply, and its demand of labor sets the price of it, just like any other commodity. Yes, it's human beings and it's lives and it's families. As an employer, I met payroll for over 28 years—1,400-and-some consecutive weeks. There were times that we didn't go to the grocery store during those hard economic times because we met payroll first. That was always the highest priority. The first cash that came into King Construction in the worst years, even when the bank was closed by the FDIC, I met payroll.

When that bank was closed, it was, let me see, April 26, Friday afternoon at 3 o'clock. They posted a highway patrolman outside the door with a red tag on the front of it. I found out that they had not only closed up my account, but the accounts of many of my customers. I actually reached into my pocket because I literally had two pennies in my pocket to rub together—it's almost a joke around our family. We still met payroll. We found a way to do it even though I couldn't write a check because the bank was closed.

I thank a lot of the people that work for King Construction and the people that we have worked with and for throughout the years. I've been in the trenches with them. I'm the guy that if they're on an air conditioned cab in a machine, I'm down in the ditch with a shovel. I want to make that job go as good as it can.

I walked in my office before Christmas one year and I found that my secretary had decorated our Christmas tree in the entryway of the King Construction office with these gold decorations printed out like a Christmas tree—a baby Jesus, a snowflake, a star of Bethlehem. When I looked at that tree and I looked at the decorations, the gold emblems, on the front side was engraved the name of one of our employees, or their spouse, or one of their children. These were the people that I went to work with every day, our employees; but the tree was decorated with the names of all the people that were directly affected by those jobs being available.

We would never be a company that's looking at soon celebrating our 40th year in business if it weren't for people that had worked for us for a long time and been part of this family. When there is a death, we go to the funeral of a family member. When there's a baptism, we go to the baptism. When there's a wedding, we go to the wedding. These are people that are like family—actually, there is even occasionally a little connection of blood that goes on, but it's like family, it is family. I have great respect for the people that do labor every day. And I am a blue collar guy here and at home in Iowa.

But there are two viewpoints here. Another point I want to make, though, is that labor has a right to collectively bargain. They have a right to bargain as a bargaining group is another way to define that. Nobody has a right to intimidate others. Nobody has a right to be heavy-handed about it, but they do have a right to bargain, and I will always defend their right to bargain.

But one of the points that is a big problem for our budget, for example, is this: that the organized labor unions in this country strongly support and promote the Davis-Bacon Act. Now, Davis-Bacon is a law that was passed back in the early thirties by a couple of Republicans from New York. Now, they remind me that it was Republicans that passed that law. I would be the last guy to stand here and say that Republicans are always a hundred percent right, but they were wrong when they did that.

They wrote Davis-Bacon, this Federal law that requires that any construction project that has $2,000 or more Federal dollars in it shall be by prevailing wage. The definition of prevailing wage, then, is they go out and survey the pay scale and the benefits package that is normal and typical within that labor market. I can say with utter confidence that that scale is a union scale, not a prevailing wage, but a union scale. They're the people that negotiate this. The people that sit down on the boards and the panels do so. They're not measuring prevailing wage; they're simply measuring union scale and applying that to the Davis-Bacon wage scale.

The result is these projects, these Federal projects cost an average of 22 percent more. Now, I have records that go back for years. We do some Davis-Bacon wage scale projects and some are not, so we're flipping back and forth. We've got a pretty good set of records that we've accumulated over the years. In our records, someplace between 8 and 35 percent is the percentage of increase in the cost of a project where there is a federally imposed wage scale. Part of that time is they doesn't know what the wage scale is, and part of the time it is because they're imposing at higher wage than prevailing wage. Part of the reason for that gap is some projects are material intensive and other projects are labor intensive, so you get that gap between 8 and 35 percent. But a standard here is 22 percent—I often say 20—22 percent increase.

Now, think of that; think what this means. If this Congress were fiscally responsible and they looked at the unnecessary spending that is part of the prescription of the Davis-Bacon wage scale mandate, then we would see the cost of our Federal project—if we repealed Davis-Bacon, we'd see the cost of our Federal projects be reduced by 22 percent.

Now, what would that mean? If there are Federal dollars in a school, that means we could build five schools instead of four. You know there's Federal dollars in a lot of our roads. We could build five miles of roads instead of four. We could build five miles of interstate highway, for example, instead of four miles of interstate highway. We could build five bridges instead of four.

How many roads would have been built by now if we hadn't had the federally mandated Davis-Bacon wage scale put in place? How far would we be with our infrastructure? We're a long ways behind in our bridge reconstruction in particular, but also our highway construction. And every year that I've been in this Congress people come to me and they will say we have to raise the road use tax because we don't have enough money to build our roads.

Now, road use tax, that really should cause a person to think. That is a user's fee. We pay it in the gas that we buy. We expect that when that nozzle goes into our tank and when we squeeze the nozzle to buy the gas, we watch the dollars—and they go up really fast when you see gas that's over four bucks a gallon—we watch those dollars go up on the pump. But we also realize that between the State and the Federal Government a lot of us are paying 40-plus cents a gallon to build the road that we're wearing out with the car we're putting the gas in. That's a user's fee. But when I came here and started to break this down and ask the question: Of that one dollar's worth of gas tax/user fee that is a Federal piece of this—18.3 cents a gallon—of one dollar of that, how much of that actually goes into roads and bridges? I'll tell you, it adds up like this—then we reduce it a little bit on this number:

Three percent, 3 cents out of that dollar went for trails, for bike trails and automobile trails and that kind of thing—3 percent. There was at one time $16 million in one of our appropriation bills to clean graffiti off the

retaining walls in New Jersey. I thought, can't they get their prisoners out there with a wire brush to do that? And 28 percent going for environmental and archaeological compliance studies and costs. Twenty-eight cents out of that dollar for environmental interests and archaeological interests, looking for arrowheads and endangered species. Can't somebody else pay for that rather than the people that are driving on these roads? When you add Davis-Bacon to that, another 22 percent.

So you have 3 percent for trails, you have 28 percent for archaeological and environmental compliance, you've got 20 to 22 percent for Davis-Bacon wage scale, and 17 percent for mass transit to buy people cheap Metro tickets in Washington, D.C., or subway tickets in New York, or the ''el'' in Chicago, or, what shall I say, the cable cars in San Francisco, subsidized by people buying gas. Add that all up and you're going to find—if you're good at math and paying attention, Mr. Speaker—that number comes to about 67 or 68 cents out of the dollar that goes for something else other than roads and bridges.

Now, how can we justify raising a user fee on the gas tax, as we call it, rather than re-prioritizing that gas-tax-dollar pie, where you get a third of the money that's going to roads and bridges and two-thirds of the money that's going to something else? That needs to be fixed. I appreciate the gentleman that spoke earlier. If he would take a stand on that, perhaps we could find a bipartisan solution.

□ 1320

Another issue, though, is child labor. He made the argument that it was the unions that drove the child labor issue and now kids don't have to worry when they go to work. That's true, because there's no place for them to work. Hardly anywhere can young people work.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask you to think about, let me say, some years ago there was a time when you could pull into any gas station and some young lad would come running out there with a rag in his back pocket. He would fill your car up. He would wash your windshield, check your oil, check your tires, and collect your money and send you on your way. That doesn't happen anymore. There are few of those full-service stations left. One of the big reasons is child labor laws.

Today, child labor laws are written in such a way that a 17-year-old young person that is awaiting their 18th birthday can't get on the riding lawnmower and cut the grass around the gas station for pay because that's a violation of child labor laws. They can climb in a car at age 16 in my State and drive wherever they choose to go, but they can't mow the lawn in the gas station that they pull up into to buy their gas.

We saw this administration push child labor laws in trying to get it pushed into the agriculture sector. It was the Department of Labor working with the Department of Agriculture to write rules like, unless you're a son or a daughter of somebody that's got controlling interest in a farm—in other words, you can't be loaned out or, as we say in my country, farmed out to the neighbors or to your kid's aunt and uncle or grandparents to do work. They prohibited youth from participating in herding livestock in a confined area, from being more than 6 feet off the ground so they couldn't paint the under eaves on the machine shed, from having anything to do with livestock that inflicts pain, like ear tagging or tail docking or clipping eye teeth or dewclaws on puppies, for example. They prohibited them from being involved in that, but that same girl that's prohibited from being around when you ring the hog can have her ears pierced—or any other part for that matter—without any objection from the same people that are advocating this.

We have a nanny state that's run amok, Mr. Speaker. It's gone overboard with child labor laws and tried to push these child labor laws into agriculture. There was a major pushback because the family farm understood the value of work for our youth. They manage the safety best on those farms. They care the most about the people that are there. And the Federal Government would only interfere, and then that child would not have the experience of learning the work ethic by going to the neighbor's or aunt and uncle's or grandpa and grandma's.

So even though the labor unions have made, I think, a big contribution with regard to on-the-job safety—the reference to OSHA and the history of that was a good thing. The organization of labor unions to negotiate for better working conditions and wages and benefits package was a good thing. But there has to be some restraint on this. We can't be going backwards.

This statement about a fair wage, well, we should be thinking, what is ''fair,'' Mr. Speaker? You can look up the definition of ''fair'' in Black's Law, and you'll find a whole series of definitions for ''fair.''

I say the only time you should use the word ''fair'' when you're talking about law is when you're talking about the State fair or the county fair or the World's Fair, because otherwise, when you use the word ''fair'' to talk about justice and equity, you finally come to this point that everybody has got a different view on what the word ''fair'' means.

Anyone that's raised two or more children, Mr. Speaker, knows that there's no such thing as ''fair.'' If you apply a rule to one child, the other child will say, ''That's not fair.'' And if you apply the same rule to the other child, there will be a reason why the first one should be exempted. We can never agree on the word ''fair.'' We don't agree on what a fair wage is. That's why supply and demand needs to establish the wage, not somebody's idea of fairness.

The statement about a living wage—a living wage. Well, a living wage for someone in New York City is different from a living wage for someone that lives, let's say, in a low-cost rural area that might be in the Midwest, for example. These definitions of fair wage and living wage are all ways to lever some kind of Federal imposition in that distorts the law of supply and demand.

So that takes me around to this concluding part, Mr. Speaker, which is that the law of supply and demand has caused people to come into the United States illegally and take jobs for a cheaper price than allows for them to live in this society. The result of that is that the cost for people who are in this country illegally—just for the welfare parts that they access—is right at $55 billion. If they are legalized in the form that is advocated on the other end of the rotunda in here, Democrats and Republicans, in other words, their comprehensive immigration reform and all the other adjectives they use to avoid using the word ''amnesty,'' the cost goes from $55 billion a year to $75 billion a year. If you track this group of people—we're talking about 11.2 million people. If you track them for a lifetime, the cost of the welfare benefits becomes $2.5 trillion.

So, think, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed ObamaCare. This is right at near the anniversary of that. Today we voted to repeal it within the, I'll call it, the Ryan budget. That's about $2.5 trillion as it extrapolates itself out on the budget scale. On top of that, ObamaCare dropped $2.5 trillion of debt on the American public. If comprehensive immigration reform, slash, amnesty passes this Congress, that drops another $2.5 trillion of debt on the American people.

What we need is a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution, and we need that passed out of the House and out of the Senate with a cap at 18 percent of GDP and a supermajority required in order to raise taxes or to break the debt ceiling that we have, to increase the debt ceiling.

If we do that, if we put a balanced budget amendment out here on the floor of the House and the Senate and if it passes, I'll be ready to look at increasing the debt ceiling for the President. If that doesn't happen, I don't see a reason to raise the debt ceiling. Let's stare him down on that until somebody gives in.

We need to get this spending under control. Myopic policies and fiscally irresponsible policies are not the way to go. ObamaCare needs to be repealed. We need to restore the rule of law in this country. We've got to shrink down the welfare package that's out here. There are 80 different means-tested welfare programs in the United States—just 2½ trillion for the illegal component of this and a whole lot more

if we don't get these entitlements under control.

Mr. Speaker, the solutions are here. They're on this side of the aisle. They're actually in the platform, and I endorse many of them. I appreciate your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 25, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8271] received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

813. A letter from the Investigative Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule -Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under Section 1558 of the Affordable Care Act [Docket No.: OSHA-2011-0193] (RIN: 1218-AC79) received March 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

814. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additional Safeguards for Children in Clinical Investigations of Food and Drug Administration-Regulated Products [Docket No.: FDA-2000-N-0009] (formerly 2000N-0074) (RIN: 0910-AG71) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

815. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Models for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-535, Revision 0, ''Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs'', Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process [Project No.: 753; NRC-2012-0280] received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

816. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC495) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

817. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XC456) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

818. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XC437) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

819. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XC451) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

820. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC481) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

821. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC487) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

822. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC482) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

823. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC441) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

824. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-2] (RIN: 0648-XC452) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

825. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal To 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC458) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

826. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 38 [Docket No.: 120717247-3029-02] (RIN: 0648-BC37) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

827. A letter from the Director, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Application Procedures and Criteria for Approval of Nonprofit Budget and Credit Counseling Agencies by United States Trustees [Docket No.: EOUST 102] (RIN: 1105-AB17) received March 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

828. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Government Employees Serving in Official Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations; Sector Unit Investment Trusts (RIN: 3209-AA09) received March 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1157; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-17371; AD 2013-04-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

830. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1164; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-075-AD; Amendment 39-17370; AD 2013-04-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

831. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hot Springs, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0655; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-6] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

832. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Impact and Related Procedures [Docket No.: FHW-2012-0092] (RIN: 2125-AF46) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

833. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1224; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-17372; AD 2013-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

834. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes

[Docket No.: FAA-2012-0721; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-17356; AD 2013-03-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

835. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft-Manufactured Model S-64F Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0689; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-17301; AD 2012-26-06) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

836. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0909; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-17374; AD 2013-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

837. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Insurer Reporting Requirements [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0024] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

838. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorages; Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0159] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

839. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1015; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-069-AD; Amendment 39-17363; AD 2013-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

840. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updates to Standards Incorporated by Reference; Reapproved ASTM Standards; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0866] (RIN: 1625-AA98) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

841. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Docket No.: FAA-2012-1106; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-084-AD; Amendment 39-17341; AD 2013-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

842. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1037; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-17373; AD 2013-0501] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

843. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronauiche Tecnam srl Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1173; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-038-AD; Amendment 39-17367; AD 2013-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

844. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0860; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-17369; AD 2013-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

845. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0720; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-059-AD; Amendment 39-17360; AD 2013-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

846. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0861; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-074-AD; Amendment 39-17364; AD 2013-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

847. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; Houston, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0079; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

848. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1159; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-17368; AD 2013-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

849. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sault Ste Marie, ON [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0791; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-9] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

850. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0091; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-17366; AD 2013-02-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

851. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Goldsboro, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0610; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-28] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

852. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0360; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-077-AD; Amendment 39-17362; AD 2013-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

853. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Reims Aviation S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1274; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-042-AD; Amendment 39-17359; AD 2013-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

854. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gaylord, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1401; Airspace Docket No. 11-AGL-27] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

855. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Casper, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0509; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-15] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

856. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; Tampa, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0080; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWA-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

857. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30887; Amdt. No. 3522] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

858. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1172; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-17365; AD 2013-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

859. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30888; Amdt. No. 3523] received March 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

860. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Commercial Acquisition; Extension of Suspension and Debarment Exclusions, Grants and Cooperative Agreements (RIN: 2700-AD81) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

861. A letter from the Director, Industry Analysis, Office of Policy, Import Administration, ITA, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Steel Import Monitoring and Analysis System [Docket No.: 121016549-2549-01] (RIN: 0625-AA93) received March 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce predation on endangered Columbia River salmon and other nonlisted species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1309. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to exclude pathologists from incentive payments and penalties under Medicare and Medicaid relating to the meaningful use of electronic health records; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare payment option for patients and eligible professionals to freely contract, without penalty, for Medicare fee-for-service items and services, while allowing Medicare beneficiaries to use their Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 1311. A bill to prohibit certain grants under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to States that do not provide for certain minimal terms of imprisonment for certain child abusers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FARR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1313. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1314. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1315. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to revise the regulations regarding the Do-not-call registry to prohibit politically-oriented recorded message telephone calls to telephone numbers listed on that registry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1316. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to specify the responsibilities of the Directors and Assistant Directors of Veterans' Employment and Training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 1317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WATT, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1318. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1319. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to expand coverage under plans of insurance available under such Act to include losses to an insured commodity when, as a result of a federally-imposed quarantine, the commodity must be destroyed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 1320. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 1321. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1322. A bill to establish educational seminars at United States ports of entry to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to classify and appraise articles that are imported into the United States in accordance with the customs laws of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax-preferred Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for wages paid to employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1325. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare entitlement to immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant recipients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 1326. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for increased price transparency of hospital information and to provide for additional research on consumer information on charges and out-of-pocket costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1327. A bill to improve United States humanitarian and other assistance to the Syrian people, facilitate the transition of Syria to a democratic government, provide for United States support to the post-Assad government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1328. A bill to reauthorize the Great Ape Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1329. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1330. A bill to increase purchasing power, strengthen economic recovery, and restore fairness in financing higher education in the United States through student loan forgiveness, caps on interest rates on Federal student loans, and refinancing opportunities for private borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HARRIS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend certain requirements and penalties implemented under the Medicare and Medicaid programs by the HITECH Act of 2009, which would otherwise impede eligible professionals from adopting electronic health records to improve patient care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend titles 10 and 41, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1334. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1335. A bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to disclose the minimum purchase price that such an enterprise will accept on the short sale of a residence financed by a mortgage purchased by such an enterprise in order to make short sales a viable alternative to foreclosure; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for taxpayers making gifts with their returns of income tax to the Federal Government to pay down the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1337. A bill to restrict funds for the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1338. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reassert the authority of Congress to restrict spending by corporations and labor organizations on campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FARR, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1339. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide grants for Urban Jobs Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1341. A bill to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to conduct a study of the likely effects of the differences between the United States and other jurisdictions in implementing the derivatives credit valuation adjustment capital requirement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1342. A bill to repeal provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act relating to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for science, technology, engineering, and math education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1345. A bill to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System lands and public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to index future increases to such wage to increases in the consumer price index; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1347. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal lands in Yuma County, Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1348. A bill to establish the Great Bend of the Gila National Monument in the

State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1349. A bill to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H.R. 1350. A bill to withdraw the Tusayan Ranger District and Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the vicinity of Kanab Creek and in House Rock Valley from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1352. A bill to provide for the protection of the quality of water in the Lower Colorado River and the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan for the prevention and elimination of pollution in the Lower Colorado River and the maintenance of a healthy Lower Colorado River ecosystem; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for higher education expenses in a program of study in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to stimulate international tourism to the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1355. A bill to replace certain Federal nutrition programs with a block grant to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FARR, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COOK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. CHU, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 1356. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1444 Main Street in Ramona, California, as the ''Nelson 'Mac' MacWilliams Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to improve the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program by providing assistance under such program for certain training programs that are considered less than full-time; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1358. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1359. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the cost of any transportation provided by the Secretary to Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives or Senate who are carrying out official duties outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1360. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1361. A bill to terminate or retire certain aircraft and ship programs of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend the definition of a law enforcement officer under subchapter III of chapter 83 and chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, to ensure the inclusion of certain positions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 1363. A bill to promote timely exploration for geothermal resources under existing geothermal leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage alternative energy investments and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1366. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to modify the approval of any drug containing controlled-release oxycodone hydrochloride to limit such approval to use for the relief of severe-only instead of moderate-to-severe pain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure program integrity, transparency, and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1368. A bill to assist States in providing voluntary high-quality universal prekindergarten programs and programs to support infants and toddlers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1369. A bill to prohibit the sale of a firearm to, and the purchase of a firearm by, a person who is not covered by appropriate liability insurance coverage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1370. A bill to require a site operator of an international travel Web site to provide information on its Web site to consumers regarding the potential health and

safety risks associated with overseas vacation destinations marketed on its Web site; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1371. A bill to restore to the Indian Health Service funds sequestered under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to the extent that the percentage reduction for that program exceeded 2 percent; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1372. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a registry of certain veterans who were stationed at or underwent training at Canadian Forces Base Gagetown, New Brunswick, Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 1373. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make various reforms to Social Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 1375. A bill to facilitate the development of wind energy resources on Federal lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1376. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the ''Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 1377. A bill to authorize the Mescalero Apache Tribe to lease adjudicated water rights; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1378. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the ''James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow certain hospitals in Puerto Rico to qualify for incentives for adoption and meaningful use of certified EHR Technology under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1380. A bill to require the Public Printer to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a constituent-driven program that collects priority coastal geospatial data and supports an information platform capable of efficiently integrating coastal data with decision support tools, training, and best practices to inform and improve local, State, regional, and Federal capacities to manage the coastal region; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend title XIV of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to equalize the treatment of States and outlying areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1384. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1385. A bill to amend title VI of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safe use of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1386. A bill to support the local decision-making functions of local educational agencies by limiting the authority of the Secretary of Education to issue regulations, rules, grant conditions, and guidance materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt certain perishable agricultural commodities from the goods whose sale or distribution in commerce may be prohibited subsequent to a violation of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 1388. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on bitolylene diisocyanate (TODI); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1389. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on abortions at medical facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to urban Medicare-dependent hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr.

RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 1391. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Joshua B. McDaniels and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 1392. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2539 Dartmoor Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the ''Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 1393. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3700 Riverside Drive in Columbus, Ohio, as the ''Master Sergeant Jeffery J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1394. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a weekend and holiday feeding program to provide nutritious food to at-risk school children on weekends and during extended school holidays during the school year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1396. A bill to provide for the inclusion of the State of California as a separate Federal milk marketing order upon the petition and approval of California dairy producers of such inclusion; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WATT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1397. A bill to create jobs and reinvest in communities through the rehabilitation of abandoned and foreclosed residential and commercial properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1398. A bill to facilitate the development of offshore wind energy resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1399. A bill to reauthorize the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that children of certain veterans are eligible for the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WATT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAHN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Res. 131. A resolution concerning the ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the need for international efforts toward long-term peace, stability, and observance of human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 132. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 133. A resolution commending the progress made by anti-tuberculosis programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS):

H. Res. 134. A resolution condemning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for its continuing acts of aggression, its expressed intent to break the July 10, 1953, Korean War Armistice Agreement, and for its repeated violations of United Nations Security Council resolutions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H. Res. 135. A resolution recognizing the importance of frontline health workers toward accelerating progress on global health and saving the lives of women and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 136. A resolution urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. Res. 137. A resolution recognizing the security challenges of convening government officials in one specific place and directing the House of Representatives to take appropriate steps so that the House of Representatives can meet in a virtual setting; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Res. 138. A resolution expressing support for designation of a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 139. A resolution honoring the life of the Honorable Larcenia J. Bullard; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona introduced a bill (H.R. 1401) for the relief of Jose Luis Alvarado Cardenas; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Current law has created a regulatory structure over the health care system. In

order to make this system more compatible with a proper Constitutional structure, this bill will ensure that there is less regulation impeding the ability of pathologists to provide important services to patients and doctors.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. This bill ensures that the rights of Medicare beneficiaries to independently contract are not infringed by the federal government.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 1311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution which states ''Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 1317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises''), and the 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution; and

Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 1320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 1321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 1)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 1322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the sixteenth amendment

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the sixteenth amendment

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'' as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes' as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1. Article I. Section 8. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States of America, the authority to enact this legislation rests with the Congress.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Clause I and II of Section 8 of Article I and the XVI Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 1337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IV.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:
Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. FATTAH:
H.R. 1340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. FINCHER:
H.R. 1341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 1342.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause I, Congress has the ability to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and Amendment XVI.

By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 1343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 1344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 1345.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill addresses management of federal land. Accordingly, we turn to the following constitutional authority:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.
The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.
Currently, the federal government possesses approximately 1.8 billion acres of land. The U.S. Constitution specifically addresses the relationship of the federal government to lands. Article IV, §3, Clause 2—the Property Clause—gives Congress plenary power and full authority over federal property. The U.S. Supreme Court has described Congress's power to legislate under this Clause as ''without limitation.'' This bill falls squarely within the express Constitutional power set forth in the Property Clause. Congress has the right, if not the duty, to properly manage its public lands, including establishing forestation policies, and tree harvesting and tree salvaging.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 1346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1349.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section Atricle IV, Section 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 1353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:
H.R. 1354.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.1

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:
H.R. 1355.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is introduced under the authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by devolving the responsibility of providing food assistance for low income citizens to the states. It reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments are properly situated with attending to their citizens' health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 1356.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:
H.R. 1357.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 1358.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JONES:
H.R. 1359.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 5 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to determine the rules of its own proceedings, and Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make rules for the government and regulation of the armed forces.

By Mr. JONES:
H.R. 1360.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 1361.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 12:
To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 1362.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 6
The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LABRADOR:
H.R. 1363.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:
H.R. 1364.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
Amendment XVI of the Constitution

By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 1365.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1366.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1367.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 1368.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 1369.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 the Commerce Clause

By Mr. MARKEY:
H.R. 1370.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. McCOLLUM:
H.R. 1371.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. MICHAUD:
H.R. 1372.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:
H.R. 1373.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 & 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 1374.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MULLIN:
H.R. 1375.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:
H.R. 1376.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PEARCE:
H.R. 1377.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. PETERS of California:
H.R. 1378.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PIERLUISI:
H.R. 1379.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:
H.R. 1380.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROKITA:
H.R. 1381.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:
H.R. 1382.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 1383.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 1384.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 1385.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHOCK:
H.R. 1386.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 1387.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:
H.R. 1388.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:
H.R. 1389.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
the constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 1390.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 1391.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 1392.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 1393.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:
H.R. 1394.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV Section 3 clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 1395.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:
H.R. 1396.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 of Section 8 of Clause 7 and Article 1 of Section 8 of Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 1397.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses I, III, and XVIII of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WITTMAN:
H.R. 1398.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 1399.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:
H.R. 1400.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:
H.R. 1401.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8, clause 4

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 24: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 39: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 45: Mr. CARTER and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 138: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 139: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 148: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 164: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 223: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 258: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 262: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 280: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 309: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 311: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 312: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 324: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OLSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WOLF, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KIND, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 333: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BARBER, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 357: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 366: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 427: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 437: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 452: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MENG, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 484: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 486: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 494: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WATT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 508: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 509: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 510: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 511: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 530: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 563: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 565: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 569: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 570: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 580: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 594: Mr. FORBES and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 597: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 627: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DENT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 628: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 632: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 633: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 644: Ms. MENG and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 647: Mr. BARBER and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 666: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 673: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 675: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 688: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 693: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 698: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 699: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 702: Ms. TITUS, Mr. ENYART, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 713: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 714: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 715: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 718: Mr. FLORES and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 721: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BONNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 724: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 728: Mr. CLAY and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 732: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 742: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 755: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 760: Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 761: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 763: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 807: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 811: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 825: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 831: Mr. ENYART, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 846: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 847: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 850: Mr. FLORES, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 858: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 864: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 893: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 896: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 915: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 938: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 946: Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 949: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 958: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 961: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 997: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1005: Mr. COTTON, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1008: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1014: Mr. NEAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1026: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1038: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1040: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1063: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1070: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1077: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. POSEY and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1089: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1122: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1128: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1146: Mr. HARPER and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1149: Mr. BONNER and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1163: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1173: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1175: Ms. WATERS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1186: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1199: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1201: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1218: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1243: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1250: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1255: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1263: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1265: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1281: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1284: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1288: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1290: Mr. LONG and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1294: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1301: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 34: Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. HUDSON.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CAMP.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. MESSER.

H. Res. 10: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 30: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 36: Mr. MICA.

H. Res. 72: Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 108: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 112: Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 119: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H. Res. 129: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HALL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 130: Mr. DELANEY.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2013 No. 42

Senate

The Senate met at 9:00 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of all being, energize our Senators today with Your presence. Out of Your infinite wisdom, speak to their finite hearts and guide them on right paths. Out of Your marvelous grace, minister to their common needs. Lord, inspire them to cherish the ethical road that leads to a destination that honors You. Remind them that they may make plans, but Your purposes will prevail. Enable them to sense Your guidance as they grapple with the problems of our time.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Chair report the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as we just heard, the Senate has resumed consideration of the budget debate of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution. We will continue debate during today's session. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled, of course.

The budget has 34 hours left, and then following that, we will have some votes. It is up to the two managers of this bill if we have votes before the 34 hours expire. These are two experienced Senators and they know how to handle this budget, but it would seem to me that we should move as quickly as we can to debate these issues. I hope Senators come and offer their opinions as to the budget that Chairman MURRAY has brought to the Senate floor. Maybe some people will want to talk about what passed in the House yesterday, the Ryan Republican budget.

Everyone should understand that this time will run out at the latest at 7 p.m. tomorrow night. It seems to me the two managers could reduce that time somewhat. If they don't, it doesn't matter; we will be here until we finish this budget. If we are here all night Friday, we will be in all night Friday. I spoke to Senator MURRAY, and she was willing to be in all night last night; she is willing to be here all night tonight and all night Friday night until we finish this. We are going to move forward and finish this budget.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, three years ago this coming Saturday was a historic time in this country and in the world, actually, because the Affordable Care Act passed. It was a very wintry night when it passed—very cold. It was the greatest single step in generations to help the American people.

This was unique because for the first time—going back to the days of Harry Truman where he talked about a health care bill for the country, to Eisenhower, who talked about a health care bill for this country—we were finally able to accomplish it. We ensured access to quality, affordable health care for every American with ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

Millions and millions of Americans, as we speak, are benefiting from this legislation. Insurance companies can no longer arbitrarily place lifetime caps on insurance policies during someone's care. No longer can they suddenly say: Sorry, you have cancer or had that bad accident, but you reached $1,000—or whatever limit they set, $10,000—and you are through. Go get help someplace else because insurance is over. That arbitrary lifetime cap by insurance companies put Americans just a car accident or an illness away from doom.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Today children are no longer denied insurance because they were born with a disease, disability, or some other problem. They no longer are denied insurance. And being a woman, like my daughter, is no longer a preexisting medical condition. Before ObamaCare passed—and everyone needs to understand this—my daughter Lana had a preexisting condition; she was born a girl. That is gone.

In less than a year, about 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions such as high blood pressure or diabetes can rest assured they will have access to affordable insurance and lifesaving care regardless of their health and how much money they make.

In Nevada alone—a sparsely populated State of some 3 million people—tens of thousands of seniors have saved tens of millions of dollars because 3 years ago we filled the doughnut hole. What that means is they don't have to pay exorbitant prices for their prescription drug coverage.

Health care reform is not only saving money, it saves lives. In Nevada there are thousands of examples, but I will give one about a 26-year-old woman named Sarah Coffey Kugler, a native of Gardnerville, NV. Gardnerville is a beautiful place next to the Sierra Nevada mountains.

Well, this young lady, who was very smart—and still is—was half way through her first year of law school at the University of Connecticut when she was diagnosed with stage 4 Hodgkin's disease. Not stage 1, 2, or 3, but the worst, stage 4. She had done everything right. She knew she needed insurance, so she went to the University of Connecticut and bought the best plan she could for students so she would have health insurance. Due to her cancer and the difficult treatment to fight it, she had to drop out of school. She had no insurance because insurance would not cover her.

As I said, she was no longer a student and, as a result, no longer qualified for student health insurance. What was she to do? She needed a bone marrow transplant. She and her family thought there was a very strong possibility she would pass away.

Before ObamaCare, Sarah would have been one of tens of millions of Americans who desperately needed lifesaving care but didn't have insurance to take care of it. Before ObamaCare, Sarah might have even become 1 of the 45,000 Americans who die each year because they lacked health insurance. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, Sarah was able to sign on to her parents' insurance policy.

Sarah is 1 of 3.1 million young people in America—approximately 35,000 in Nevada—who have benefited from a law that allows children to stay on their parents' health plans until they are 26 years old.

Sarah's story has a happy ending, as so often happens in America where we can get health care. She got the treatment she needed. Her most recent PET scan was clear, and she plans to return to school this coming September and finish law school.

Her mother Sue sent me a letter. She wrote that ObamaCare and the dedicated doctors who took care of her daughter saved her life. There are so many legacies of this landmark legislation. No American will end up in an emergency room because they have no insurance. No American will live in fear of losing his or her insurance because they don't have a job. And in the richest Nation in the world, no insurance company ever again will put a pricetag on a human life.

Long, long ago Thomas Jefferson wrote: ''The care of human life and happiness . . . is the first and only object of good government.''

I am gratified that the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, meets Thomas Jefferson's standard. I am so happy this law came into being. For all of us who participated in that, we will always remember that cold winter when we were in session longer, I am told, than any other time in the history of the country to pass this legislation. We worked hard to pass it. It is already insuring the care of human life, which remains the first object of government, as Thomas Jefferson said it should.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank my ranking member, Senator SESSIONS. We had a good debate, and I think everyone had a chance to see the differences about the values and priorities that drive us, how we see our country, and our future. I am looking forward to having that conversation again today.

The budget we are debating on the floor this week puts our middle-class families first. It reflects our progrowth, pro-middle-class agenda that the American people went to the polls in support of at the election just a few months ago. It takes the kind of truly balanced approach that families across our country strongly support, and I believe it is a strong and responsible vision for building a foundation for growth and restoring the promise of American opportunity.

I spoke at length last night about our budget. It is built on three principles. No. 1, we have to protect our fragile economic recovery, create jobs, and invest in our long-term growth. This is something every family in America is asking us to focus on.

No. 2, we need to tackle our deficit and debt fairly and responsibly. As Democrats we understand it is a responsibility we bear today, and we do it in this budget. No. 3, we need to keep the promises we made as a Nation to our seniors, our families, and our communities. There are many people who have struggled so much over the last few years and they are counting on us to be there for them again now.

We are going to hear a lot more about all of these principles today, and we are going to discuss the stark contrast between the budget that is expected to move in the House of Representatives today and the plan and path we have put forward here in the Senate as Democrats.

At this time, I yield to Senator SESSIONS for his opening remarks, and we will continue this debate throughout the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair and express my appreciation to Senator MURRAY for her leadership, her courtesy, and her skill in managing the bill through the committee and on the floor. She is an experienced legislator who has strong convictions, but she is easy to work with, courteous, and effective in what she does every day. I thank Senator MURRAY, and I enjoy working with her.

Well, our Chair says this is a progrowth, pro-middle-class budget. I say it is a pro-tax, pro-spend, and pro-debt budget. It is a budget of deep disappointment. It is a budget that comes nowhere near doing the things necessary to put America on a sound path. It is a budget that does, indeed, reflect the stark differences between our parties. It is rather remarkable to me, the extent to which our majority party in the Senate has no interest in producing a budget that actually balances and actually puts America on the right path.

They say they care about growth, and I know they do. I know they would like to see the economy grow more and more jobs being created because we have had the slowest recovery during this recession since anytime after World War II, at least. It has been very, very slow. But we have done something to a degree we have never done before; that is, borrow and spend to stimulate the economy.

Someone has compared borrowing and spending to stimulate the economy to the idea of someone taking a bucket and scooping up water in one end of the swimming pool and pouring it into the other. We have no net gain. The truth is that we lose some of the water out of the bucket as we walk along the shore. In this case, what we lose is interest on the debt indefinitely because there is no plan to pay down the debt.

So this budget that is before us today does not balance, it does not put us on a sound path, it does not create confidence among the American citizens that the future is going to be sound, that we have gotten this country reoriented in a way that is going to produce long-term growth. Indeed, it is going to do exactly the opposite. It is going to do exactly the opposite. It says, once again, that this Senate is not willing to do the things necessary to put America on a sound course. And it is not that hard. We can do this. It is within our grasp. But our leadership in this Senate, contrary to the House, is not willing to take those good, solid but achievable steps necessary to put this country on a sound path. I just feel that very deeply.

Hopefully, in the context of our debate and a budget being moved through here on a party-line vote, I suppose, as it was in committee, maybe some connection will be made amongst ourselves and our Members and our brains about the real issues facing the country and what we need to do to get on the right path. And maybe even in conference, if not here on the floor, we can have some miraculous agreement that would create the kind of long-term confidence businesspeople and the American people are looking for from the U.S. Congress and the government.

Senator REID indicated he would like to finish. I would like to finish too. We were under the impression that we could have started this voting process on the budget as early as Monday, if not Tuesday. That could have happened. Apparently, the leadership decided to block amendments. That created, on this side, a number of Senators who felt very strongly that they, in fact, had relevant amendments and they wanted them voted on, and they would not agree to time limits until the majority agreed to give them a vote. Whether I was for or against the amendments is not relevant. I thought they should have been given a vote. They are Senators. A big bill moving forward, several appropriations bills cobbled together to fund the government, and we only have four or five amendments. Serious amendments, such as the Moran amendment with 28 cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats, was blocked. He couldn't get an amendment on a relevant issue involving the health and safety of America.

So that has put us behind in the schedule, not anything we have done. There was not a problem on this side. If they had been given amendments, they would have been done in very short order and could have been completed Monday or early Tuesday.

So here we are. We have under the law 50 hours of debate on the budget, 25 to a side, and an unlimited number of amendments can be offered. So that is going to take time, as it always does, and I am sorry it is getting pushed into the weekend.

I would also just say briefly that as time has gone by, I have been more and more convinced of what I believed from the beginning, which is that this Congress is not capable of producing a massive overhaul of the Federal health care program. I remember the night Senator REID refers to when the final passage, I guess, occurred or the day that it occurred. But what I remember most is being here Christmas Eve—my birthday—when the bill cleared the Senate on a straight party-line vote, 60 to 40. Senator Scott Brown of Massachusetts was elected on a promise to block and kill the legislation. The American people were consistently opposing the legislation. They were able to ram it through before he could take office and cast the deciding vote. They got the absolute minimum number of votes—60—to pass this monstrosity.

I am told now the regulations in the bill are 6 feet high when stacked. We still haven't seen them. That legislation has 1,700 references to this section to be effectuated by regulations to be issued by the department. Regulations continue to pour out in record numbers to try to clarify the hundreds and thousands of ambiguities in the bill.

We were told that people's health insurance premiums would go down, that this was going to bend the cost curve to bring health care costs down. We warned that would not happen. Who was correct 3 years ago? Health care costs are surging. They are not through surging yet. We are going to have more increases as the health care bill takes effect in January of next year. The average person's premium has already gone up $2,000-plus a year. Small businesses all over America are telling us they are not hiring because of the health care bill. This has clearly been a deficit and a detriment to job creation.

We had no ability to write this health care law. We didn't know enough about it. Speaker NANCY PELOSI said: Well, we have to write it to see what is in it. What she meant was that we are just going to pass some vision of health care reform and the bureaucrats will take care of it. Well, they are not taking care of it well. We are not capable of managing it.

We are endangering the greatest health care system the world has ever known. We are going to see fewer and fewer top-quality young people go into medicine. I am hearing that over and over again. Doctors are telling me they don't know what to tell their children about going into medicine.

This is just one example of what happens in this country when people in Washington take on the arrogant view that they know how to fix the health care system—one of the most massive, complex, marvelous systems the world has ever known.

You can go to Alabama and see some of the best doctors in the entire world in our State. People go there from all over the world. Dr. Andrews treated RG3 at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, his private practice in Birmingham. People can go to top-quality surgeons in Mobile, Montgomery—throughout the State—Auburn-Opelika, Tuscaloosa, Huntsville. This is true for every State in America.

For people to say our health care is not the best in the world—why do people come here from all over the world? That is one of the most horrible things I have ever heard, really, around here, suggesting we don't. So we have people who die sooner than in some other countries. We have a lot of causes. We have more obesity. We have more smoking. We have fewer people taking care of themselves sometimes. We have a lot of individual problems. We have a higher murder rate. We have high accident rates in automobiles. So we have things that pull down our lifespan, but that doesn't mean our health care isn't good. It doesn't mean our health care is not the best in the world. All of us have seen that.

Mr. President, I wish to ask Chairman MURRAY where we are now on going through the business of the day. I appreciate the chairman's leadership and suggestions as to going forward.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Absolutely. I am happy to get things going here today. Does the manager on the other side have an amendment he wishes to start with this morning?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to start with a motion, yes, and I am prepared to do that, and I thank the chairman.

I offer a motion to recommit this budget that is on the floor today to the committee with instructions that it be altered to produce a balanced budget.

That is what I think this Nation needs. I think that is what the American people want, and that is what we are determined to fight for because it is the right thing for the country, not because it is some green eyeshade goal. I have heard that argument, and that is not what is on our minds when we say: Let's balance the budget. It is not what the American people have on their minds when they say: Why don't you guys balance our budget?

What is it that is necessary here? We believe that if we alter our debt course in a responsible way and we begin to reduce the deficits regularly and steadily in an effective way, we can reach a balanced budget and we can keep on that balanced budget without cutting expenditures. The facts are quite clear that we can increase spending every year, just not as much as we are increasing spending today and just not as much as our Democratic budget increases spending. That is what we believe we should do. I will explain as we go forward how that can create jobs, create growth, will make this country healthier, will create confidence in the world financial community, will see more money come to the United States, and will allow businesses that are sitting on cash to begin to invest and hire people. That is the direction in which we should be going. That is what would be good for America.

But first and foremost, as I explained last night, the Democratic budget on the floor today comes nowhere close to that. It is nowhere close to setting forth a plan that would actually balance the budget. Indeed, the budget never balances under their plan, and it won't balance in the future. Things are only going to get worse. They are going to get worse because it deals in no way with the fundamental, driving forces of the debt this country faces. It does not deal with that. If we don't deal with those issues, then we are not going to get the debt under control. But we can do it. We can do it in a number of ways.

Now, the President has sent a very clear message. Recently on ABC, with George Stephanopoulos, the President said: And so, you know, my goal is not to chase a balanced budget just for the sake of balance.

Who said we are trying to chase a balanced budget just for the sake of balance? That is not what we are doing. We are trying to put America on a sound debt path. We are trying to put America on a sound financial path that will create confidence and avoid the danger of a fiscal crisis.

We started counting last night. My colleagues, yesterday and last night—I think we stopped counting—used the phrase ''balance'' 24 times: This is a balanced approach. It is a balanced plan. We are seeking primary balance. We are going to have a responsible, balanced plan.

Pretty soon, they will say they have a balanced budget. Well, they don't have a balanced budget. We need to understand that fully.

Secondly, the budget that has been produced does not even put us any closer to a balanced budget than we are today. When we add up the taxes that are being increased, when we add the new spending that is in this bill, it doesn't change the debt course at all.

Earlier this year, Mr. Elmendorf, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, testified before our Budget Committee. Mr. Elmendorf is an excellent scholar and a man who has managed the money of the budget well. Mr. Elmendorf is—Mr. President, I am having a little trouble concentrating with the roar going on in my background. I would appreciate it if we could keep it down a little bit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Regular order.

Mr. SESSIONS. So Mr. Elmendorf told us at the Budget Committee that we are on an unsustainable path. OK. This is after the Budget Control Act, after we reduced the growth of spending $2.1 trillion, and that includes the sequester. After we did all that, this year he told us we are on an unsustainable debt course. He said this is a danger to America and we have to get off it and we need to make further changes to get on the right course.

So we have looked at this budget, and we thought the committee, which called him, would listen to him, and we wanted to see if the budget that is on the floor now actually helps us get toward a sound financial future. I have to say it does not. It does not change the course we are on. It raises taxes dramatically, but it raises spending and eats up all the new taxes, not altering the amount of debt that will be raised over 10 years.

Isn't that a failed budget plan? Isn't that a failure of leadership? I hate to say that. But the challenge of our time is to deal with our financial crisis. The challenge of our time is to alter the debt course we are on and put us on a sound path, and it has not been met by this budget.

The House budget—we all may have different ideas about some of the things in it—provides for increased spending every single year, but it balances the budget, totally balances the budget, in 10 years. It would balance in 10 years and does it by increasing spending every year, on an average of 3.4 percent a year. So we can increase spending at 3.4 percent a year—increase spending—and balance the budget.

But the problem is the budget the majority sends forth would increase spending at 5.4 percent a year. That does not sound like a lot, but the difference is trillions of dollars. The difference is a plan that puts us on a sound financial path to the future and a plan that leads us on the unsustainable debt course we are now on.

My Democratic colleagues need to look at this. We saw, I guess, in Politico—I had the quote here yesterday that said fundamentally the majority's plan was written by the left of the Democratic conference—the left—and it said explicitly to the left of President Obama. That makes sense if we look at what is in the budget. Look how much they spend, how much they tax, and how they do not reduce the debt we are adding every single year. So that is what we have.

As Chairman MURRAY said, budgets present a contrast. Budgets lay out your vision for the future. A budget defines who you are because it says how much you want to tax in the next 10 years, it says how much you want to spend in the next 10 years, and it requires you to state how much debt you are going to accumulate for America over the next 10 years.

This plan will add another $7.3 trillion to the debt of America. We are already at almost $17 trillion. That will take us to about $24 trillion in 10 years. Interest on that debt is huge. By their own numbers, interest on their debt would amount to approximately $800 billion in 1 year. Interest on the debt, under their budget, would rise to the point of $800 billion in 1 year. We spend about $100 billion on education. We spend about $40 billion-plus—a little over—on highways, roads, and bridges. That is just an example. We are now surging from $200 billion, $250 billion in interest to $800 billion in interest. As a result of the accounting CBO has provided us, if we follow this path, it is going to crowd out spending for research, it is going to crowd out spending for children, education, health care, and any other program this government wishes to undertake, including defense.

Mr. President, what kind of time limit is there, might I inquire? Is there 30 minutes on this side on this motion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the motion, there is 1 hour, equally divided.

Would the Senator like to call up his motion?

Mr. SESSIONS. The first question would be how much time is left on my half of that hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion has not yet been offered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I call up the motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] moves to recommit Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 back to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report back no later than March 22, 2013 with such changes as may be necessary to achieve unified budget balance by fiscal year 2023.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. This motion would simply say this to our colleagues—it will be a defining vote for our Members; and Members need to understand the meaning of this vote—the question will be: Do you favor a balanced budget? Is it important to you? Have you said: I am going to vote for a balanced budget amendment. Have you said in your townhall meetings and in your campaigns and in your debates: I believe in a balanced budget amendment or I believe in a balanced budget, period.

What we are saying is that this country can balance its budget. We can balance the budget in America today if we set forth a plan that allows the spending levels to increase by 3.4 percent a year for the next 10 years. Isn't that great news? We can spend 3.4 percent more each year. According to the data the Congressional Budget Office gives us and we rely on, we can do that and still increase spending over the next decade.

Inflation is going to increase about 2 percent or a little over, according to CBO. Inflation will increase about 25 percent over the next 10 years and about 40 percent if we increase spending each year at 3.4 percent. That puts us on a path to balance. It begins to reduce the debt overhang for our country. It brings down the amount of debt we have in our country and puts us on a sound path. It does all the things we need. It sends a message to the world that we have our financial house in order. I believe good Members of this body—Democrats and Republicans alike—have told their constituents and are sincerely of the belief that we can and should balance our budget. When I say ''balance,'' I mean honest balance, not some balanced approach, not some primary balance, none of that; that when the revenue comes in and the money goes out, it is the same. We are not sending more money out than we are bringing in, in revenue, having to borrow the difference and pay interest on it. Because that is what we have been doing to a degree we have never, ever done before in this country. We have never, ever done before what we are doing now. We have never, ever had 4 consecutive years of trillion-dollar deficits—nothing close to it.

People say President Bush was irresponsible. He should have been more wary of the grand promises that the economy would never have a recession and that things are going to go great. He should have. The next to the last

year he was in office, the budget deficit was $167 billion. It had dropped from a higher figure in his time in office. His last year, it was $450 billion or $460 billion.

President Obama has been in office 4 full years, starting his fifth, and his deficits have been averaging $1,200 billion a year. We have never, ever, ever seen anything like this before. The debt of the United States of America has surged, and our Democratic colleagues do not have a plan that will put us on a sustainable path in the future.

If we come back out of the economy and we restrain the spending growth just a little bit, we can balance the budget. That is what we ought to do. Again, the goal of balancing the budget is not some frivolous goal for political reasons. The goal of a balanced budget is that we would put us on a sound financial course. It will mean we have confronted the challenges of our time. It means we know we cannot continue to spend systemically more than we bring in, that a debt crisis could occur and we could have a decline in wealth in America.

So when we say we want to recommit to the committee, colleagues, you need to know what this means. It simply means this: We are directing the committee, the majority of whom are Democrats—and they can write the budget as they choose, using whatever tax changes they want to make and whatever spending changes they want to make—but the budget that hits this floor would be a budget that balances, that creates growth, confidence, and prosperity for America. That is what we are asking you to cast a vote for, and I believe you should break ranks on this. I believe you should vote your conscience. I believe every Senator should vote the beliefs of their constituents. Poll after poll after poll shows that the American people prefer a balanced budget. They know we cannot continue to do what we are doing.

I think it has potential. We are willing to work with the majority. We may disagree with the results, but, my goodness, wouldn't it be great if the Senate produced a budget that balances—and it has one vision of how to balance the budget, the House produced a budget that balances and they have their vision about how to balance the budget—and we go to conference and we could actually reach some sort of a compromise that would fix the financial future of America? The whole world would be amazed. They would say: My goodness, the United States—look at this—they have gotten themselves together. We thought they were going goofy. We thought they had completely sold out to spending and borrowing and look at this.

There would be more investment. American businesses would feel better. American workers would feel better. We would begin to have more growth that way.

That is the way we believe jobs and growth are best created, not by the sugar high that comes from borrowing and spending money.

Back when we did the stimulus bill—I would like to share this with my colleagues because a very important concept was explained us to by Mr. Elmendorf, the CBO Director. Back when we did the stimulus bill, the $800 billion-and-something that President Obama passed that was going to reduce the unemployment rate dramatically, put the country on a sound path, and stimulate the economy, we asked how were we going to do it? We were going to borrow money—every penny of the $830 billion—now $1 trillion with interest—was borrowed and we spent it.

This is what the Director of the Congressional Budget Office said about that. He said: Yes, it will create growth in the short term. It will enhance the growth in the short term. One financial expert called it a sugar high. We will get that. But once that is over and we have the burden of the debt, it begins to cost us every year and it will cost us as long as that money has been spent, as long as we pay interest on that money, and we are going to pay interest—young people, American people—indefinitely because we have no plan to pay down this debt that we have accumulated. We will be paying interest on that indefinitely.

This is what CBO said back in 2009 when the stimulus bill was passed. They said: Yes, you get a short-term benefit. But CBO said that over 10 years, you will have less net growth than if you did not have the stimulus package at all. Think about that.

So we took the sugar high. We voted to borrow the money. I did not. I opposed it. But it passed to borrow more money, to spend now to try to create a sugar high, pull yourself up by your bootstraps, pour one bucket of water from the pool into another, and this is going to somehow permanently fix our economy.

There were some things that I think would have been legitimate for us to do at that time. I supported a more restrained package that had more infrastructure and actual benefits in it. But, fundamentally, we are almost now at the point where the benefits of that spending have been gone and the detriment is already here. Multiply that. Multiply that by the fact that we now have a total of $17 trillion borrowed from around the world, and we are paying interest on that every day. But we are paying extraordinarily low interest rates, unlike any we have seen in the history of the world, and those low interest rates are not expected to remain.

This is why they project that with this budget we will have a $24 trillion debt by 2022, resulting in $800 billion a year in interest. This would be more than the Defense Department, more than we pay on Social Security today, and more than we pay on Medicare today. This is a huge item.

I would say we want growth. We want prosperity. We want to unleash the natural, inherent, entrepreneurial power of the American spirit, economy, and culture. It is a wonderful thing we have. Our free market infrastructure is magnificent, but it is being handicapped by poor economic financial policies of this country. We need to exit this path and return to a path for a balanced budget amendment.

I thank you for the opportunity to make this motion and hope it will be considered. It would provide the committee with full freedom to produce a balanced budget through any way you choose, through any mix of tax-and-spend policies which would be chosen by the committee. It would then come back to the floor. If we were to vote for it, then it would go to conference and put us in an extraordinarily better position to achieve a bipartisan agreement this year, which could help pull us out of the economic doldrums. This would put us on a path to economic prosperity to eliminate the debt drag which international studies, the IMF, European Central Bank, Bank of International Settlements, and Professor Rogoff and Professor Reinhart have all shown pulls down growth. They are saying our debt is so high it is lowering economic growth right now.

We would change all of this through a balanced budget coming out of committee. It would put us on the right path without having to reduce spending, actually. We could still increase spending every single year.

I submit my motion, and I yield to the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to use time in opposition to the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Our colleagues have sent a motion to the desk which sends our budget back to committee to balance.

I think we all know what this means. They wish to send our budget back to take months and weeks to put together a budget, which does one of two things in order to balance: It either raises incredible revenue or has devastating cuts. We have seen the package they are talking about. It is the Ryan budget being debated in the House right now. They say they would eliminate the deficit in 2023.

The Republicans have not put this budget out here right now, because they don't want to specify what the cuts are and be responsible for them. They just want some mystical moment to happen back in committee where these tough decisions are made.

We know what they are looking at. They are looking at the Ryan budget. They say it eliminates the deficit, but it does so in a devastating way to middle-class families across this country, families who are already struggling so much.

We hear a lot about balance these days. I want to clarify some real differences, important differences between how the Senate and the House budget use the word ''balance.''

The proposal which passed through the Budget Committee in the House would be devastating for our economic recovery. It would really threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs this year alone. It makes extreme cuts to our infrastructure, which is crumbling; to education, which is so important to our future; to the innovation this country has been built on, which would lay down a strong foundation for broad economic growth—which our Senate budget is working so hard to make happen.

Their budget in the House which the Republicans now want us to go back to committee and put in place would dismantle Medicare and cut off programs to support our middle-class and most vulnerable families. This sounds pretty unbalanced to me.

Frankly, their budget gets worse. As we learned last week, House Republicans have put forth a budget which calls for huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and makes it unclear how it will be paid for.

Those pay-fors will come on the backs of families who are working hard, average families who would see their taxes increase in order to give that tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. This is what they call balance.

I don't think that is balance. House Republicans like to say they are offering a balanced budget, which I would note also includes savings from the Affordable Care Act they vowed to repeal and tax increases on the wealthiest, which they strongly oppose. They haven't explained how they will reach that goal of reducing those rates down to 25 percent and who will pay for this. It is pretty clear, when you look at the numbers, how that will happen.

The House Republicans never explain how they get to what they call ''balance,'' because the only way they can do it is by raising taxes on the middle class or making deep cuts to vulnerable families and seniors, who depend on these benefits.

Our budget takes a very different approach to balance. We ensure our families today have the ability to get what they need to put their families back on a stable path to recovery. We make sure we invest in the important things this country needs to ensure our middle class has what they need in education and infrastructure. These are the things which allow families to know their kids can go to college, pay their mortgage, receive job training, and get back to work. That is balance.

When we have a responsible approach to spending cuts and to revenue, balance is an important word. Balance is about making sure we do what the Simpson-Bowles report has recommended, what every bipartisan group has said, and contains a responsible mix of revenues and spending cuts. This ensures no one bears the burden of the challenges of this country alone.

I would not call the House Republican bill balanced. Their balance says the wealthiest Americans, the biggest corporations don't contribute to this problem at all. Everything is done on the backs of our middle-class families.

Balance is an important word. It is an important word to every family, every community, every American. The approach we take is balanced, making sure everyone has an opportunity in this country for the future we need. This ensures everybody participates in solving the problems in front of us.

I take a backseat to no one when it comes to making sure we have a balanced approach. Our budget does that. We are going to be hearing more on it right now. We have a number of colleagues on the floor.

Let me make this very clear. The motion to recommit the Senators on the other side have offered simply says we will return to committee until we get the Ryan bill in front of us. This is something we soundly reject.

I have a number of colleagues here who will participate. I yield to the Senator from Delaware and thank him for his great contributions to our committee this year.

Mr. President, I yield time from the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy for up to 30 minutes with Senators from California, New York, Illinois, and Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, at its heart a budget is a statement of values. Last week I joined with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to pass a budget resolution firmly rooted in our values.

With appreciation to the chairmanship of Chairman PATTY MURRAY, the budget we passed reduces our deficit and stabilizes our debt in a balanced, responsible way, relying on an equal mix of spending cuts and cuts to spending through the Tax Code, which is a balance of cuts and increased revenue through tax reform.

This first chart briefly shows we have made significant progress toward the Simpson-Bowles goal of $4 trillion in reduced Federal spending over the next 10 years. Our budget relies on these two next pieces, reducing loopholes, tax expenditures, and spending cuts. This is the balance I believe the American people called for in the last election.

Our budget promotes economic growth and job creation in the short term, makes critical investments in our competitiveness for the long term. It does all of this while putting a circle of protection around the most vulnerable in our society: children, low-income seniors, and the disabled.

Unfortunately, in my view the budget resolution passed by the House Budget Committee, led by Chairman RYAN, does not reflect these same values or this same balance. It is wildly unbalanced, relying only on spending cuts in order to achieve claims of enormous savings.

Yet when you look closer—and we will turn to this in more detail later in this colloquy—the Ryan budget actually relies on a whole series of deceptive gimmicks, impossible arithmetic, and unrealistic assumptions. The only way to make the Ryan budget add up is to increase our deficit or to raise taxes on the middle class by as much as $3,000 a year.

In my view, the House Republican budget either fails the test of deficit reduction or fails the test of basic fairness. It also, I believe, fails the test of economic growth and would put us on a fast track to austerity.

Let me turn now, if I might, to my friend and colleague from the State of Maryland to ask for his further comments on the contrast between the budget we have adopted here in the Senate and the budget offered over in the House.

Senator CARDIN.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me thank my friend from Delaware, Senator COONS. The Senator is exactly right, as he talks about balance. Senator MURRAY is absolutely right about the balance we have and the budget which has come out of the Budget Committee.

Yesterday we did something which was the right thing to do. We passed the continuing resolution, an omnibus appropriations bill. The good news is we worked together. We completed it, and it was a major improvement from what the House did. The House again was acting in a very partisan, one-way direction which would have caused additional harm.

I was disappointed the bill we passed yesterday was at the sequestration levels. I am against sequestration. I think we should substitute it for strategic reductions in the deficit. This is exactly what the budget coming out of the Budget Committee would do. It will substitute for sequestration a strategic way to get our budget into better balance. This is what we need to do.

The budget, as Senator COONS has pointed out, is our blueprint. It speaks to the priorities we have as a Nation. It is a framework. All of the elements which are necessary for a responsible budget are included in the budget document, which has been brought to the floor. I am proud to support it. It gives us the right blueprint for America's future.

The most important thing is it does get rid of sequestration. Sequestration is across-the-board mindless cuts. It says every priority in this country is exactly the same. That is not the case. The budget coming out of the Budget Committee is a responsible way of substituting for sequestration.

Senator MURRAY mentioned balance. I wish to speak about this chart, which

points out the fact of how balanced the budget is. The Senate Democratic budget balances additional spending cuts—Senator COONS is absolutely right—and additional cuts in what we do in the tax expenditures. We spend money through the Tax Code and through appropriated bills. The budget you brought out balances reductions in both categories. Sequestration only applies through the appropriations process. It doesn't apply to how we spend money through tax expenditures.

It is very interesting, as this is very similar to the other bipartisan proposal which has been brought forward. We talk frequently about Simpson-Bowles. Some of us may have disagreed with the specifics, but we thought it was the right blueprint and the right balance between spending reductions and tax expenditure reductions.

The Senate Democrats' proposal is very similar to Simpson-Bowles on the ratio of cuts. Actually it has more spending cuts and a little bit less revenue. Again, the Gang of Six is very similar. We are very proud our colleagues came together in an effort to try to bring Democrats and Republicans together. The Democratic budget in the Senate builds upon that bipartisan cooperation. It is very similar.

When we look at the House Republicans, they are totally out of step with what is necessary in order to get our country back into balance.

This provides a framework for investment. I appreciate the fact Senator MURRAY has provided ways in which we can invest in infrastructure, invest in research and development, and how we may invest in education. This translates into job growth. The more jobs we create, the more people pay taxes and the less revenue which is used. This is how you also balance the budget.

The Senate Democratic budget, the budget coming out of the Budget Committee, provides for those types of important investments. You also protect the most vulnerable citizens. This is so important. You protect Medicare. Why? Because it is important for the dignity of our seniors.

I particularly appreciated the statements which were made by Senator DURBIN, who was a major player in bringing this out, that going into deficit reduction we want to protect the most vulnerable. We don't want to add to the poverty of America. The Democratic budget which you brought out carries out that commitment, protecting our most vulnerable.

You also lived up to the commitment to our veterans, and I appreciate that very much. President Kennedy said, ''As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them.''

We all say how much we appreciate our veterans and our soldiers and what they have done for our country, protecting the democracy and freedom of our country. This budget does more than just say our appreciation, it acts by deeds, carrying out our commitment to the best health care for our veterans, including mental health services. I particularly appreciate the reserve fund that is permitted that makes more veterans eligible for benefits and improves the efficiency of the claims processing, which is particularly important in our region where so many veterans have waited way too long to get the benefits to which they are entitled.

Let me mention one last point, which is a huge difference—and Senator MURRAY and Senator COONS have mentioned it. The main difference between the budget the Democrats have brought out and the Republican budget conceived in the House is this is a credible way to manage our deficit, which is the most important thing—managing our deficit in a credible way—that will get our deficit under control. It builds on the deficit reductions we have already done. Since we started this debate and the Simpson-Bowles recommendations came out, we have already done $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction, $1.8 in spending reductions, and $600 billion in revenues. This is very similar to how the Simpson-Bowles proposal was made to have a plausible baseline.

Now, I am not going to get too technical about all this, but it means we are not using smoke and mirrors but are using a realistic baseline in order to do the deficit reduction. It is achievable, it is doable, it is credible, and Senator COONS deals with tax extenders.

One more word about tax extenders, because Senator COONS is absolutely right. We have provisions in the spending programs of this country that invest in energy security that are subject to sequestration because it is an appropriations bill. But we have provisions in the Tax Code that give special breaks to the oil and gas industry. These are expenditures. These are revenues we are hemorrhaging. They should at least be under the same scrutiny as the appropriations bills. What this budget is saying is that we can get some savings from these tax expenditures and then use that to get our debt under control.

Senator MURRAY is absolutely right. One of the huge differences between the Democrats and the Republicans is the Republicans want to reduce the tax breaks for middle-income families to give bigger tax breaks for high-income families. We say we can make the Tax Code more efficient and have a budget that allows for the growth of the middle class and manage our debt in a better way.

The bottom line is this budget produces $4.25 trillion over the 10-year window compared to Simpson-Bowles, which was $4 trillion. It is even more deficit reduction than the Simpson-Bowles proposal. It puts us on a sustainable path for a manageable deficit.

What we need to do now is negotiate and get this done for this Nation, and this framework gives us the ability to do that. What Americans want is a balanced approach that allows for growth and that is credible. This budget gives us that pathway and, most importantly, it will give predictability to the American economy, which is what I hear more and more as I go around. People want us to make decisions. We are prepared to make decisions. This budget gives us that pathway, and I congratulate Senator MURRAY. I also congratulate Senator COONS for the work he has done.

Mr. COONS. I thank the Senator for his comments and for his leadership in the Budget Committee and his hard work in the Chamber over many years.

The budget we are bringing forward to this floor today is one that invests in growing the American economy; that gives us a real path forward toward out-educating, out-innovating, and out-building our competitors globally; and one that is focused on job creation but also on deficit reduction in a responsible and balanced way. In my view, the Ryan Republican budget, if adopted, would give us a cure worse than the disease.

To talk about the budget's impact on America's treasured entitlement programs and the promises we have made to our veterans and our seniors, I am grateful to turn to my friend and colleague, Senator BOXER of California, who has joined us.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank Senator COONS so much for including me in this opportunity to speak about the choices we have before us.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time remains for Senator COONS so I have some idea?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). There is 18 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. We all know a budget is critical because it is not just a bunch of numbers, it is a statement as to who we are as a people—what are our values, what we think is worth investing in, what we think we should cut, and so on. It is interesting because we have been attacked—Senator MURRAY and the Democrats—for backing a budget the Republicans say is not in balance. Well, I want to argue the point. I think it is, in fact, the only budget, between this budget and the Republican budget in the House—which is the one embraced by the Republicans—that is balanced in many ways.

The first way this budget is balanced is between investments—the things we need to invest in for our Nation; in innovation, education, investing in our kids, investing in their health—and commitments we have made over the years to our senior citizens. I am going to talk more about that in a minute, about what the Republicans do to Medicare in their budget—by the way, they kill it. I will explain how and why. Our budget also moves us toward numerical balance in a way that economists of all sizes and stripes believe is wise, which is to get the deficit down below 3 percent of GDP.

My colleagues don't think that is good enough, although I never heard one word from them—not one word—when George W. Bush came in and shredded the budget. He took a surplus that Bill Clinton and the Democrats, with the help of some Republicans, had put in place, and they shredded it under George Bush by giving tax breaks to the wealthiest, putting two wars on the credit card, adopting a prescription drug plan that didn't allow Medicare to negotiate for lower prices, and the deficit went wild. And it didn't even make sense. I am an old—well, I am old—economics major, and I remember the basics. You don't go into such deep debt because, if there is a recession, you can't really help but spend your way out of it.

So what happened when President Obama got elected is he faced the worst deficit crisis, and that deficit went up to well over $1 trillion. He has gotten it back to $850 billion. It is still too high, but the fact is I never heard a word from my really good friends on the other side of the aisle when they were racking up those debts. It was, oh, this supply side stuff is going to be great. Well, it wasn't great. It wasn't good. And I am glad this budget takes us back to the notion of the Clinton years, which is we have a balanced approach between revenues, investments, and commitments to our people.

If we look at the Republican budget—that Ryan budget over there that passed with huge Republican support—we can see what he does. I have to tell the people something they may not know. The Ryan budget, the Republican budget, includes more tax breaks for the people at the top. Surprise. I thought we had an election about this. That didn't seem to matter to the Republicans. A new tax break of $200,000 a year for people making over $1 million. Just what we needed, Mr. President. More tax breaks for the people at the top. This is per year. Think about that. The average income is about $50,000 a year, and the Republicans are giving $200,000 a year to millionaires. Forget it. That is why they want us to send this budget back—to come out with that kind of a budget? No way. I want a balanced budget.

By the way, how do they pay for this? With unspecified closing of tax loopholes. Well, let me tell you, the amount of money they are putting in these new tax breaks—$5.7 trillion—is so high they will have to end the home mortgage deduction, which the middle class really needs. The wealthy people don't need mortgages, they can buy their homes outright. The middle class, the upper middle class need this tax break. Charitable deductions, which our charities count on, is another of their loopholes; and making sure you can write off State and local taxes, which helps our States and our cities. That is what they are going after. They do not say it because it is ''unspecified.''

I hope I have made the point that the Republican budget is basically a sham because I don't know any Senator on either side of the aisle who would vote today to do away with the charitable deduction, the home mortgage deduction, or State and local tax deduction. Maybe a couple of them would, but I can tell you, hearing from my folks at home and the charities that depend on that deduction and the real estate people who are finally seeing a little recovery, what a time to do that. So I say that budget is a sham. It doesn't balance and, worse yet, it hurts our people.

I have only one more point to make and then I will yield back the time to my friend.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes is remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Chair will advise me when I have used 5 minutes.

So let me now tell you about Medicare. In the Republican budget, if you are younger than 55, instead of getting the same Medicare your parents had and the same Medicare you have paid into and the same Medicare that you counted on, it is over, folks. It is over. You will get a voucher. There is no more Medicare. They tell you to go out with that voucher and find your own insurance.

Now, we know, because studies have shown us, that plan says you will be paying $6,000 a year more out of your own pocket for health care. That is what this so-called Medicare—new Medicare—Program is. It is not Medicare. Medicare is a guaranteed benefit where you take the card and go to the doctor. Here you take a voucher.

So now you are 55, and then you get older. If you are lucky enough to get health insurance, and you get older and now you are 70 or 80, and you are taking an insufficient voucher—you are retired—this is a giant nightmare. These are supposed to be the golden years. Well, the people who lose this will have lost the golden Medicare guarantee, I will tell you that.

Here is the final point. The Republicans say if you have Medicare, don't worry. You are fine. Baloney. If you end Medicare, destroy it like the Republicans do, the people left in it are part of a dying program that is being phased out. Who is going to try to improve the quality of that program? It is going to be like fixing an Edsel or fixing your typewriter. There is no more Medicare. It is going to be a program that is dying, that is being phased out, and that will hurt current senior citizens.

So let's be clear. The Ryan budget, the Republican budget, takes the Medicare promise and shreds it, destroys it, and it is the end.

When President Johnson signed the Medicare law in 1965, here is what he said:

> No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings they have carefully put away over a lifetime. No longer will young families see their own incomes eaten away because they are carrying out their deep moral obligation to their parents, to their uncles and their aunts.

So I am saying to Senator MURRAY: Thank you, thank you, thank you, for your leadership. I am saying to Democrats such as Senator COONS, who has organized this today, thank you for your leadership, thank you for a budget that recognizes our obligations to our seniors, to our veterans, to our children, to this Nation, to make sure this is a Nation of innovation, and thank you for protecting transportation, an issue that I care deeply about as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Without being able to move people and move goods, our Nation will not be a leading economic power.

So I thank you, and I yield back to Senator COONS.

Mr. COONS. I thank my good friend from California and the other members of the Budget Committee who have worked so hard to pull together this proposal, this package, this budget resolution that comes to the Senate floor today.

I think this is a great week for the Congress. We are at last, in stark contrast, presenting to the people of the United States a budget path forward adopted by the Republican-led House and a budget path forward adopted by the Democrat-led Budget Committee. Hopefully, this will not just be debated but adopted in this Chamber this week.

Let me briefly summarize the main points made by my colleagues. First, as the Senator from California emphasized, one of the core elements of the Ryan budget plan that gives us real pause and concern is that it doesn't keep our promises to our seniors, to our veterans, and to our most vulnerable populations.

It block grants Medicaid, it repeals the health care law's expansion of Medicaid, it repeals the health care's law exchange subsidies, and, more important than anything else, it turns Medicare into a voucher program. These are fundamental changes.

When Chairman MURRAY began our deliberations as a budget committee, she laid out three core values she wanted us to keep in mind; that our budget resolution should, first, help grow the economy and help the private sector create jobs, and I believe it does that by prioritizing critical investments in infrastructure, in education, and in R&D; second, to keep our promises to our seniors, to our veterans, to those in our country to whom we have made commitments over decades—something I would add, that we also continue to respect and embrace a circle of protection for the most vulnerable in our society; and last, that we make credible progress toward reducing our deficit and debt but in a sustainable way that allows us to continue to grow our economy from the middle out.

Let me turn for a few minutes to some criticisms or challenges that

many of us on the Democratic side of the Senate have of the Ryan Republican budget. Briefly, it relies on outlandishly rosy assumptions about revenue and spending levels. It counts $716 billion in Medicare savings from the very health care reform law it says is repealed, and that tension within the Ryan budget is irresolvable.

Third, $810 billion in Medicaid savings are just cost-shifted onto the State governments. As we know, States all across this country are struggling to balance their budgets today. These costs are not trimmed. They are simply shifted from the Federal Government onto the States.

Fourth, RYAN relies on $800 billion in undefined savings in mandatory programs, significant cuts that would have dramatic and negative impacts on our country and on our economy. There is $800 billion in cuts that he doesn't specify out of his total $962 billion in overall savings to so-called other mandatory spending.

Last, RYAN claims his tax cuts for the wealthy—which cost more than $4.5 trillion—wouldn't add to the deficit. To give some visual sense of the likely impact, it is anything but balanced. While RYAN claims his budget plan would balance the budget—and I challenge that assumption, given all these different mathematical and programmatic challenges—it is also doing it in a way that is fundamentally unbalanced and that doesn't respect our core values. To double down on tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, to give an additional tax break of more than one-quarter million dollars a year to the very wealthiest Americans while shifting that tax burden onto the middle class doesn't make sense. It doesn't meet the test of fairness and it doesn't meet the test of sustaining economic growth in a balanced way.

Last year, the independent Tax Policy Center analyzed the Ryan rate reduction, the proposal to reduce rates on the wealthiest Americans to 25 percent, and estimated that unless those costs were offset with corresponding tax hikes, it would add $4.5 trillion to our deficit.

So which one is it? Does the plan shift tax burden to middle-class Americans as was described in some detail by my colleagues or does it actually add to the deficit and fail the test of balance?

Let me move then to the question of revenue and how our budget package achieves some contribution to balance going forward. One of the things that I think is important for folks watching the difference between these two plans to grasp is that both plans make significant changes to what my colleague from Maryland talked about as spending through the Tax Code.

We spend almost as much as we receive in revenue through a Tax Code that, in the many years since 1986, has become riddled with loopholes, exemptions, and special treatments, particularly for the wealthiest and best connected. Both plans—the Ryan plan in the House and the Democratic plan in the Senate—both close tax loopholes. Out of an estimated $14 trillion in these tax expenditures over the next decade, the Ryan plan actually cuts $5.7 trillion. The Democratic plan that we are moving forward today only cuts 7 percent of these tax expenditures. That is how I think we can credibly say it would not cut into those tax expenditures relied on by the middle class—things such as the home mortgage deduction, the deduction for employer-provided health care, the deduction for charitable contributions. This 7-percent reduction in tax expenditures is much more modest than the significant amount of revenue raised in the Republican plan.

The more important contrast, though, is to what end. What do we do with these two significant differences in revenue raised through closing tax loopholes? As I said a few minutes ago, the Ryan plan would dedicate it almost exclusively to reducing tax rates for corporations and the wealthiest Americans while, in our balanced plan, this is half of the total contributions we make toward deficit reduction.

Let me move toward a close with a few conclusory comments. There are reasons to say the House Republican plan makes cuts that will grind our economy to a halt, makes cuts that are unduly focused on just those areas that we think deserve investment: research and development, infrastructure, education, public health. In my view, it wipes out the chance for us to continue to expand high-tech manufacturing to ensure that we have a more competitive economy, to cure life-threatening diseases, and to bring America's economy fully back to health. It relies on budget gimmicks and on faulty assumptions. In my view, the plan we move forward today is a more balanced and responsible path forward to keeping our promises to seniors and veterans, to protecting the most vulnerable in our society, to dealing with our deficit and debt, and to moving this country forward.

The future that our budget plan would move us toward is the kind I envision for my kids, for my State, and for our country—one where we can grow our economy but continue to respect our most basic values.

Even though the Ryan plan, in my view, fails a basic test of values, it also fails a basic test of balance. We have a budget that this body will take up and consider today and I hope we will pass. As it passed out of committee with the strong leadership of Chairman MURRAY, I am confident it will pass out of this Chamber today. From that passage, it is my hope that people of the United States can see us begin to work together on a balanced bipartisan plan that will responsibly deal with our deficit and debt, grow our economy but continue to respect our most fundamental values.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, was the time used there time against the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Washington specified that the time would be taken off the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we understand what is happening here. The budget produced by the majority does not balance, doesn't come close to balancing, does not change in any measurable way the debt course we are on that the Congressional Budget Office Director said is unsustainable.

This budget taxes more, it spends more, and does not change the debt course we are on; therefore, it is a budget about to bankrupt America because, as Mr. Elmendorf said, our current deficit plan endangers our future.

They have used—we have counted—now over 30 times the word ''balanced.'' We have heard a balanced approach, a balanced plan; a balanced approach, a balanced plan. But it does not balance.

Senator COONS, a great Senator, was a county commissioner. He balanced his budget and gained acclaim for it, and it wasn't a balanced approach—it was a balanced budget.

The Presiding Officer has been a Governor and balanced his budget. All former Governors in this body balanced budgets—real balance.

A balanced approach means nothing, nada, zero. A balanced approach means nothing. It is an excuse to tax and spend and not change the debt course of America. At some point, every Senator is going to have a moral responsibility to decide whether they want to stay on that course.

The Ryan budget is not before us. This motion that I have does not require the committee to have a Ryan budget. This motion would simply say: Committee, go back and look at this budget. Committee, do a budget that balances, and if you want to tax oil companies, if you want to tax rich people more, lay it out. If you want to cut spending in some other area than RYAN wants to cut spending, do so. But remember, RYAN does not cut spending.

We see the chart up here. How much does RYAN cut spending? RYAN's budget doesn't cut spending. Our proposal is not to cut spending. It increases spending every single year. One of the ways this country is going broke is, when they reduce the growth of spending, they say it is a cut. That kind of logic is why we are going broke.

If we change the growth rate from 5.4 percent that we are on now to 3.4 percent, this budget would balance. We can grow spending every year and balance the budget—no net cuts. Some programs ought to be eliminated but no net cuts.

We are glad to have Senator THUNE, who has served so ably on the Budget Committee for many years, is thoroughly knowledgeable about these issues and is part of the leadership in

our conference and I yield to him on the resolution.

How much time remains on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately, 16 hours, 30 minutes on the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield to Senator THUNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his eloquence in laying out what is at stake in this budget debate we are having and for also pointing out, once again, that the budget before us in the Senate doesn't balance.

In a way, the speakers who have been here before on the Democratic side have been talking about another budget. They are talking about a budget that is under consideration in the other House, in the House of Representatives. They are not talking about their budget.

I suspect one of the reasons they don't want to talk about their budget is it is a budget that, for all intents and purposes, will hurt economic growth, cost jobs, and lower take-home pay for middle-class Americans because it doubles down on the failed policies of the past 4 years, which have consisted of more spending, more borrowing and more taxes, and that is what this budget is about.

I wish to quote something from the Washington Post editorial page in regard to the Democratic budget that is before us.

> Except for the part about no imminent crisis, the Senate Democratic budget recognizes none of this.

They are talking about the challenges we face with regard to the fiscal crisis we are in.

> Partisan in tone and complacent in substance, it scores points against the Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base—but deepens these senators' commitment to an unsustainable policy agenda.
>
> In short, this document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

This is their assessment of the budget debate that is going on in the Senate. The Washington Post editorial page isn't exactly a bastion of conservative thought, but note what they say about this: It is not a viable plan. It is not even a responsible public assessment of the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

This is precisely what is wrong with this budget and why the Democrats who come down to the floor of the Senate aren't talking about it. They are coming down to talk about the budget that is under consideration today in the House of Representatives—which, incidentally, does actually balance in 10 years.

The first motion that is under consideration in the Senate is to recommit this back to produce a balanced budget.

It strikes me, at least, that I think most Americans would accept the logic, if you will—the notion, that we ought to be able to submit a balanced budget—at least a budget that balances in a 10-year period.

Most Americans have to make decisions every single year. They have to figure out how they are going to go about balancing their own family budget, how to make what is coming in the door meet the expenses that they have to deal with in their daily lives. Yet the Democratic budget that is before us not only doesn't balance in 10 years, it doesn't balance ever—it doesn't balance ever.

That is why this motion that is before us to recommit this budget to the Senate Budget Committee and to produce a budget that actually does balance is something I hope my colleagues on both sides will support.

It is time we got serious about doing the important work of the Senate, taking care of the people's business, which is to get spending on a more responsible and sustainable fiscal path so future generations of Americans aren't saddled with this massive burden of debt, so we can protect and save programs—important programs such as Social Security and Medicare—which are on a pathway to bankruptcy.

Social Security is already operating at a cash deficit; in other words, there isn't enough money coming in, in the form of payroll taxes, to pay the benefits that are due to Social Security beneficiaries. Medicare is going to be bankrupt 10 years from now and even in the hospital part of that trust fund, by the year 2016, according to the CBO.

It is clear. These things are looking us right in the face. This is not something out there on the horizon, these are issues today that need to be dealt with. Yet the Democratic budget before us does absolutely nothing to address the long-term fiscal challenges facing this country. What are we going to do to save Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid?

In fact, according to the CBO, by the year 2023, 10 years from now, mandatory spending will represent 91 percent of all Federal spending. Think about that. It is about 62 percent today. We are on a trajectory and a pathway over the next decade to where 90 cents—over 90 cents out of every dollar is paying for those basic core programs with nothing left over. How are we going to fund the military or defense or the other priorities this government deals with every single day when over 90 cents out of every dollar is going to be spent on these programs? Yet this budget does nothing to address those important fiscal problems.

What it does do is it grows government—a 62-percent increase in government spending over the next decade. It adds $7.3 trillion to the Federal debt, and that is on top of the $6 trillion that has been added in the last 4 years. It raises taxes. The Democrats will say it is only by $975 billion, about $1 trillion. But if you look inside the numbers, they replace the sequester—another $½ trillion—with a fund, some sort of fund. What is going to fund that? Spending cuts? I do not think so. We are talking about up to a $1.5 trillion tax increase in this budget on top of the $1.7 trillion tax increase we have already seen under this President and the Democrats here in the Congress.

What does that mean? They say it is just a tax on the rich. We just need the rich to pay a little more. They need to pay their fair share.

They got a big, fat tax increase with the fiscal cliff. They got a big, fat tax increase with the $1 trillion in ObamaCare. The rich are getting hit with higher taxes, but what is happening is a lot of these tax increases are starting to hit the middle class, and they are starting to figure this out. If you are a middle-class American and they are saying: Let's soak the rich a little more, that is OK, the rich can pay more—Mr. President, I have to tell you, it is coming at you. If you are a middle-class American, you cannot tax the rich enough to do all the things these guys want to do to increase Federal spending and grow the size of the Federal Government.

Our focus should not be on growing the government; it ought to be on growing the economy. This budget does absolutely nothing to get the economy growing again. It simply does what we have done in the past 4 years; that is, increase spending, increase borrowing, and increase taxes.

If you don't think the taxes are hitting the middle class already, just look at your health insurance premiums because the tax increases in ObamaCare were taxes on, yes, medical device companies, taxes on your health insurance plan, taxes on pharmaceuticals, all of which are being passed on in the form of higher costs to average working Americans.

We have a crisis in this country that affects the middle-income families, people who are out there every single day just trying to do their best to make their budget balance and do the important things to plan for the future of their children and grandchildren, and here we are in Washington, DC, debating yet more policies that are going to hurt the economy, going to crush job creation in this country and lower take-home pay for those very middle-class American families.

This is the wrong approach. I hope as we debate this we will have an opportunity to vote on amendments. Perhaps there is a way we can make this better. I doubt that to be the case. This budget is so far off in terms of where we need to be going as a country. If we are serious about getting the economy growing and expanding again, creating jobs for middle-class Americans, and doing something about the massive amount of debt we are passing on to future generations, this budget is the exact wrong prescription for that. We can do much better by the American people, and we need to. I hope that during the course of this debate that will

become clear and that we will move in a different direction for the future of this country.

I see the leader is here on the floor. I will conclude my remarks at least for the time being and allow him to make his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota. He is entirely correct. This budget is extreme, and it is unbalanced. What would happen if it passed? We would have a tax hike of up to $1.5 trillion. That would be the largest in U.S. history. It would cost the average middle-class family literally thousands.

Democrats here in Washington, as Senator THUNE and Senator SESSIONS pointed out, already just got billions of dollars in new taxes at the end of the year—about $600 billion because the tax law expired, the fiscal cliff; then they got $1 trillion more out of ObamaCare. So this would be on top of all of that—$1.5 trillion on top of the $1.6 trillion that is already going into effect. And there is a nearly two-thirds increase in big government spending.

It would siphon $½ trillion out of our economy and into the hands of Washington bureaucrats and the people in Congress to spend; 42 percent more debt, with each American owing up to $73,000; and an average of 850,000 fewer jobs every year. That is about 11,500 jobs in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Medicare would be allowed to go bankrupt in a few years, and this budget would not balance—not this year, not tomorrow, not ever.

A lot of Democrats here in Washington are saying they simply don't care about balancing the budget anymore. It certainly shows with this one. Their budget will not give Americans a better economy. There won't be any real job creation or the kind of deficit reduction we all know the country needs, just a massive tax hike and more spending to grow the bureaucracy from the pockets of the middle class out.

Our Democratic friends here in Washington like to say that budgets are not just about dollars and cents, they are about values. What their budget tells me is that they have completely lost touch with the hopes and concerns and aspirations of their constituents, that they are putting the needs of government ahead of those who elected them. The budget we waited 4 years for—4 long years we have waited for a Democratic budget—is just a rehash of the extreme policies that continue to pummel the middle class. As all of us have said, it is time to grow the economy, not the government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we have among the many people who serve in the Senate some people who have balanced budgets and done it——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from South Dakota? The Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota such time as he and Senator JOHANNS would utilize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, if you would, that would be from the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senator.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. We have among the Senators who serve in the Senate people who have balanced budgets and done it the old-fashioned way, the hard way, one of whom is the former Governor of the State of Nebraska, now Senator, MIKE JOHANNS. Senator JOHANNS, like me, comes from the midwestern part of the country where common sense prevails and where people are not unaccustomed to having to tighten their belts a little bit during difficult times. As a consequence of that, many of those States in that part of the country are well managed, and they elect leaders who bring those types of principles to their leadership and to the way they govern among their States.

So the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. JOHANNS, has a long record—not only as a Governor, I might add, but as a mayor. He has been an executive. He knows what it is like to make those hard decisions, and he is someone who, like me, is very concerned that we get on a more sustainable fiscal path for this country, get our fiscal house here in Washington, DC, in order, and make sure we are not bankrupting this country and saddling the next generation with massive amounts of debt.

I yield to my colleague from Nebraska, Senator JOHANNS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for a nice introduction. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today on the budget that has been proposed by the majority party.

If I might lay a little groundwork, in addition to what the Senator from South Dakota said about me, my time in elected office dates back to 1983. I was first elected to be a county commissioner in Lancaster County. After that, I went to the Lincoln City Council, where I served for a couple of years, primarily because I had concerns about where the budget of the city of Lincoln was headed. I ran for mayor of Lincoln, and I served two terms as mayor of the city of Lincoln in a strong mayor form of government. From there I went to the Governor's office of the State of Nebraska, and from there I went on to become Secretary of Agriculture in the Bush administration, and 4 years ago I joined the Senate after running for election.

I have dealt with government budgets all of my career. I worked on my first budget when I was 32 years old. The one thing I knew was that it had to be balanced or it was not going to work. I have submitted budgets over and over again through those years, all balanced.

But let me focus a little more intently on the State of Nebraska and my time as Governor there. Nebraskans have a very practical approach to spending money. It is very straightforward. If you don't have the money, you don't spend it. It is that straightforward. You see, in our constitution, when the founders of our State wrote our State constitution, they worried about the very thing that is happening with this budget being presented by the majority. They worried that there would be politicians who would figure out that if they just kept borrowing and spending, they could get themselves reelected over and over. But they also realized that was no course for a State, so they put into our constitution that the politicians could borrow $100,000. I suspect that when our constitution was written over 100 years ago, many at that time looked at $100,000 and said to themselves: That is a handsome amount of money. Obviously, in today's world, $100,000 doesn't get you very far. In those years—post-9/11, I might add, when the economy had tanked because of what happened on 9/11—we were not only balancing the budget, we were not borrowing money to do it.

The other thing I would say is this. The Presiding Officer understands this as a former Governor. There was always a day of reckoning for the Governor. It was called the State of the State address, when you would walk into a chamber like this and you would lay out your plan for the State, and every media outlet in the State was there examining every word of the budget you submitted, every single senator was listening to every word you had to say, and if you laid out a plan that did not work or was filled with gimmicks, then the editorials the next day were devastating. You could never do that.

Let me compare that experience over those many years doing those many things with what I am faced with today as a Senator. This is what I am faced with. In order to support this budget, I, a former Governor, mayor, county commissioner, city council member who has balanced every single budget I ever submitted, would have to go home to Nebraskans and say this: My fellow Nebraskans, I just supported a budget that has over a $1 trillion tax increase. I would have to go on to say: That would be on top of the $600 billion tax increase last year. That would be on top of the $1 trillion of new tax increases in ObamaCare, and that is what I would have to say in order to support this budget to the citizens of Nebraska. I would also have to say to them that notwithstanding the fact that I have balanced your budgets for over 30 years in every budget I ever submitted, our Nation's debt in this budget will grow by $24.4 trillion by the end of the 10-year budget cycle. That is $7.3 trillion in new debt.

Let me just offer a thought on that. One could argue that at my age, age 62, maybe that doesn't mean a lot. After all, the Good Lord willing, I am probably not going to be on this Earth forever. It is just the way it works for human beings. Let me look around and see who is going to pay for this. Well, I know this weekend when I go back home—if we get back home—I am going to see my kids and grandkids. My kids are in their thirties. I am going to see my grandkids who range in age from 5 to 13. I am not going to have to look very far because if I vote for this budget, I am saying to my kids and my grandkids: I hope your life turns out OK because you are taking on, at the end of this 10-year budget window, $24.4 trillion of debt.

Now, let me compare that to how I started my adult life. When I was 20 years old, this Nation owed $380 billion of debt. So what I am saying to my kids and grandkids is I supported this budget, because here is where you are going to end up. You are going to end up starting your adult life with about $25 trillion of debt. I started my life with $380 billion. So when there is a war—which I wish I could say it will never happen, but it does—when there is a flu pandemic, when you want to do something more to educate your children, you are going to be hampered.

They are going to be paying back the debt I ran up during my life if I support this budget. This budget balloons the debt by 42 percent. That is what I will tell my kids and grandkids when I go home this weekend if I vote for this budget.

Net interest on the debt over the 10 years will total $5.2 trillion. What do we get out of that? What can we tell our kids and grandkids they get out of that? Well, they get to pay China back for lending us money. No schools will be built, there are no new teachers who will be hired, and there is no better health care which will be provided. That is just to service the debt our generation is running up.

Our debt, as a percentage of the gross domestic product under this budget, never goes below 90 percent of our economy. Actually, for 4 out of the 10 years it is over 100 percent. Every economist will say if we get into that stratosphere, the warning lights will be going off, the flags will be waving—stop, stop, stop borrowing the money. If I would have suggested anything like this as the Governor of Nebraska or the mayor of Lincoln, I would have been laughed out of the chamber.

Annual deficits. Even with all of the tax increases and gimmicks under this budget, we never get under $400 billion a year in new debt we are taking on. It ranges between $891 billion annually—on top of the nearly $17 trillion we owe today—to $407 billion annually. We never get close to a balance.

Senator SESSIONS says it so well: Balanced? What is balanced about this? I have been balancing budgets my whole life. This is not balanced. This is crazy. This is insane. This is adding debt to the shoulders of our children and grandchildren who are already up to their eyeballs in debt because of the spending that is going on.

Looking at the spending, it actually increases. Today's budget is $3.6 trillion. Under this budget—if I vote for this—it will go to $5.7 trillion in 2023, and that is a 60-percent increase.

Entitlements. You know what. I am 62 years old and in June I will be 63. Two more years until Medicare, and a little bit after that I will receive Social Security. People have talked about this great benefit that Senators get. Well, I said to a group back in Nebraska, at 65 I am going to get this great benefit. I am not going to have to pay much for it, and it is going to pay for my health care costs until the moment of my death. Everybody was looking at me. Wow, what is that plan? I said: Ladies and gentlemen, it is Medicare.

I said: At a point in my life where I could afford to pay something for it—and I would be happy to do that. I am not the richest person in the Senate, but I am not the poorest either. So I am going to go on this program and pass it on to my kids and grandkids. Is there anybody here who wants to get up and say: My gosh, that is fair.

That is not fair. We should not be doing that. It is not right. What does this budget do to address that problem? Nothing.

In a townhall meeting I was at in Lincoln recently, I said: If you are 62 years old, it is probably going to work out for you. We will probably borrow enough money to get Medicare and Social Security throughout my life. For those 40-year-old Members in the Senate or citizens who come to my townhall meeting, I am sorry, but I cannot make that promise to them. The trustees are telling us we cannot make that promise.

We waited 4 years for a budget from the majority. Year after year the majority leader would come down, stand right there and say: We are not going to be doing a budget this year. I wonder what the city council meeting would have been like if I would have gone down in Lincoln, NE, and said: I have been thinking about this, and I will not be doing a budget this year for the city of Lincoln. As Governor, I cannot imagine walking into our chamber back home and saying: I have been thinking about it, and I will not be doing a budget this year. Justifiably so, the people of the great State of Nebraska would have been looking for a new Governor and trying to figure out how to run the existing Governor out of office. Yet that is what we have been doing for the last 4 years.

We have waited 4 years, and we finally get a budget that does nothing for this country except increase taxes, increase the debt, increase spending, increase borrowing, and lay it off on our kids and grandkids with whom we will all go home and spend time this weekend—if we get out of here. It is not right.

Even the newspapers have figured it out. USA Today says:

> Disappointing . . . namby-pamby plan that underwhelms at every turn . . . neither balances the budget or reins in entitlements.

Now, I read the Washington Post, but I have to say, they are not always the most favorable to Republicans, and that is the understatement of the day. Here is what the Washington Post said: ''Gives voters no reason to believe Democrats have a viable plan.'' Boy, talk about a condemnation of a plan.

The Wall Street Journal said: ''Much higher taxes to fund much higher spending to finance a much bigger government.''

The Hill said: ''The Murray budget does not contain net spending cuts with the sequester turned off.''

I talked at length today about going home and explaining what a ''yes'' vote would mean on this budget. I am not going to do that. I am not going to go home and tell people I voted for this budget. I just want people to know right now that I will be a ''no'' vote on this budget. I will be a ''no'' vote because somebody has to stand for the people who are ultimately going to pay the bill.

We cannot pull the wool over the eyes of Nebraskans. They are just too darn discerning. They do not believe for a moment that all of this debt and spending and taxation is going to be financed by the rich guys. They realize that at the end of the day, this is going to visit home, and this is going to hammer the very people who are out there ranching, farming, running small businesses, and trying to pay their bills and educate their kids so maybe even they can leave a little something behind for the grandkids. That is what we are facing.

We are facing literally a situation where if we don't stand up to this, the day is not very far off where people's Social Security is in jeopardy, their Medicare is in jeopardy, Medicaid is in jeopardy, and we leave our children and grandchildren with this massive pile of debt. There is just no way to deal with it unless we just slam their standard of living and tax the living daylights out of everybody, and that is where this is headed. There is no way I could justify this vote back home.

I proudly announce that today I will be a ''no'' vote on this budget resolution, and I will do everything I can to stop it. It is the wrong course for our country.

I yield back to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska could not have put it better. He has great experience with budgets and the people of Nebraska, who are similar to the people I represent in South Dakota.

Someone else who is also from a very similar State, the State of North Dakota—he is yet another Governor who,

when he came here, came here in many respects because of his record of accomplishment as a Governor. The people of North Dakota elected him by an overwhelming margin largely because he knows how important it is that a State and country live within their means and that they not spend money they do not have. The Governor, and now Senator, of North Dakota has a long and incredibly strong record when it comes to fiscal matters. Again, like me, he represents a constituency which understands very clearly what is at stake when it comes to balancing our budget and making sure we are not handing that debt down to those children and grandchildren.

It is great to have here the Senator, my colleague and neighbor from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

I am pleased to be here to discuss this very important issue, the matter of our budget, for this great Nation and to follow my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I have had a tremendous opportunity to work with both of these Senators. Senator THUNE and I have been friends for many years and have worked on many issues important to this country and the Dakotas. Likewise, I have had an opportunity to work with Senator JOHANNS when I was Governor of North Dakota; he was Governor of Nebraska.

I want to pick up on some of his comments, but I am going to start out in a broader sense; that is, we are here today to debate a budget for this country. It is something we need to do. It needs to be a budget that moves the country forward. It needs to be a budget that helps us meet the challenges the American people want us to address. It needs to be a budget that sets the right priorities. It needs to be a budget that will help us truly reduce our debt and our deficit, and that means it needs to balance. It needs to be a budget that balances in a timely way. It needs to balance without raising taxes.

We have millions of people in this country who want a job. They want to get back to work, and raising taxes will absolutely hurt our economic growth and hurt their ability to get a job and to get back to work. At the same time we are talking about reducing our deficit and our debt. That means we have to control our spending and find ways to cut and reduce spending in an intelligent way, but at the same time we need economic growth. We cannot have higher taxes to hurt that economic growth, which kills jobs, but also it is that very economic growth, not higher taxes, that produces the revenue—again, combined with the right kind of controlled spending reductions—that gets our debt and deficit under control. The fact is this budget doesn't meet those very fundamental tests. It raises taxes by $1 trillion—more than $1 trillion. That would be the largest tax increase in the history of our country. That will hurt our economy. That will hurt our ability to get people back to work. That will hurt the economic growth we need to actually create revenue to address the debt and the deficit. So more than $1 trillion in higher taxes that will truly hurt our economy. Yet, even with a $1 trillion tax increase, the budget doesn't balance. Think about that: $1 trillion in tax increases and the budget doesn't balance. Does that make sense? I don't mean it doesn't balance this year; I don't mean it doesn't balance in 10 years; it doesn't balance.

So we can go through all the individual numbers and talk about all the different aspects of this budget in great detail, and we will. But for starters, on a fundamental basis, the Presiding Officer was a former Governor, as was my colleague from Nebraska, and there are others in this Chamber. We were required by the constitution of our respective States to submit budgets that balanced, and balanced every single year. This budget raises taxes by over $1 trillion on the American people, the largest tax increase in the history of our country, and it never balances. That is not setting the right priorities.

The Senator from Nebraska spoke a little bit about how he as a Governor approached presenting a budget, and it is something every Governor has to do. They have to present a budget to their respective legislatures that sets the right priorities.

When I did that budgeting process, the way I approached it was to say, OK, our budget first has to fund the right priorities. We have to set priorities. There is always more demand than there are resources available, so we have to determine what the right priorities are and fund those priorities in the best way we can. We can't fund everything, so we have to set the right priorities.

Second, in our State—and I know in many States—we said as well that we also needed to have a rainy day fund. We needed to be prepared for the future. We shouldn't be running big debt and deficits; we should be having reserves for a rainy day. We should have an adequate reserve fund for the future.

Third, we always looked to determine how we could reduce the tax burden on our hard-working citizens, the taxpayers of our respective States or the taxpayers of this country.

So fund priorities, build proper reserves, be fiscally sound and responsible, just as we do for our homes and businesses. We want to make sure we are in strong financial shape, we are fiscally solid and sound, have a reserve, and reduce the tax burden on our hard-working taxpayers. This budget does none of those fundamental things that go into building the right kind of budget. That is why I can't support this budget and we should not pass this budget.

As we look at our country today, we have to get people back to work. We have to get our economy growing. We have to reduce our deficit and our debt. We need to do it for our well-being today, for the well-being of our country today, and we need to do it for our children. This is about our kids. This is absolutely about our kids. So that means we have to have a budget that reduces our spending, that sets the right priorities, that controls and reduces spending. At the same time, we need progrowth tax reform and not higher taxes that hurt our economy. We need progrowth tax reform that gets our economy going, that gets people back to work. And with a growing economy, we get revenue from growth, not higher taxes. We need to reform our vital programs. We need, in a bipartisan way, to reform our programs such as Social Security and Medicare so we preserve and protect them for the long run. That is what the American people want. That is what the American people are asking us to do.

So as we set this direction with this budget—something that is incredibly important for our country—with all of these different aspects, we have to have the right priorities. This budget does not have the right priorities.

Members have to ask themselves as they vote on this budget: Does this budget set the right priorities? Does it properly control our spending? Will it put our fiscal house in order? Does it increase or reduce the tax burden on our hard-working taxpayers? We should ask ourselves those questions as we deliberate.

I know the American people will be asking those same questions. Those are the priorities that have to be fully evaluated and properly addressed in any budget, and this budget doesn't do that. For that reason I cannot support it, and I believe it should not be passed. I believe we should go back to work and create a budget that truly does those things: controls spending, sets the right priorities, doesn't raise taxes, and that truly does what the American people want and need us to do.

With that, I turn again to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. I thank him for leading this colloquy, and I look forward to working with him on this very important issue.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I think he put it absolutely right in terms of what the priorities should be and what the stakes are in the budget debate. I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

I want to close with one final point he made. He spoke a lot about the impact on the economy and what happens when we get economic growth. His State is a good example of this, because the State of North Dakota has a growing economy. And when we have a growing economy, we have people who are making money, people who are working, people who are investing, and that means people are paying more taxes, and that is how we get more revenue. What we need is a growing economy.

In the last 4 years, the average growth rate is less than 1 percent, eight-tenths of 1 percent. The 60-year average of economic growth, post-World War II, is 3.3 percent. So we are growing at less than 1 percent. In the last 4 years we have added $6 trillion to the debt, and we still have 12 million people unemployed and an unemployment rate that continues to hover around 8 percent.

Having said that, wouldn't we think we would want to try something different and go in a different direction? Yet this budget doubles down. It flat doubles down on these failed policies of the past 4 years that are antigrowth, antijobs, and continue to tax and spend and borrow as if there is no tomorrow. We need a different path. We need a different approach.

So I hope, as we have this debate over the course of the next couple of days, it will become clear not only to the Senators here in this Chamber but to the American people who really is interested in getting revenue the right way, which is through growing our economy, creating jobs, getting Americans back to work, and doing something about the debt and the spending crisis we have in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 60 minutes to the Senator from Virginia. Both Senators from Virginia are here. They are both great members of our committee who have contributed a great deal of time and effort in helping us get on to a path of sustainable economic recovery and deficit reduction. I appreciate the work of both of them.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me, first of all, thank the chairman of the committee for her great work in putting together what is this first step toward getting this issue that has plagued this body and plagued this country behind us.

This budget, as I have said to her and others, wouldn't have been the exact one I would have drafted. However, it reflects the varying concerns of the Democratic caucus. It is a budget that is credible, that is real, that moves us forward, and that has as part of its core all of the critical ingredients.

Anyone who has looked at this problem—I know the chairman of the committee has, I know the ranking member has; many of us have wrestled with this; all of the bipartisan groups have wrestled with this issue—have all said we have to do three or four things. No. 1, we have to have additional revenues. No. 2, we have to do entitlement reform. No. 3, we do need, yes, smart, targeted cuts on both the discretionary side and the defense side.

The Democratic budget, compared to what has now been as I understand in the last hour passed by the House, is the only document, the only budget that has all four of the component parts of any solution that will get this problem of the $16.5 trillion debt that our Nation faces, and a debt that goes up by $3 billion a day, to start putting a realistic, real plan in place to attack this problem in a real way.

I wish my colleagues from North and South Dakota were still here, because I, as was my good friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, was a Governor as well and, yes, we had to balance our budgets. I and my colleague, my great friend, the junior Senator from Virginia, was a Governor as well. I have to tell my colleagues, I will match our record of fiscal responsibility in Virginia and progrowth policies in Virginia with any State in the Nation. Independent rankings have named Virginia the best managed State in the country, the best State for business, the best State for educational opportunity. Those are not my words, not the words of the Senator from Virginia, but independent validation.

How did we get there? Well, the remarkable thing was what we had in Virginia because of actions of prior administrations. When I came in and when the Senator from Virginia was my lieutenant governor, we had a structural budget deficit. How did we have that structural budget deficit? One, because we had spent too much, yes, but also what we put in place was a tax code and a revenue stream that would never meet the needs of basic operations of government.

That analogy is actually what we face now in the United States of America. Yes, we do need to find ways to limit our spending. But what I find curious from all of my colleagues who talk about this issue is their constant focus on the spend side with virtually no mention of what we in this Nation have done on the revenue side.

Anybody who can read a balance sheet—and I take great pride in the fact that I was a businessman long before I was a politician—realizes we have a revenue side and spending side. If we take a moment and look at what previous Congresses have done on the revenue side, back in early 2002, 2003, we put in place a tax cut that cut $4.5 trillion out of the revenue stream over 10 years. We had an expectation we would see budget surpluses as far as the eye could see. Well, I think there is not an economist anywhere or, for that matter, virtually any elected official, who would at least acknowledge privately that in retrospect that was a tax cut of unsustainable proportions. What is particularly remarkable when we talk about growth is that some of the period of our Nation's highest economic growth took place during the 1990s under President Clinton when we had a Tax Code that generated that additional $4.5 trillion of revenue over a 10-year period.

What is remarkable about all of the debates and all of the groups that have looked at this, all of which have included new revenue back into the revenue stream along with targeted cuts, along with entitlement reform, is that every one of those independent reviews of our problem has said the only way we get a balanced approach to get this debt and deficit under control is yes, cuts, yes, entitlement reform, but, yes, additional revenue as well.

The plan that is most often cited on this floor is the Simpson-Bowles report. Simpson-Bowles, on a 10-year basis, based upon the baselines they used in 2010, would have generated $2.2 trillion of net new revenue—$2.2 trillion of net new revenue. Again, thinking about that in the context of what we cut, that is less than half of the amount of taxes we cut back in 2003. So even the most ambitious proposal has said we do not need to go back to the Clinton tax rates when our country was prospering at unparalleled rates. We do not need to put back all of that revenue. We do not even need to put 50 percent of that revenue back in. But we do need to put somewhere between one-third and 40 percent of the revenue back into the revenue stream to make sure we correct the structural deficit on both the spending side and the revenue side.

What does this budget do? Well, we put $600 billion back in on New Year's Eve in a deal where many of us maybe had to hold our nose or our breath on, but it was back in the revenue stream. We put on top of that now another $1 trillion back in—$975 billion back into the revenue stream. That puts us at $1.575 trillion of net new revenue back in—$1.575 trillion—literally only one-third of the revenue that was taken out with the $4.5 trillion tax cut in the so-called Bush tax cuts.

So I find it a little strange for those who are saying: Let's look at the country's balance sheet—and, yes, we have to cut spending—not to reflect back upon the incredible growth we had back in the 1990s and recognize we have both a structural problem on the spending side but also a structural problem on the revenue side.

I have to tell you, from any kind of reasonable standpoint, putting one-third of the revenues we took away back into the revenue stream seems to me to be a reasonable, balanced, thoughtful, and, candidly, on any kind of operational basis, business basis, fiscally conservative approach.

I have colleagues here, and I want to engage in a conversation about sequester, but I also have to make one other point that particularly bothers me about what the House, which just passed their budget, did and I assume that many of my Republican colleagues, I guess, are endorsing.

I 100 percent agree with my colleagues that we have to have a growth agenda in America. You cannot, no matter how much you cut, cut your way to prosperity. And you cannot—and I know our Republican colleagues agree—you cannot spend your way and tax your way to prosperity. You have to have a growth agenda.

Well, for 20 years before I got into politics, my business was investing in businesses that were growth businesses. I was a venture capitalist. I was proud to cofound Nextel, close to 70 other technology-related companies. Anybody who was an investor in businesses—whether you were me or whether you were Mitt Romney at Bain Capital—looked at a couple of key components of any business in which you would invest. There were generally three items you would look at on any business plan. One was, did that business invest in its workforce, because in a global economy there is a global competition for talent, and the most important criteria you can look at, if a business is going to be successful, is, are the workers going to be trained and are they going to be able to compete and do the job?

The second thing you would look at—of any business I would look at—is, does that business have a plan to invest in its plant and equipment? Whether you are creating software or making widgets, are you going to stay current in a very competitive marketplace with how you make things?

The third issue is, no matter how successful your business is today, are you going to stay competitive in this global economy and how do you stay ahead of the competition, because no matter how good you are today, somebody tomorrow is going to come up with a new idea.

I would invest in businesses that met those three criteria. I would say that former Governor Romney had a very successful record at Bain in many cases. I bet he looked at those same three criteria.

Countries, in a very similar way, have their own business plans, and budgets kind of reflect those business plans. We may call it different items, but we have those same three criteria: workforce, plant and equipment, staying ahead of the competition. We just call it different items. We call it our investment in education and workforce training. In terms of plant and equipment, we call it our investment in infrastructure because how well your economy, how well your country is going to do is how well your roads, your rail, your ports, and your broadband are, how well you can move goods and equipment in an efficient and effective manner. The third item is, how do you stay ahead of your competition? Well, in the global economy, staying ahead of your competition means, what is going to be your value added? That is going to be your intellectual capital and your ideas. That means research and development.

Well, under the growth agenda criteria, under the business plan criteria, under the investment criteria, the House budget that just passed—and I hope I find my Republican colleagues will contradict me and say: No, no, we do not want to do this, but the House budget that just passed takes Federal domestic discretionary spending, which is currently only 16 cents on every tax dollar that we spend in America—and for those viewers, in English, non-Washingtonese, domestic discretionary spending is, yes, money we spend on the environment and energy and law enforcement and early childhood, but it is also the money we spend in the Federal Government on education, infrastructure, and research and development. It takes that 16 cents—not a very high number right now even—and takes it over about a 20-year period to less than 5 cents.

I have to tell you, I would never invest in a business that spent less than 5 percent of its revenues on its workforce, its plant and equipment, and staying ahead of the competition. I would never invest as a nation in a nation that is spending less than 5 percent of its revenues on the education of its people, the infrastructure of its nation, and the research and development to stay ahead of the competition.

I tell you, I have spent a lot of time as somebody who looks at what some of our competitive countries are doing. China is spending, just on infrastructure, four times the percentage of their GDP what we are; India, significantly more as a percentage of their GDP on education; even Europe, with all its challenges, significantly more than what this House budget would spend on America's business plan, on America's growth agenda.

I have to tell you, I would never invest in it. I have to tell you, I would really question if Governor Romney, whom I have great respect for with his business acumen—I do not think Bain Capital would ever invest in a business plan for America that spent less than 5 percent of its revenue on its growth agenda and its ability to stay ahead of the rest of the world.

So I hope over this coming debate we can talk about growth agendas, we can talk about revenues, we can talk about balance, we can talk about looking at our plan from any historic perspective. But what I want to turn to now—and I apologize to my colleagues who are on the floor—is the question of sequester.

Back in August of 2011, when we got close to the budget ceiling debacle—not exactly a high point for this institution or Congress, and we could debate about who had the idea or where it came from originally, but what was curious about that was we set up a process that said: We are going to figure this out in a way where we will never get to sequester.

I use the analogy for sequester—some of us are old enough—my good friend, the Senator from Maine, may recall the movie ''Blazing Saddles.'' In that movie, ''Blazing Saddles,'' the sheriff comes out and puts a gun to his head, and all the townspeople come up and say: Oh my gosh, the sheriff may pull the trigger.

We in Congress set up that circumstance with the sequester, and unfortunately 2 weeks ago we allowed that trigger to be pulled. Because I believe, as somebody who cut spending as the Governor of Virginia—and I know my colleague, the new Senator from Virginia, cut spending as well—we know how to make cuts. But there are smart cuts and smart ways to cut, and there are stupid ways to cut, and there could not be created a more stupid way to cut than sequester.

There are 975 separate line items in the Navy budget. Those 975 separate line items in the Navy budget are not of equal value to the taxpayer, nor are they of equal value to the defense of this Nation. But within the framework of sequester, we do not have any ability to pick and prioritize the way any reasonable business leader or any reasonable Governor would. We had to cut them all of an equal amount. The remarkable thing that is happening—and, again, my friend, the Senator from Virginia, will talk to this more—is that there is example after example, under the name of sequester, that supposedly we are cutting spending where we are actually going to cost the taxpayer more than any perceived savings. I will just cite two examples before I turn to my friend from Virginia.

For those viewers, the American government actually does get certain things right. We have even gotten a law that if we do any bulk purchases, we have to get at least a 10-percent discount. If we buy 10 tanks instead of 1 tank, we get a discount. If we buy more than one Virginia class submarine, we get them at $2 billion apiece. If we buy them individually, they cost $2.5 billion apiece.

Under the name of sequester, if this is allowed to continue, we will have times where we will have to violate those contracts and not only pay a penalty cost but then not receive the government discount because of volume purchasing. It does not mean we are not going to still have to buy the same amount; it just means it is going to cost the taxpayer more money.

In the case of research, the National Institutes of Health does some remarkable work, but anybody who follows medical research knows you cannot normally finish a research project in a single year. So it may take 4 or 5 years to do a cancer research project. If we allow sequester to continue, you may have 4 years of a cancer research project done, but because you cannot discriminate between projects, you cannot let that fifth year of the contract, so the first 4 years of that research is flushed down the toilet.

My colleagues, there has to be a better way to deal with this. Our budget, which replaces sequester with half revenues and half more targeted spending cuts, I believe moves us in that right direction. We in Virginia, in many ways, are ground zero of the effects of sequester. Many States have not begun to feel it. They will at some point.

I would like to turn to my colleague, my good friend, the new Senator from Virginia, somebody who serves now on the Armed Services Committee and has

made hard choices as Governor as well, who knows what it takes to have a balanced approach to continue to grow the economy. He has continued the kinds of accolades that Virginia has received. I would like to ask the Senator from Virginia if he would be willing to explain in a little bit more detail some of the challenges we face at ground zero in Virginia around sequester and why the approach we have taken in our Senate budget is better than the status quo approach we are now having to deal with.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I would be happy to address that question from my senior Senator and good friend, Mr. WARNER. As he indicated—and I think I can maybe say it a little bit more strongly than he could because he would be a little bit modest. I know of many people in this body who have great experience in governance, great experience in the business sector. I do not know of anyone who has worked harder on issues of fiscal responsibility and who has a greater track record in the business world of understanding what true fiscal responsibility is than my colleague Senator WARNER, and I am glad to engage in this colloquy with him.

I also want to thank our chairwoman, Senator MURRAY, for a job well done in helping shepherd this budget through committee to the floor. This debate, both in committee and here on the floor, that will take place in the next few days will illuminate important choices we need to make as a nation and will illuminate important differences between the Senate's approach and the House's approach.

I echo comments Senator WARNER made. This Senate budget is a compromise, like all are, and there will be more compromise that should take place in any normal process. But the budget does a very good job in a number of ways. It tackles the task, the challenging task of deficit reduction to get us to figures that would be very much the equivalent of what had been recommended in the Simpson-Bowles report, as Senator WARNER indicated. It focuses upon economic growth, a growth agenda, which is the most important thing we need to be focused on in this body, and it does it in a balanced way that incorporates real savings and also appropriate reform of revenues.

It is impossible to fix a balance sheet by just focusing on one side of the balance sheet. Business leaders know this. Governors know this. Everyday Americans know this. I commend Chairwoman MURRAY and the other members of the committee, and I echo the comments made by my colleague, Senator WARNER, about the budget having the critical components.

I feel very confident, if this budget were enacted as is with no change to an apostrophe, comma, or a line item, this budget would be a positive result for the American economy. It would promote growth, and it would find us continuing on a path to responsible deficit reduction to reach the levels of debt, deficit, or GDP which are appropriate from economic terms.

I would not say the same about the House budget. If it were enacted without a change, comma, or apostrophe, it would not be a positive thing for the American economy—it could be somewhat catastrophic or cataclysmic for the economy.

To get to the question, my senior Senator and friend has asked me about the effects of sequester in Virginia. As some of you might know, I took the floor for my maiden speech on this topic last month—a little bit earlier than I would have wished to have spoken as a freshman Senator. With the spectre of the sequester having such a significant effect on the Commonwealth of Virginia, I felt I couldn't be silent on it. A Senator colleague from Hawaii is here, Senator HIRONO, who I know feels equally strongly about this issue.

I took a tour throughout Virginia in the middle of February, which was designed as sequester was looming. We spoke to people who were affected, especially in the armed services area. I heard their stories about the sequester and the anxieties and threats it posed. Beginning in early April, 90,000 DOD civilian employees will begin to be furloughed in the Commonwealth of Virginia, hundreds of thousands nationally. This will have a very significant effect on the kitchen table, family pocketbook discussions which are happening all over the Commonwealth. This will be a very significant change to the individuals and the lives of their communities.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KAINE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. I would ask the Senator, I know he has seen and is very familiar with these installations and their families because of his tenure as Governor. You may also want to make the point: in an area such as Hampton Roads where you put these folks on furlough with literally 88,000, 98,000 immediately affected, will the Senator speak about the point of the ripple effect this has for literally thousands of others who provide the support services—restaurants, gas stations, auto repair, you name it—which rely on those folks having jobs as well?

Mr. KAINE. Absolutely. I am pleased the Senator brought this up. When folks are furloughed and they see their pay reduced, they will spend less at the drycleaner and less at the restaurant. They will delay the purchase of the automobile they planned for this year. They will be doing all kinds of things to tighten their spending. This will affect shopkeepers and merchants in their area.

When I was Governor, early in my term Ford decided to close a plant in Norfolk with a couple of thousand workers. The ripple effect of that was felt throughout the economy, a couple of thousand workers, was very significant. To take 90,000 civilian DOD employees in a State such as Virginia, heavily concentrated in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads and furlough them and reduce their salaries will be felt throughout the economy. These civilian furloughs are one of the many effects of sequester.

Sometimes when people hear about furloughs of Department of Defense civilian employees, they might think it is someone sitting in an office. Who knows what they are doing? You need to think about who these people are. I visited Fort Belvoir Community Hospital, one of the premier facilities in the United States which treats wounded warriors, the people who have sacrificed so much for this Nation. When I was dialoguing with a wounded warrior and his wife at Fort Belvoir Community Hospital, they raised sequester. I thought they were raising sequester about something about their veterans' benefits. No. Instead, what they wanted to know is, My nurse is a DOD civilian and my physical therapist is a DOD civilian. Are the people we are asking to care for those who have borne the scars of battle—are they going to have reduced care because of this sequester? This is who these DOD civilian employees are, doing wonderful work, such as the nurses at Fort Belvoir Community Hospital.

Outside of the DOD civilian space, let's move into the private sector world. On this tour I went to the Newport News Shipyard. Senator WARNER and I were there last Saturday for a wonderful occasion honoring former Senator John Warner. This is a shipyard we in Virginia are proud of and proud of nationally. It is a great story. We manufacture the largest and most sophisticated items manufactured on the planet Earth in the Commonwealth of Virginia, nuclear aircraft carriers. They are manufactured and refurbished in Newport News at this shipyard. It is a very special technical expertise, the construction and refurbishing of these aircraft carriers. They are heel-to-toe for months. Then one leaves and the next one comes in. If you get out of line or delay, everything becomes backed up. The result is your shipping fleet isn't ready or as operational as it should be.

There was a pier, a drydock, filled in because the *Truman* was supposed to be coming in for a new refurbishment. It was stopped and sitting across the water in Newport. They couldn't start work because of sequester and uncertainty about the CR.

Many other shipyards in the Hampton Roads area, private, small ship repairs but without the financial muscle of a Huntington Ingalls of Newport News Shipyard, have issued warn notices to lay off employees because the Navy indicated in quarters three and four they would need to scale back on repairs. These were some of the effects they were seeing.

I went to a National Guard armory in Stanton, which was very interesting. I

learned the National Guard in Stanton is called the Stonewall Brigade. Their first activity on behalf of the defense of the Nation occurred 20 years before the French and Indian wars. The Stonewall Brigade in Stanton began in 1740 defending the Nation, and they were talking to me about sequester.

How does sequester affect the Guard in Virginia, the Stonewall Brigade? It affects their ability to train their people. A whole series of training exercises planned for the next months or years is now jeopardized. They will not be able to train.

The commander of the brigade said, My people will do anything, but I would rather have them take on the tasks and the challenge knowing they are 100 percent trained and ready, rather than 85 or 90 percent trained and ready. This is an important responsibility we have to those men and women who sign up to be guardsmen in Virginia. Once again, whether it was our DOD civilians, ship repairers, wounded warriors, or guards men and women, you see these immediate effects sequester has in Virginia.

Of all the effects I have mentioned, I will say there was only one which made goosebumps come up on my arm. They were all of concern to me, but there was one which really made me stop and think. I went to visit an ROTC unit at the University of Virginia, which combined students from Navy, Army, and Air Force ROTC programs at UVA, to sit with me and speak about their career path. They spoke about their love for their country, their patriotism and willingness to sacrifice and put themselves in harm's way for their country.

One of them basically said this: I am willing to sign up voluntarily for a career path which will put me in harm's way—because I know it is a dangerous world. But as I am making a decision about my career, I hadn't really factored in the notion, Is my civilian political leadership willing to support me? When I watch Congress indiscriminately cutting budgets and doing an across-the-board cut to the military of the size sequester suggests, I need to ask myself—I will put myself in harm's ways, face bullets, danger, and the likelihood I could be a wounded warrior and a vet in a bed at Fort Belvoir Community Hospital once in my life. Do I want to face the risk a Congress might impose these types of cuts which are so nonstrategic and thereby send a signal to me what we are doing isn't that valuable?

This was chilling to me. This is the message we send, whether it be the ship welders who could be ship repairers or go somewhere else or bright and talented college students who could be military officers or do something else. When we send a signal from this place, people pay attention. If the signal we send is we have a wavering commitment and are willing to do nonstrategic across-the-board cuts, it is not only affecting today but it could potentially have an effect down the road.

There is an answer to this, a solution. What I heard repeatedly on the trail from Virginians of all political parties is fix this, make a deal, find a compromise, listen to the other side. No one said to me fix this; fix my problem by taking more money away from someone else. I didn't have the warriors say: Fix our defense cuts by cutting Head Start or by cutting other priorities more.

They said go find the kind of balanced approach which would involve cuts and savings, and we all know how to do them. This would also involve the kinds of revenues we need to find a balance to this problem.

The other good thing is we can fix this. In fact, we tried to fix it. There was a bill on the floor here which replaced the first year of these sequester cuts with a balanced mixture of revenues and expenditures. The bill was on the floor for vote, and it received enough to pass. It received more than 50 votes and more than a majority of this body. This is a way of saying we do not want there to be these nonstrategic sequester cuts. Because of the decision to filibuster, to require it to reach not a majority but 60 votes, the will of the majority in this body to turn off sequester for the first year and find a balanced replacement package was thwarted. We have another opportunity in this budget.

I will say one more thing, and then I will throw it back to the Senator with a question. We have before us a sequester alternative in the fiscal year 2014 budget we are debating. The budget includes a path of deficit reduction which is balanced and is both expense cuts and revenues. It also does something very particular with respect to sequester. It replaces blunt across-the-board nonstrategic cuts with targeted and strategic cuts of a lesser magnitude, because we are adding in revenues as well. It also times the cuts so they are not straight across-the-board equal for 10 years but a little more focused on the back end of the 10-year period to help the economy. Signs indicate the stock market, housing market, auto sales, and consumer confidence is picking up.

What this budget does with the sequester is it finds savings but reduces the deficit of savings. It makes them targeted and strategic, rather than blunt and across the board. It times them in a way which is more conducive to economic growth. This, as one of the many features of this budget, is the better approach to sequester than the one we are currently living under.

I wish to ask the Senator a question. After attending the Budget Committee hearings with me and hearing the debate on the floor thus far about the budget, I have to say I have been a little surprised to hear some of my colleagues. They argue: No, we shouldn't replace sequester. The sequester should go forward. The sequester is a good thing.

I heard this argued in committee. There was opposition to the notion of doing something better than sequester. It was sort of expressed as we said we were going to do the sequester cuts and we need to do them. I have heard it said on the floor, even in the course of the debate since yesterday. Under any circumstances, as somebody who has created and run businesses, who ran a State government and received fiscal accolades for doing it the right way, if we have a reasonable fix, is there any justification for continuing with blunt across-the-board sequester cuts which do not take into account the priority of any of the line items and do not take into account the performance data about whether any of those line items are affected? I would like to hear the Senator address that question.

I know our colleague from Hawaii is also anxious to tell us about sequester effects in her State.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent to engage in colloquy with my friend, the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Hawaii, and the Senator from New Hampshire as well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. To briefly respond—I don't want to keep returning to the ''Blazing Saddles'' analogy, other than the fact these cuts were set up to be the stupidest way possible. No rational group of folks would allow them to come to pass.

The only other point I wish to make is with regard to the Senator's point about the ROTC individuals. I think at times this may not have been part of debate—although there may have been a number of colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have argued strongly against sequester and pointed this out as well. We are not just talking about the immediate short-term effect on that furloughed employee or the ship which may not get repaired. As these cuts were set up to be so ridiculously put forward, the effects of these cuts will actually, in many cases, cost us more money than the savings.

If that ROTC member who has taken 3 years of ROTC decides to quit and not become an officer, the money we have invested in his or her training up to that point is flushed down the toilet.

If we do not make the ship repairs that are part of our industrial base and if the workers at those ship repair businesses in Hampton Roads and in Hawaii and in New Hampshire and in California and in Alabama and in Mississippi leave those careers and those welders go elsewhere, the cost of replacing that workforce and retraining them because we have said, oops, we made a mistake and we come back and fix it 2 years from now, will end up costing the taxpayer more than the dollars we have saved.

If we continue to defer the maintenance and the training of our Armed Forces so we don't have divisions ready to go into action, the cost to get them

back up to military readiness will be exponentially higher the longer we wait than doing these cuts in a smarter, more tailored and more phased-in fashion.

I think the military and everybody I have seen realizes they are going to have to make the kind of cuts to make sure that everything—domestic discretionary, defense, entitlement reform, and revenues—all have to be part of the mix.

Our military does a remarkable job for us, and we owe them not only the kind of platitudes we sometimes say on this floor, but we owe them an ability to manage a budget that is reasonable, that is thoughtful, that does not have this kind of arbitrary, across-the-board-regardless-of-performance cut. We owe that young man or woman who is in the ROTC the commitment that our Nation will stand by their obligations to their training and support of them so they can continue to serve and protect our Nation.

I now want to ask our friend, another new Senator, the Senator from Hawaii, for her comments. Hawaii is a State that has enormous military assets as well as other assets on the frontline of our Nation's shift in focus on Asia. She may want to add as well any particular stories about her views on sequester and how our budget takes a more reasoned and balanced approach.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the Senator and good morning, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Good morning.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. I wish to thank Senator WARNER for leading this colloquy, and I am glad to join him and my friend Senator KAINE in talking about the effects of sequester and how we need to come up with an alternative to the sequester.

Senator WARNER used the word ''stupid'' to describe sequester, and I think that is apt, because what family, in trying to get a handle on their budget, would just make an across-the-board cut to everything in their family's budget. The Senator raised the analogy that no business would do an across-the-board cut, but let's talk about families in our country. No family would cut across the board their food budget, their rent budget. That would not happen. So why are we doing this?

As one of the people who testified before the Armed Services Committee said, sequester was the result of political dysfunction. That is very true because it was never supposed to happen. As Senator KAINE said, I am very surprised to listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about sequester—something that was never supposed to happen, and both Republicans and Democrats had agreed this was not going to happen—now take the position that we are where we are and we need to live by the boundaries of sequester.

What sequester does is it interjects huge uncertainty into our economy, huge uncertainty, at a time when we are still digging out from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Senator WARNER and Senator KAINE have both acknowledged that Virginia is ground zero on the bad effects of sequester. If Virginia is ground zero, I would say Hawaii is ground 0.1. We have a huge military presence in Hawaii. They are a big part of our economy. In fact, there are some 101,000 people in Hawaii who are directly employed with the military. That is 16 percent of our workforce. Some 20,000 of them have gotten notices of furloughs, looking toward a reduction in their pay of 20 percent. Talk about the ripple effect of that kind of reduction in their ability to buy products, we can see what the negative ripple effect would be.

In Hawaii, as I said, the military is such a big part of our economy. States such as Hawaii, such as Virginia are among the first States to experience the negative effects of sequester—immediate. Thousands of letters have been going out to say: Expect to be furloughed, with 11,000 people possibly losing their jobs directly. These are immediate impacts.

The top reason we need to replace the sequester with something balanced, reasonable, fair, and not stupid is that sequester cuts jobs. There will be huge job losses, and economists of all stripes have said don't keep going down this path with these kinds of cuts that will severely hamper economic growth and cost jobs in this country. These are senseless cuts.

The State of Hawaii is already reeling from the potential impacts of sequester which will begin in a couple weeks. We have already gotten many of these notices. But the sequester also represents huge cuts to education, housing assistance, and other programs that are on the chopping block. We must listen to our constituents. So many of them, I know, have contacted all of us. There was one letter I received from an elderly woman and her husband. She lives on Social Security and on HUD housing grants—HUD vouchers—and she said: Our Social Security checks are so small.

Yes, while sequester doesn't touch Social Security, it certainly has a potential impact of cutting their housing vouchers.

She said: I don't know where we would go if we lost our HUD housing voucher. We would be homeless. I am so distressed, she wrote to me.

Another letter I received was from an Army reservist who was all set to go for his training. Now multiply this situation thousands and thousands of times across our country. He said due to sequester he will no longer be traveling to the TDY location for his training. Yet he planned his calendar based on his going. The letter he got was that his orders had been canceled for training due to sequester and his billet is going unfulfilled to cut costs.

Failing to provide training to this young man and the thousands and thousands of other men and women who are in our Reserves degrades our Nation's readiness.

I received letters from people who work at the Pearl Harbor shipyard, which is the largest industrial employer in the State of Hawaii, with some 5,000 direct employees, both civilian and military, who got their furlough notices. These are highly skilled people with good-paying jobs. When they think about a 20-percent reduction in their salaries, believe me, they are thinking about how to revise their family budgets, and that revision is not going to involve across-the-board ''stupid'' cuts.

These are just some of the examples of how sequester will hurt a State such as Hawaii. What should we do to replace sequester? My colleagues have talked about it. The American people understand this meat-ax approach to balancing our budget is the wrong way to go because it destroys jobs and it affects many people who are working right now. So the budget put forth by Chairman MURRAY will reverse this path down no man's land, basically. What the Murray budget says is let's provide a balanced approach. Let's ask a little more from the most fortunate and wealthy, including the corporations, while including more smart, targeted cuts to other areas of our budget.

Let's remember once again that we have already implemented and put in place $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. So by following the balanced approach that is represented in the Murray budget, we will have reduced the deficit by some $4 trillion over the next 10 years.

As I said, we need to do this in a responsible, balanced way, and it bears repeating—because we are still hearing from our friends on the other side that sequester is what we have; let's just live with it—that there is an alternative, friends. The alternative is a fair, balanced, smart way to deal with our budget deficit, to create jobs, and to help our families, because our budgets do reflect our values, and our values are about supporting our families, creating jobs, moving our country forward, and enabling us to continue to dig out from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

I thank Senator WARNER very much for this opportunity to come forward, and I will have a few more things to say perhaps later on about the budget and how Senator MURRAY's budget reflects the kind of values we should be putting forth in our country.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to thank the Senator from Hawaii for the real stories of how these sequester cuts are affecting folks in her State of Hawaii, and, obviously, my friend, the Senator from Virginia, has expressed those challenges as well.

Let me be clear. It is not that our budget proposal doesn't make significant cuts in defense. We still add roughly $250 billion of cuts in defense over a 10-year period, but we do it in a smarter, targeted, phased-in way.

The last point I wish to make, before I ask my friend, the Senator from Virginia, to close out, is I want to agree with so many of my Republican colleagues who have come and pointed out this is a responsibility we owe to our children and our grandchildren. We, candidly, owe it to ourselves. This $16.5 trillion in debt goes up $3 billion a day, and it is unsustainable. As Erskine Bowles once said: It is the most predictable crisis in our lifetimes if we don't grapple with it. And so we need a growth agenda.

Two comments I would simply make in closing: If we look back at recent American history for the period of the highest economic growth, the period that we added the most jobs, the area where America continued to lead in innovation, it was during the 1990s. We had a Tax Code at that point that generated sufficient revenue to meet our needs without dramatic expansion of government. I think, in retrospect, most of us would acknowledge we probably made a mistake when we took $4.5 trillion out of the revenue stream in some of those cuts that were made earlier.

We have a spending issue, but we also have a revenue issue. What this Democratic plan puts forward doesn't say we have to put all those revenues back. It doesn't say we have to put half those revenues back. What the Democratic plan says, to get us back on this path to balance, to get us back on this path to growth, we have to, roughly, return about one-third of that $4.5 trillion. With what we did on New Year's Eve and what this budget does, it replaces $1.575 trillion into the revenue stream. It doesn't bring us back to the 1990s rate, but I would love the chance to debate my colleagues on how that is not a reasonable assumption.

If we have a structural deficit problem on the spending side, we also have a structural deficit problem on the revenue side, and I believe this approach is reasonable and both fiscally prudent and responsible.

I would simply close as well with saying that we can't tax and cut our way out of this problem. We have to have a growth agenda. Any good company—any good country—has a business plan. Any business plan for any good company—any good country—that is going to compete in the 21st century has to do at least three things: They have to invest in their workforce, invest in their infrastructure, and they have to stay ahead of their competition, which means research and development.

I tell my colleagues, there is no way a plan that says America will invest less than 5 percent of its public revenues in its education, infrastructure, and R&D will keep America the leading economic power in the 21st century. If we want to honor our commitment to our children, we have to leave them not only a nation that is not riddled with debt and deficit but also a nation that continues to be the economic leader in the world. I believe our plan makes and protects those investments in those key components of growth.

I hope, over the coming hours, we will go through this debate—I know we will have a spirited period of a lot of amendments—that this budget will pass, and it will then find agreement with our colleagues in the House.

I want to again commend both the chair and the ranking member in that at the end of the day, we have to find common agreement to get this done. This issue that hovers over all of our other debates has in many ways become a metaphor of whether our institutions can function in the 21st century. So just as the chair and the ranking member found agreement through a markup process where both sides were heard and amendments were offered and debated in a fair and open process, I want to thank both the chair and the ranking member for their commitment. They have different ideas about how we get there, but at the end of the day we do have to get there in common agreement.

Mr. President, I want to give the Senator from Virginia the last word on this issue. So I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator WARNER.

I do want to pick up on one of the last points he made, which is the balanced way of getting to where we all want to go. We want to have a growing economy with a lowering unemployment rate. We want to deal with our deficit. These are challenging, complex goals that are not easy, but we can get there. Even the action of this body last night in passing the fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill and fix shows we can cooperate together and with the House get there. It is my hope that will inspire us going forward.

The question is this: All agree that what has been done thus far in the area of deficit reduction equates to about $2.4 trillion of deficit reduction that has been done by the last Congress, including the deal on the Bush tax cuts that were made at yearend, $2.4 trillion of deficit reduction over the next 10 years. And all in looking at that deficit reduction also agree that $1.85 trillion of the deficit reduction was cutting expenses and a little bit more than $600 billion of it was revenues that were achieved through the yearend Bush tax cuts deal. So overwhelmingly what has been done thus far has been in spending cuts rather than new revenues. It is very important for us to know that. It is very important for folks to realize that Democrats are willing to make hard calls about spending, and we have done it already.

But the question before this body and the question before the House now is, going forward, what do we do to achieve additional deficit reduction that is consistent with having a growing economy? The approaches of the Senate and the House on this could not be more different.

The House approach basically says all additional deficit reduction should be achieved by cutting spending, by looking at one side of the balance sheet. I do not know of a business, I do not know of a family, I do not know of other units of government that, as they are trying to wrestle with this question, confine themselves only looking at one side of the balance sheet. But that is what the House budget does.

I was thinking about this approach and this question about deficits not long ago, and it struck me that when I look at myself in a mirror, I always wish I was thinner, but I have never once looked in a mirror and wished I was weaker. An all-cuts approach is like looking in a mirror and wishing you were weaker because an all-cuts approach makes you weaker. It makes you weaker in defense, it makes you weaker in education, it makes you weaker in infrastructure.

By laying people off in jobs, it makes you weaker because your unemployment rate is higher. An all-cuts approach is like looking in the mirror and wishing you were weaker.

I don't want to be weaker. I don't want this Nation to be weaker. We have to be stronger. Can we make cuts? Sure, we can. We have, and we will make more. But we ought to be focused on being stronger, about growing the economy and growing jobs.

That is why the approach the Senate takes is the right approach; because by utilizing revenues appropriately, reforming tax expenditures to reduce them on the equivalent of about 7 or 8 percent a year, these myriad of tax expenditures in the Tax Code, we are able to find investments in infrastructure and soften the indiscriminate cuts that are leading to the job losses that my friend from Hawaii described.

The Senate budget, in achieving additional deficit reduction, is a balanced approach that will make us stronger, not weaker. That is why it is my great hope that we will pass this in a significant way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senators from Virginia and Hawaii for excellent statements and laying out the framework of why it is so important that we have a progrowth bill that is balanced, that deals with both spending cuts and revenue, and I really appreciate their time both in committee and on the Senate floor.

I ask unanimous consent that at 3:45 p.m. today there be up to 60 minutes of debate, equally divided between Senators KLOBUCHAR and COATS, or their designees, for a report on the economic goals and policy under section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I have enjoyed listening to our colleagues discuss the issues, particularly

the sequester. I know Senator KAINE and I talked about this previously. I would just like to make a few points that are so important for every Member of this body to understand.

Senator KAINE just said additional deficit reduction is needed. He is exactly correct. But this budget has no additional deficit reduction.

They claim they have a balanced approach. They have used that word now 40-some-odd times, ''balance.'' This budget never balances. It does not balance in 10 years, 15 years, and has no vision that would even lead to balance. It remains unsustainable in terms of adding to the debt every single year, resulting in a 1-year interest payment in 2023 of $800 billion—well more than the defense budget; surging interest from around $250 billion now to $800 billion a year—forever, I suppose. And it would go up with the debt rising and with interest rates that could rise even more.

So we don't have additional deficit reduction in the budget that we are being asked to vote on. Senator KAINE said can we make cuts? Yes. Well, I would say we can make more cuts, but we don't. Yes, there is some reduction in some programs, but, on net, no deficit reduction in the budget. So it doesn't change the debt course. You can't deny that.

What we are saying is, go back to the committee. Write the budget like you want. If you think there ought to be more taxes than I think, that is OK. Bring it up. Let's vote on it. But let's have this budget do what you say, be balanced. They have used this word ''balance''—balance, balance, balance—40 more times. We have been keeping up with it. It is so ridiculous. It is utterly unbalanced. It never balances.

By their own admission, the deficits in 1 year are never lower than $400 billion. So it never balances.

A balanced approach. A balanced plan. Why? Are they guilty of confusing the issue? Do they think the American people will hear their message and think, oh, they have a balanced budget? I suspect that is what they think. Twice I have observed my Democratic colleagues at the committee slip and say they have a balanced budget. They have this in their heads so much, but a balanced plan is what they are really saying.

So what is a balanced plan? The way it has been promoted: $1 trillion in tax increases, $1 trillion in spending cuts, a net $2 trillion in deficit reduction. Not so. It is not so. The tax increases are offset by spending increases.

That is just the way it is. You can spin it any way you want to, but I want to make that point.

One thing I will share about the sequester—and I am so pleased that Senator RUBIO is here, and I look forward to yielding to him. I truly think this is an unwise mechanism to reduce spending. It should not happen. It should be fixed.

I totally agree with my colleagues that this is unfairly and disproportionately falling on the military. I know Senator RUBIO has military bases in Florida. I have them in Alabama and they have them in Virginia, we almost all do. These are patriotic Americans, and these furloughs are in effect 1 day a week, a 20-percent pay cut out of the blue. It is not necessary, and there are other things that have happened.

So how did it happen? Well, it was proposed by the White House, who said: OK, if this special committee doesn't reach agreement on the details of spending cuts, then we will have a sequester across the board. So it originated from the White House. The political theater we have down here is not correct, and we need to be honest about this.

The Republicans agreed to it. It was part of the Budget Control Act. That is the legislation. And who signed the legislation in blue ink right on the back? The President of the United States, Barack Obama.

So he signed it, it is his document, and we agreed to raise the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion, and we agreed to reduce spending over 10 years by $2.1 trillion.

Before the ink was dry, the President was proposing to eliminate the cuts he agreed to. He has been fighting to eliminate those cuts from the beginning, and they are not really cuts. If they were properly applied, it would reduce the growth of spending and not cut spending at all.

So the committee that was supposed to find other cuts failed. The sequester went into effect. And it is an anti-military provision. It was designed by Jack Lew, a very liberal member of the President's Cabinet, who was the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at the time.

The President, in my opinion, seemed to be quite happy to see these cuts fall on the Defense Department. He seemed to be happy to have this happen.

Why do I say that? Because he has done nothing to fix it except demand something that he has no right to demand, and that is to violate this agreement to reduce spending and instead raise taxes and spend more. That is not going to happen. Congress is not going to vote to violate the agreement they made with the American people less than 2 years ago. If we give in on that, we might as well quit.

Our colleagues say they want to have a balanced approach to this budget, and they are going to raise taxes. Most people who hear that think the taxes would be used to reduce the deficit, but they are not. The taxes are going to be used to fund more spending over the agreement we have had in place now for about 20 months under the Budget Control Act. They want to increase spending above these levels, and they want to use all the new tax increases they are now proposing to fund it.

It does not change the debt course of America, which Mr. Elmendorf, the CBO Director, told us in committee is an unsustainable path that we are on even after the Budget Control Act was passed in August 2011. So we need to work on it.

I am prepared to offer solutions. The House of Representatives has twice passed legislation that would alter the Budget Control Act so that the cuts don't fall so hard on defense. In fact, they eliminated the additional defense cuts, the second phase of defense cuts, and found cuts elsewhere in the budget and smoothed it out fairly. That is what should happen, and that is where we need to be.

So I would encourage all our citizens, all our Members of Congress, all our military leaders by saying if you want to fix the sequester then address your request to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Address your request to the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military, who has an absolute duty—a responsibility—to ensure that these reductions are done in a fair way.

We have voted and fought for flexibility on this side of the aisle, and we believe in finding, and will vote for, other reductions in spending to prevent this happening the way it is set to occur under current law.

It seems to me they wanted it to happen this way, so they could come to the floor and make a point somehow that we are dramatically and disastrously hammering the budget, when it is not necessary for it to be done this way. That is the way I see it, and I believe we can reach agreement on this. I think somehow we will because it is not right the way the military—representing one-sixth of all Federal spending—is taking half of the cuts. That is the way it falls right now. It is not right and it is too damaging.

It is great to see Senator RUBIO. I believe he is next up. I yield to him and thank him for his contribution to our discussion.

Madam President, I ask that time be counted against the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I thank Senator SESSIONS for enlightening us on this budget as he has been doing all day on the Senate floor.

I want to give some perspective about what we are debating. I think sometimes those of us who work in this building come to believe that Washington, DC, and government is the center of the universe or even the center of peoples' lives, and it is not. All this stuff we are talking about on the Senate floor, not just this day but every day, the reason it is relevant is how it impacts the lives of real people all over this country. What impact does this have on peoples' lives?

Ultimately, I know it is cliche-ish to say this, but it happens to be very true that we are sent here to work for people. We are sent here to work for the people who elected us from the States we come from. So all this stuff we are discussing is relevant to the extent that it impacts the lives of real people in our country and in some respects around the world.

When you talk about cutting spending, what matters is the spending you are cutting and how it is impacting real people, for better or worse. When you talk about raising taxes, those taxes have to be paid by somebody. They are not being paid by some anonymous thing. They are being paid by a person or a business, which is a collection of people. The point is these taxes are being paid.

Talk about the debt. The debt is not simply just a moral financial obligation. The debt also has to be paid. Someone is going to pay that debt one day. Every penny this government borrows someone is going to have to pay back one day. They are going to have to pay it back through higher taxes. If the debt is too high they are also going to have to pay it back through less opportunities. That is why this matters and why it is relevant. It is relevant because we have to view it through the lens of peoples' real lives, the lives of real people in the real world.

What do people want out of their lives? It is not that complicated. It is what all of us want. They want a job that pays them enough money so they can have a good standard of living, so they can afford to maybe buy a house and have enough time to spend with their families and have leisure activities, maybe take a vacation every year or so. People want that. People want to be able to pursue their dreams. Maybe you have a great idea about a new business you want to start and you want to live in a country where if that is what you want to do with your life, it is actually possible; you can actually do something that you love for a living and they pay you for it.

What everybody wants, no matter where you are in the economic strata, everyone wants to make sure their kids are better off than themselves. That is not unique to Americans. People all over the world want their kids to be better off than they were.

That is what this is about. It is about what role can we play making all these things more possible in this country. The fact that this has been more possible here than anywhere else is what has made us special. So in order to understand what we can do to make that possible we have to understand what makes that happen. How does prosperity happen? How does the kind of prosperity we Americans want for ourselves and our families, for our children, how is that possible? That is also not that complicated. It is largely a function of the private economy, and it is a cycle that is very well understood.

Someone has a good idea for a business, a new business, or growing their existing business. They somehow get access to money, whether it is their own money or money they borrowed or someone invests through them, and they open this business. There is no guarantee that business is going to work out, but they are willing to risk it. And the idea works. All of a sudden this business they started all by themselves out of the spare bedroom of their home now has five employees—and five employees is not just a number, that is five families who are taking home a paycheck. Those are five providers, mothers or fathers, who are bringing home opportunities to their children.

This is how prosperity is created. This is how every one of us has ever gotten a job or how our parents got their jobs. It is because he or someone else risked it and created a business opportunity that provided them a job. This is how prosperity is created.

When you view prosperity this way you come to understand that what we need to do here is to make it easier for that to happen and not harder. Government does have an important role to play in our society. It does.

For example, we believe in a safety net, not as a way of life but to help those who cannot help themselves. We are a society that is too prosperous and, quite frankly, as well as that, we are too humane and too compassionate to not take care of those who cannot help themselves. We always have and we always will. We also need to have a safety net to help those who have failed to get back on their feet and try again. But the safety net was never designed to be a way of life.

By the same token we need to have security. Government plays an important role in our security—our national security for sure, but also in combating crime and enforcing contracts and ensuring that the water we drink is clean, the air we breathe is safe. These are important roles for government to play. But the majority of the things that are going to impact prosperity creation in this country do not come from government. They come from the private sector, and the job of our government is to make it easier for that cycle of prosperity I described to happen.

The job of our government is to create an environment where people are encouraged to and it is easier for them to risk the money they have access to in order to start a new business or grow an existing business so they can hire more people and create more jobs for others. There are a lot of things government can do to help create that environment, but there are a few that are being discussed. I want to point to three.

The first is predictability. What do I mean by that? What I mean is when someone decides they are going to open a business, one of the things that encourages them to hire people is they know what tomorrow is going to look like. They know what the taxes are going to be, they know what the law is going to be, what the economy is going to look like, so they feel encouraged because they can plan and know what tomorrow is going to look like.

Imagine for a moment you are a businessman or businesswoman and you are deciding whether to hire five people next year. One of the first things you want to know is, Am I going to have customers to pay their salaries? How much am I going to owe on taxes and insurance? You want predictability and that is something that has not happened from Washington. There has not been a budget over the last 4 years out of this Chamber, and that creates unpredictability.

I am pleased there is a budget to debate; it is an important debate. Even though we do not agree on everything, I congratulate those who have prepared this budget on bringing it up for a vote on the Senate floor so we can have this debate, a vibrant debate. But part of the problem we have is this budget that is offered doesn't really address the debt. Why does the debt matter?

The debt matters. It matters as a moral obligation for sure. It is wrong to hit future Americans and our young people with this kind of debt, but it is having an impact right now. The debt is not something that is hurting us 20 years down the road or 10 years down the road alone, it is hurting us today. The problem is when people look at this economy and they look at this debt and they say there is no plan in place to fix it, there is no serious plan in place to deal with it, they are worried about risking their money and creating jobs in America.

They believe unless this debt is solved, we are going to have a financial crisis in this country. They believe unless this debt is solved, we are going to have dramatic increases in taxes, which is not going to make America a good place to do business. So there are jobs that are not being created right now because of the fear over the debt and no plan to fix it. This budget does not fix it. This budget does not fix it.

The first thing we need from government is to create an environment where private business can grow and create opportunity, which is predictability. This budget does not do that. The second thing is affordability. We all understand we have to pay taxes. How are you going to pay firefighters and police officers? How do we pay the men and women who defend our freedoms around the world? How are the lights on in this building? Of course we have to pay taxes. This is not about paying taxes or not paying taxes. This is about the fact that there is only so much money in the world. Every penny the government takes in in taxes is money that is not available to invest in a private business.

Every time you take a tax, what you are doing is taking money out of the economy. You have to do that at some point because you need a government, but if you do too much of it then there is not enough money for people to spend at your business. If someone is paying more in taxes, that means they have less money to spend where you work, which means you are going to make less money in tips or in salary or it may even cost you your job if the taxes are too high.

I tell you, we focus on Federal taxes here, but these are not the only taxes

people pay. Depending on where you live you are paying local and State and now Federal taxes. You add this up and there are people in this country paying close to half the money they make in taxes. How is that good for growing your economy?

So that is a problem.

This budget talks about raising taxes. It doesn't say how. That is one of the things I wanted to address because I am telling you right now, you can raise taxes 100 percent on the richest people in America, and you will not solve this debt problem. Some statistics say if you raise taxes 100 percent on millionaires it will pay for about 60 days' worth of government. What are you going to do for the other 305 or 304 days of the year? That is a problem. What happens when you run out of rich people to raise taxes on—or so-called rich people? You have to raise taxes on people who are not rich, and you have to raise taxes on the middle class.

That is why I am going to offer two amendments to this budget that I hope will pass. The first amendment says we are not going to get rid of the mortgage interest deduction to pay for new spending and new programs in government. If you want to talk about the mortgage interest deduction in the context of tax reform—I am not sure that is the best idea or bad idea. Let's have that debate. But if you want to talk about it in the context of we are going to take that money and use it in the context of lets grow government, we are going to have a problem because there are middle-class people in this country who already have it hard enough as it is. They are working twice as hard, and they are making half as much. They have paid their mortgage on time every month even though they are upside-down, but because they paid on time, now their bank will not finance them and they are stuck and they are upset and they have a right to be.

Now on top of that you are going to get rid of that mortgage interest deduction? I am not claiming that is what is being offered. I am just saying if no one is going to offer that, let's prevent that now. I am offering an amendment that is going to prevent that.

Here is another thing. We should not raise taxes on the middle class at all to pay for new government, and I will offer an amendment that prohibits that as well. So the second thing we need is affordability. No one is saying we don't need to fund government. Of course we do.

By the way, the best way to fund government is to grow your economy. If we could grow this economy at 4 percent a year for this decade, that would generate about $3, $3.5 trillion in new revenue. There is no tax increase in the world that can do that, at least no realistic one.

My last point on this is one of the things government can do is help people to help themselves. In the modern era there is nothing more important in that regard than education. The world has changed. When my parents came here in 1956 from Cuba, they did not have a lot of skills. My dad didn't really go to school. My mom didn't either. And they were able to achieve a middle-class lifestyle in this country as a bartender and a maid. That is almost impossible to do today. That is no one's fault; that is just the way the world has changed.

Today you need a certain level of skill because the information technology age has changed everything. The good news is the jobs that are being created, these new middle-class jobs have a lot more opportunity for better pay. The bad news is we have a lot of people who do not have the skills for those jobs.

We have a skills gap in America that needs to be closed, but the one I want to focus on is school choice. I think it is wrong that the only parents in America who cannot send their kids to the school they want are poor parents. I think that is fundamentally wrong. Middle-class parents can sacrifice and scrape and some of them—not all of them but some of them—can afford to send their kids to the school of their choice. Rich people can send their kids to any school they want, but poor parents in America are stuck.

Envision this for a moment. Envision this for a moment. You are a poor single mom or single dad. You are living already in a dangerous neighborhood in substandard housing, and on top of that you are forced by the government to send your children to a school that is failing and every year the politicians tell you they are going to improve these schools. They say: Give us a chance to pour more money in these schools. We are going to turn them around.

I hope they do. But in the meantime, while they are carrying out this experiment your kids are turning 5 and 6 or 7 or 8, and the clock is running and you can never have those years back. It is wrong. It is wrong that parents who do not have access to funds cannot send their kids to the school of their choice.

One of the things I want to try to do at the Federal level is replicate what we have done in Florida; that is, create an incentive for people to donate their money to private not-for-profit scholarship organizations that give scholarships to low-income families so they can send their kids to their parents' choice, not just to the school of the government's choice. That is important in terms of helping people acquire the skills they need in this new century because if we do not close that skills gap, we are going to have a huge opportunity gap in America, one that is already developing.

I hope we do not underestimate what is happening out there. We have working class people in America who are starting to wonder if this is still the place where if you work hard you can go as far as your talent will take you. They are starting to wonder if this is still the place where if you work hard, you can leave your children better off than yourselves. You have middle-class families who are starting to wonder who is fighting for them. The people who have made it—big companies, big corporations—have lobbyists all over this building standing up for them. They don't want to take anything away from the people who have made it. They see other people always arguing on behalf of government programs to help people who are struggling. Many of those programs are important. They don't want to take that away from them either. But who is fighting for them? Who is fighting for the people who have done it the right way, who did not take out mortgages they couldn't afford, who will take a job even if it pays half as much and requires them to work twice as long because they do not want to be dependent on government? Their pride will not allow it.

Who is fighting for them? And they are worried about the future. What about the people with the big ideas, the ones who are going to start the next American company? They are starting to wonder whether America is the place to do it when they hear some people basically describe financial success as wrong. They start to wonder whether government is an obstacle or ally in their hopes of opening their business here. This is a fundamental problem for us. This is not an economic debate; this is a debate about our identity as a country.

It is important for us to understand what makes America different from the rest of the world—and we are different. For those people who were born and raised in this country, as I was, it is easy to take this for granted. We should not. It is not like this everywhere. In most countries, a person can only do what their parents did for a living—even today. In most places on Earth, children can only go as far as their family went—even today. This Chamber is full of people—and I am glad to be a part of it—who have gone further than their parents ever did.

If people in this Chamber had grown up in the Old World, they would not be here, nor would they be able to run a business. In the Old World, people were trapped doing what their parents did. What makes us special and different is that it doesn't matter what our parents do for a living. It doesn't matter if we are not well connected or famous. We can go as far as our talent or work will take us. If we lose that, we will lose what makes us special and different. That is what we should be fighting about, and in some ways we are.

I think we actually do have an agreement here. The agreement is that the only solution to our problem is growing our economy. We cannot tax our way out of this problem. We cannot cut our way out of this problem either. The only solution to this problem is to grow our way out of this problem, and I think we agree on that.

I hope the debate we are going to have is, how do we grow our way out of this? How do we create growth in the private economy? Do we allow government to spend as much as it wants until growth starts to happen? That is what one side is arguing. We have to ask questions, such as, do we embrace the principles of free enterprise and say: Look, government has a role, but it has to be limited. What we have to do is create an environment for the private economy to be incentivized to grow, and it will happen.

I want to have that debate. I want this budget to be that debate.

By the way, no one comes to this with clean hands. I will criticize my own party on this. No one can build up $16.5 trillion by themselves. This is a bipartisan debt. We have never seen anything like the last 4 years, I will say that. I have never seen anything like the last 4 years in terms of growing the debt. There are Republicans who are complicit in this debt issue as well. We should be honest about that. We should also be honest that at times some in my own party have focused so much on the trees of debt that we lost focus on the forest of growth.

The reason we should care about the debt is because it hurts growing our economy, and that is what the debate should be about. It should be about growth. Let's have a debate here about how we can get our economy growing at least 4 to 4.5 percent a year so we can pull millions of people out of poverty, pay down and stabilize our debt, and get people from the working class to the middle class and from the middle class and beyond. Let's have that debate. Let's argue about what is the best way to create growth. Do we create growth through more government or more free enterprise? Let's have that debate.

For those on my side of the argument, I hope we can have that debate because I like our chances. I like what history has to say about it. I think we can prove that the only nations in the history of the world that have ever accomplished the kind of economic exceptionalism and middle-class prosperity that Americans want and expect and deserve are the countries that have followed the path of limited government, effective government, well-run government, and free enterprise. Our country deserves once and for all to have that debate and stop hiding behind negotiations that it is rich versus poor or the haves versus the have-nots.

Let's have a debate about growth. If we grow this economy, we can protect America, and it will make the world a better place as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I yield such time as I may consume from the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senator from Florida. I could not agree more with the importance of focusing on economic growth and developing policies that maximize economic growth.

I believe we could have a tremendous economic recovery underway right now, but we don't. The main reason we don't is because we have a dysfunctional government in Washington that has policies that are preventing economic growth.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution our Democratic friends have offered offers more of the same failed policies that would only result in extending this period of miserable economic growth or a lack thereof. I would like to talk about a few aspects of this. I will talk about what they want to do on taxes, but before we get into the substance of the Democratic budget proposal for taxes, I think a little historical context is important, and we don't have to go back to ancient history.

In the last few years, what our Democratic friends and this administration have done is repeatedly raise taxes on all Americans, including middle-income Americans, and they propose much more now. Let's go back, for instance, to the ObamaCare middle-income tax increases. I will run through a quick litany of some of the tax increases we have suffered through as a result of ObamaCare, which raises taxes on people with health savings accounts and flexibility spending accounts. It raises taxes on people with catastrophic medical expenses. It raises taxes on people who purchase medical devices. It raises taxes on people who buy health insurance. It raises taxes on people who don't buy health insurance. It raises taxes on employers who cannot afford to provide health insurance. It raises taxes on people who have family plans that Washington believes are excessive. Is there anyone in America who is not on one or more elements of this list? I very much doubt it. The fact is that ObamaCare was a huge tax increase that added up to $1.2 trillion over 10 years, and it very much included all kinds of taxes that will be carried by middle-income Americans.

More recently, on January 1 of this year, we had another huge tax increase. That was about $620 billion over the next 10 years. It was less than 3 months ago. This raises the top rate from 35 percent to 42.5 effectively when we include the phasing out of deductions. If we add in the Medicare increases and the total top Federal marginal tax rate, it is 44.8 percent.

By the way, this is the highest this rate has ever been. Right now, this is the highest this rate has been since Ronald Reagan inherited a disastrous tax code from Jimmy Carter. That was a long time ago. That doesn't include the State and local taxes, which put many Americans at a top marginal tax rate of over 50 percent. The government is taking over half of the income they are earning, and our friends who are introducing this budget are suggesting that all of this is not enough. They are suggesting that we need yet another big tax increase—in fact, we need a giant one, $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years in new additional taxes.

I have news for everyone. I don't see how this can possibly be done without significant tax increases on middle-income Americans. I know some folks in this Chamber like to suggest this can be done by soaking the rich again. We can just go back to soaking rich folks again. I don't see how that can work. I will give an example of why I don't think that can work.

The President laid out in his budget last year his plan for a whole new round of taxes for wealthy Americans on top of the tax increases that occurred weeks ago. He specified how he would propose doing it. The gist is that he wants to limit the value of deductions and apply taxes to income that is not otherwise taxed at the moment. He will limit the value of all kinds of deductions. He laid this out. It would be all itemized deductions—mortgage interest deductions, charitable contributions, State and local taxes. They want to tax health insurance exclusions and employee contributions to 401(k)s and IRA plans, section 199 manufacturing deductions, tax exempt interest, contributions to health savings accounts.

All of these things would be limited and would especially affect the wealthy taxpayers under the President's plan—the last budget we got from this President. He has chosen not to comply with the rules whereby he should have already produced one for this year. These tax increases were meant to be in that budget above and beyond the tax increase he got on January 1. Guess what. The President's plan for raising taxes on the wealthy is $584 billion. That is a lot of money, but it doesn't get us anywhere near the $1.5 trillion this budget resolution calls for. The President has laid out his plan for how he intends to soak the rich yet again—we know that much—but we don't know yet how he will raise the other $1 trillion. I can tell everyone where they are going to get that money. It will come from the middle class; that is where the money is.

What are all of these tax increases for? A lot of it is for increasing spending. The Democratic budget would spend more money than the current CBO budget. I know it doesn't look that way if we look just at the top lines. We have to dig deeper. What we discover is that the Democratic budget decides to make a totally different assumption about the American presence in Afghanistan than what CBO does. We are winding down our presence in Afghanistan, but the budget doesn't decide that. That is a separate matter altogether. If we want to compare apples to apples, we make the same assumptions about ongoing war expenses. When we do that, we discover that this proposal actually increases spending at a rate faster than what current law calls for. That is what this budget would do.

This budget raises taxes enormously, including very much on the middle-class because I don't see any other way we can get there. It also increases spending.

By the way, the only operative year of a budget is the first year. In the first year, the increase is $162 billion over what we are going to spend this year. That is a 4.6-percent increase in spending in the year in which inflation is running around 2 percent, and that is what this plan is.

Here is what is most objectionable to me about all of the spending and these huge tax increases. This is a big part of the reason we are suffering through the worst economic recovery since the Great Depression. There is no coincidence here. If we look in the post-war era, in the 3 years following a recession, the economy, on average, has grown by 14.4 percent. That is the average growth over a 3-year period after we have had a recession. What is the growth we have had this time? It is 6.7 percent. It is less than half. This is the worst recovery in our lifetime, and it is no coincidence.

We have had huge increases in spending, and what has that given us? It has given us this feeble economic growth, and it has given us an unemployment rate hovering around 8 percent. We all know that does not include the millions of Americans who left the workforce altogether. They have given up looking for work. It doesn't include the many folks who are underemployed. In fact, we have fewer people working in America today than we did in 2007. And it never takes this long for an economy to bounce back and create the jobs that were lost during a recession. However, it has this time, and it is partly because we are pursuing the wrong policies.

There is huge government spending, stimulus spending, all kinds of growth in government, and huge tax increases and the threat of big tax increases. This is a big contributing factor. Higher taxes reduces economic growth not only because of the money it takes directly out of the economy but because of the incentives. It reduces the incentive to work, to save, to invest. Whatever is being taxed, there is less of for the person to enjoy who actually created it. Sure enough, as a result, we get less of that activity. So the more we raise taxes on work, on savings and investment, the less of it we get. The other thing is that there are tax increases that are looming in the future—and that day will come—and people's behavior is affected by it.

Huge growth in government spending and the corresponding deficits we have seen have a chilling effect on economic growth itself. People understand that is eventually going to get paid with either higher taxes or we are going to monetize it and diminish the value of our currency and have inflation or some combination of those. So all of this government—of which this budget proposes still more—is part of the reason our economic growth is so meager.

I have one final point to make on this as it pertains to the budget. The irony is that growth is the best way to solve all of our problems. Strong economic growth has a direct benefit for the families who enjoy it, who benefit from the jobs that are created, the higher wages they earn, the elevated standard of living, the integrity that comes from providing for their families. All of those things are the direct benefits from a stronger economy. There is no better way to deal with our budget deficit than stronger economic growth.

In fact, the CBO tells us that just one-tenth of 1 percentage point of sustained increase in the rate of growth in 10 years results in $280 billion of new revenue. That is not completely linear. However, we are so far below the average that if we just add a full percent, we would be talking about literally trillions of dollars in additional revenue and smaller deficits. All of that would come from economic growth in the context of people who are back to work and an economy that is booming. That is what we ought to be heading for. Unfortunately, this budget doesn't take us there.

I know the Senator from Wisconsin wants to speak, and I will yield the floor in a minute.

I want to say a quick word before I do that about one particularly important amendment we are going to debate beginning around 2 p.m. today and vote on hopefully soon. This goes to a small subset of the tax problems ObamaCare and this budget would create. It is the medical device tax.

The medical device tax is one of the more egregious flaws in ObamaCare, in my view. Part of the reason is it is such a badly designed tax. This tax is badly designed, in my view, because it applies to total sales, so it is even worse than an income tax increase, which would have been a bad idea.

This applies a tax to sales, irrespective of whether a company is making income. So if you are a startup company, if you are a small growing company or if you are an established company and having hard times, this is a tax that disregards whether you are operating in the black and says, We are just going to apply this new tax on your total sales. That is a very badly designed tax, in my view.

It is a particularly bad idea in a sector that has so many young and growing and startup companies that have so much promise. They are making medical devices that are improving the quality of our lives, saving lives that without these inventions wouldn't be saved, and we are going to slap a new tax on the sales of some of these companies that are just trying to get started and not yet profitable. That is a terrible idea. I know in Pennsylvania, the tax has gone into effect. It went into effect on January 1 of this year. It is already costing us jobs, limiting growth, and preventing new factories from being built in Pennsylvania to manufacture medical devices. It is also making health care more expensive. We are all consumers of medical devices of various kinds. We are talking everything from surgical implements to prostheses, to hip replacement to ordinary health care devices.

Lastly, I would suggest that the existence of this tax makes it harder to raise the capital to launch new firms and, therefore, it is going to stifle innovation.

I know there is bipartisan support to repeal this tax. I am very pleased about that. I wish to thank Senator HATCH for his leadership for a long time on this. I know Senator KLOBUCHAR has been a great leader on this issue as well. Several others, including Senator CASEY and myself, feel very strongly about this. I am cautiously optimistic that this amendment could pass. I sure hope it does. It would be a big improvement.

At this time I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Before my colleague yields, first I am speaking and taking time off the resolution, but I wish to inquire of my colleague from Wisconsin as to how long he will be speaking, for the information of the body. It was my understanding there had been an informal discussion about having the majority start speaking on the resolution at 12:45. So just for the purposes of colleagues, I wanted to check on how long he thought he would be speaking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, I was allocated 15 to 20 minutes. I will try to keep it to 15 minutes to yield at the top of the hour.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, I ask that my time be used against our allocation on the resolution.

I wish to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is absolutely right. I supplied the medical industry for over 31 years, and the medical device tax will do great harm to medical innovation.

I also wish to commend both the Senators from Florida and Pennsylvania about their great points on the importance of economic growth and how important it is that we concentrate all of our efforts here in Washington on economic growth.

I truly believe that every Member of this body, people serving in Congress, share the same goals, or the same goal: We want a prosperous America. We want every American to have the opportunity to build a good life for themselves and their family. But often folks on the other side of the aisle accuse Republicans—conservatives—of conducting a war on women or a war on the middle class. Nothing could be further from the truth. I will tell my colleagues what is the truth. It is that with all of our deficit spending here in

Washington, we are conducting a war on our children. Fortunately, I do not know of a parent or parents who would willingly drive up their own personal debt, who would max out their credit cards with absolutely no intention of ever paying those debts off, but fully intending to pass those debts on to their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Again, fortunately, I don't know anybody who would do that. Yet, collectively as a Nation, that is exactly what we are doing. We are mortgaging our children's futures.

I ask all Americans to please consider what we are doing in terms of robbing future generations of the prosperity and the heritage and the type of opportunity that we should be handing over to them.

An awful lot of people don't quite understand the connection between our high levels of debt and economic growth. By the way, it is economic growth that actually strengthens middle-income Americans. But if we think about our own personal situations, if we in our own family budget have driven our debt levels up to the point where creditors are calling us all the time, how are we going to grow our own personal economy? In other words, how can we increase consumption when all of our extra dollars are going to pay off our debt, pay our creditors? We are under a great deal of pressure. The answer to the question is a person can't grow their personal economy, they can't grow their own personal consumption. That same economic fact applies to a nation as well. That is why these high levels of debt are harming economic growth and harming the very people all this government spending is purporting to try and help.

One way to take a look at this in terms of the harmful effect of all of the regulation, all the government debt, is economic growth. The fact of the matter is, on average, after 14 quarters, the American economy has grown, after post-World War II recessions, by 19.9 percent. Under Ronald Reagan, our economy grew 20.1 percent in the first 14 quarters. Under this President, our economy has grown by only 7.5 percent. Again, I would argue an awful lot of that has to do with regulations, but an awful lot of it has to do with the fact that we have increased our debt to unsustainable levels. It is scaring consumers. It is scaring business people away from investing in capital and growing their businesses.

As Republicans, as conservatives, we want every American to pay their fair share. We actually want a balanced approach to deficit and debt reduction. We want more revenue flowing into the Federal Government, but we want to increase revenue the old-fashioned way: by growing our economy.

Just a couple of quick little facts. Even with the meager economic growth we have experienced from 2009 to 2012, revenue has increased to the Federal Government by a total of $344 billion per year. If we returned to an economy such as we had in 2007, when revenue to the Federal government was 18.5 percent of our economy—it was pretty close to the 50-year average—that would add another $435 billion per year of revenue.

The tax deal, the ''punishing success'' tax increase that was part of the fiscal cliff, supposedly will raise $41 billion in the year 2014. So $41 billion versus $435 billion is a tenth as effective. The problem with that ''punishing success'' scheme is it puts at risk the very growth that is far more effective at raising revenue.

So how do we get our fiscal house in order? Well, we actually have to put our Nation on a glide path toward a balanced budget. We have to return that level of certainty. Global creditors have to be able to look at the United States and say, I think they are getting this situation under control. The only way we can do that is by passing a budget in this body that actually shows a glide path to balance.

Of course, that is not what the Democratic Senate budget resolution will do. It never balances. As Senator TOOMEY was speaking about, we have to take a look at that first year. In comparison to the CBO estimate, it actually increases spending by $100 billion. It would increase our deficit by $75 billion. That is the primary thing we have to take a look at because these budget resolutions are only about as good as the paper they are written on, so we have to look at that first year.

The other point I want to make in terms of this budget resolution is the claims in terms of deficit reduction are patently dishonest. The claim to reduce the deficit by $1.85 trillion in comparison to the CBO baseline is not true. The only way we get that is by comparing apples to oranges. If we adjust the CBO baseline—for example, the $1 trillion—it counts in more spending, or the $300 billion of Hurricane Sandy extended spending, or the additional $200 billion of interest. If we compare apples to apples, this budget at most will reduce the deficit by $300 billion to $400 billion. Again, what we have to take a look at is what it does in that first year, which is actually increases the deficit and increases spending.

This is basically not an honest budget. So my first amendment that I will be offering is a simple amendment. It would establish a point of order subject to a 60-vote waiver or appeal that simply requires a balanced budget in the year 2023. Pretty reasonable. I think the American public actually expects us to live within our means far before that date, but this would be a responsible glide path. I think it is an eminently reasonable amendment, and I certainly hope my colleagues here in the Senate will support a very commonsense approach to providing some level of fiscal discipline to our Federal situation.

The second amendment I wish to offer has to do with the financial situation of States and local governments. Far too many cities are already going bankrupt. We have a chart here that shows a number of cities that have already declared bankruptcy and are going through that process. I think it is extremely important that we here in Congress put States and local governments on notice that they cannot come to the Federal Government looking for a bailout. They need to get their own fiscal house in order. We are not picking on anybody, but it is amazing when we take a look at the unfunded liability that some of these State and local governments are facing right now.

The city of Chicago, for example, has an unfunded liability per household of close to $42,000. I said $42,000 per person. New York City is about $39,000, and San Francisco is about $35,000.

The point of this amendment is to put State and local governments on notice that the Federal Government will not be here to bail them out. They need to get their own fiscal house in order.

The third amendment I intend to offer has to do with recognizing the truth of the situation with our entitlement programs. At the current level, at the current path, neither Social Security nor Medicare is sustainable. So this amendment is also a very simple amendment. It establishes a point of order that requires in any budget resolution that we reform both Social Security and Medicare to create a 75-year solvency. Again, I think that is pretty reasonable. Let me describe why I think it is so important. I frequently hear all kinds of people claim Social Security is solvent to the year 2035 or the year 2038. It is a moving target. Let's take a look at the true picture in terms of the Social Security financial balance sheet. This comes right from the Social Security Administration. This is looking ahead to the year 2032, a mere 20 years' worth of deficits.

It is true that Social Security actually was running surpluses for decades. It built up a trust fund of—we will talk about that later—about $2.5 trillion, $2.6 trillion. But in 2010, that situation turned around. Now Social Security is paying out more in benefits than it is taking in, in terms of dedicated revenue to the payroll tax. Over the next 20 years, that total cash deficit will equal $5.1 trillion.

How could anybody, looking at these facts and figures, possibly claim Social Security is solvent? Well, it is because of the fiction—and it is fiction—of the Social Security trust fund. I have a couple of quotes here from the Office of Management and Budget. Talking about the Social Security trust fund, they say:

> These balances are available for future benefit payments and other trust fund expenditures, but only in a bookkeeping sense. The holdings of the trust funds are not assets of the government as a whole that can be drawn down in the future to fund benefits. Instead, they are claims on the Treasury.

In other words, they are claims against the Federal Government.

The existence of large trust fund balances, therefore, does not, by itself, increase the government's ability to pay benefits. Put differently, these trust fund balances are assets of the program agencies and corresponding liabilities of the Treasury.

In other words, we have assets worth $2.6 trillion, we have liabilities of $2.6 trillion, netting to zero.

One of the analogies I use to describe the trust fund is very similar to this: If a person has $20 and spends it—by the way, this money is spent; it is gone—and then that person writes him- or herself a note for $20 and stuffs it in their pocket and says, Hey, I have 20 bucks, they really don't. They have a promissory note they will have to give somebody else to purchase so they can have the real $20 to spend. That is basically what we have in the Social Security trust fund. It does exist. It is just worth zero.

But here, ladies and gentlemen of America, as shown in this picture, is the Social Security trust fund. It is a file cabinet. It is locked. That is kind of funny because they are actually nonmarketable securities, but there you go. That is $2.6 trillion worth of value that supposedly makes Social Security solvent to the year 2035. It is a fiction. It is false. And until everybody here in Washington starts truthfully describing the extent of our problem with not only Social Security but also Medicare—I was part of that group of Senators who had the privilege of having dinner with the President a couple weeks ago. I found it very interesting that President Obama accurately described the problem in reforming Medicare. He said the problem is that Americans pay in $1 but they get $3 worth of benefits. He also went on to say we have a problem because most Americans do not understand that.

Well, today I am asking the President, I am asking Members on the other side of the aisle to join with Republicans to honestly describe the problem to the American public. You do not solve a problem until you first define it and then secondly admit you have the problem. We have severe problems with Social Security, with Medicare, with other mandatory spending, with our budget. Until we come to terms with that, until we are honest with the American people—stop pulling the wool over their eyes—we have no chance whatsoever of solving these very severe problems.

So with that, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I will be speaking off of the time on the resolution for a moment and then deferring to Senator MIKULSKI in yielding time to her, as well as our great colleague from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and others who wish to speak as we proceed with the debate on this resolution.

Let me take a moment and say that today the House has passed their budget called the Ryan Republican budget, and it effectively rolls back health care for women in this country. Our budget does exactly the opposite. We protect and strengthen access to health care for women.

Under health care reform, which we strengthen and support in our budget, health insurance plans, as we know, are required to cover women's preventive care, things such as annual wellness visits, domestic violence screenings, and contraception, without copays, coinsurance, or deductibles. The Republican budget that was passed today would take away those protections. Under the budget they passed today, 1.3 million women in Michigan alone could lose their health care.

Insurance plans are now—under what we have passed—not allowed to discriminate against women. That is part of health reform. Being a woman is not a preexisting condition anymore. You cannot charge higher rates, you cannot discriminate in other ways against women in the marketplace when they are looking to buy insurance. And it would prohibit insurance companies from denying access to health insurance for a variety of things, such as being a domestic violence survivor. The Republican budget in the House would take away those critical protections.

Until we passed health reform, as many as 60 percent of the individual insurance plans in this country did not offer basic maternity care, which I think is shocking. I know that whenever I talk with folks about that, they cannot believe that basic prenatal care, which is so important for babies, for women, was not provided. Now it is under our definition of health care.

The Ryan Republican budget would mean that 1 million women and children would not have access to maternal or child health services in Michigan alone. It would mean that 6,000 fewer women in Michigan would get cancer screenings that could save their lives and that nearly 16,000 children would not get the vaccinations they need to remain healthy.

That is just one area of many reasons why we need to support the budget Senator MURRAY and our committee have put before this body. This is about focusing on women's health, on middle-class growth in terms of education and innovation, and on infrastructure investments to grow our economy. It is important that we are having this debate, and it is important that the women of the country understand that the budget we have before the Senate, the Democratic budget, places women as a priority—their health, the economy for their families, being able to balance their own budgets, and being able to provide futures for their children.

I would now like to yield time off the resolution to our great leader from Maryland, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, a person who, as we know, showed extraordinary leadership in the last few weeks on the floor in a very challenging time, dealing with the current budget, which we have now successfully passed. She also is our leader as it relates to women's health care and the provisions on women's health care in health reform that are now impacting and saving women's lives.

I yield time off the resolution—as much time as she would consume—to Senator MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for her kind words and also her leadership. She is part of our Democratic leadership team and has been a real champion for jobs that pay a living wage, jobs that lead to the middle class. She is an advocate for making sure we have an economy that builds from the middle class out. Also, as the chair of the full Committee on Agriculture, she has fashioned bipartisan solutions to help our American farmers, particularly the family farm, and to feed the hungry here and around the world. I salute her for her leadership.

Mr. President, I come here today to support the budget put forth by the Democrats in their resolution, led by the very able chair, Senator PATTY MURRAY. We are showing that we can govern. Yesterday we passed the continuing funding resolution in the Senate. It passed 73 to 26. It showed a bipartisan resolution, a resolve to make sure there is no government shutdown, slowdown, slamdown. We now have to look ahead to fiscal year 2014.

I salute Senator MURRAY for what she has done through her committee. First of all, she is dealing with sequester, that Draconian approach that is going to shred government but most of all shred opportunity and place our fragile economy in jeopardy. She has done it in a balanced way. At the same time, she has protected seniors, veterans, and our most vulnerable by making sure she has looked out for Medicare and Medicaid. Contrasting the Ryan budget, she also showed that she, in our budget, is not going to throw women and children under the bus. I think she has done an outstanding job, and I want to support her.

As we look at what we need to do here in the budget, I was appalled, first of all, to see what the Ryan budget did. Women across America have to balance their family budgets. They know America also has to get its fiscal act together. But the entire Ryan budget places the whole burden of drawing down our public debt on discretionary spending. It preserves tax breaks and tax earmarks and further squeezes those fiscal priorities that impact women and children, impact education, impact empowerment. I think what we have to offer here offers a far greater vision.

One of the things I am deeply concerned about is its impact on women's health care. The Senator from Michigan has spoken about it. We worked on

making sure that—when we were working on the Affordable Care Act, we acknowledged the special needs of women. We were appalled in hearings that I had that women were paying more for their health insurance than men of comparable age and health status. We were paying a gender tax.

Now, the Affordable Care Act—disparagingly mentioned on the other side as ObamaCare; affectionately mentioned here as ObamaCare because the President does—our legislation that we passed in the Affordable Care Act eliminated gender discrimination in the insurance industry, that you do not penalize someone because they are a woman.

Then we got right rid of the punitive practices in insurance companies, one of which was to deny families with children with preexisting conditions health care. That meant that if you had a child with autism, if you had a child with cerebral palsy, you could not get health insurance for the rest of your family—punitive, harsh. We got rid of that.

Then there was the way they treated the women. Simply being a woman, as others have said, was a preexisting condition. We were appalled in our investigation that showed that in eight States you were denied health insurance if you were a victim of domestic violence. So you were battered in your own home, and you were battered by your insurance company. Again, we got rid of those punitive practices.

But the Ryan budget gets rid of the Affordable Care Act. So all of those reforms—increasing universal access to the working poor, getting rid of the punitive practices of insurance companies, ending gender discrimination—will be vitiated. It will be canceled like it did not happen.

During their campaigns, they said they wanted to repeal and replace. Well, PAUL RYAN repeals, but he does not replace. And do you know what. We do not need to have it replaced. We need to keep the Affordable Care Act in place, moving America in the right direction and helping health care be affordable both to families and to businesses. We cannot allow the Ryan budget to stand.

But just being against an idea is not good enough. This is why we support the Murray budget, because she preserves the Affordable Care Act, and she continues to emphasize those reforms we made in quality and prevention and integrative services. We know how, through those quality initiatives, we can save money and save lives.

Others will also speak about Medicare. I cannot believe that we are going to replace Medicare with a voucher—a voucher and a promise. So let's get rid of, not deal with, the health care needs of the elderly. Let's get rid of the financial needs of the Federal Government. So we would rather protect billionaires than protect senior citizens. I think we have our priorities wrong.

Others will speak to Medicare. I am going to go to Medicaid. I want to speak to Medicaid because of our knowledge about who is on Medicaid. Mr. President, 1.8 million seniors are in nursing homes. What is Medicaid? Medicaid is the only safety net the middle class has when, through the ravages of Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, or other chronic, debilitating disease, you must turn to a long-term care facility, that you have a safety net to help pay the bill. In order to qualify, you have to spend down.

I was a leader here, 25 years ago, in trying to reform the spend-down policy. Twenty-five years later, we have made no reforms. We have had plenty of attacks but no reform.

We cannot turn Medicaid into a block grant. It is going to endanger really the ability of sound nursing homes—either by the private sector or faith-based—in my own State to look at how are they going to fund this.

All we are doing is funding our problems with public debt onto the States. Many people here talk about, oh, we need to go to the Governors. All we are sending to the Governors is more unfunded Federal mandates. We cannot do this to Medicaid, and we cannot do this to the middle class.

Instead, we should be investing in research. I say this because my father died of the ravages of Alzheimer's. We had to spend down the family savings he earned from working over 60 or 70 hours a week in a little grocery store. This is not only our story, it is the story of over 1 million people.

What could we do? I felt so sad for my father. I felt worse because even though I was a Senator, even though I could get Nobel Prize winners on the phone, even though I was an appropriator, there wasn't the cure, the cognitive stretchout for him.

We need to invest in the research. We are on the brink of incredible breakthroughs in neurological science which could either help fund the cure for Alzheimer's or do the cognitive stretchout. We need to spend money to save money. Let's put the money into research and deal with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and Lou Gehrig's disease, debilitating things which break the family's budget and family's heart but also contribute to the public debt. We can get there if we make wise and prudent choices. Most of the people in nursing homes are primarily women over the age of 80. What are we going to do? Are we going to abandon them?

This budget is unkind to women, but it is also unkind to children in terms of the opportunity structure.

The Ryan budget caps and freezes Pell grants at $5,645. It requires families who make less than $20,000 to qualify for a Pell grant. This means many people who seek Pell grants are single mothers. There is recent data showing many of our families, 63 percent, are in single-parent households. It could be a single mother or a single dad, someone who started out life with hopes and dreams and now has many responsibilities.

Many wish to return to higher education, particularly the community colleges which offer gateways to better jobs in the new economy. In my own State, this could be an associate degree in nursing, in pharmacy tech or in lab tech. This can help keep people in the middle class in affordable living. An affordable education will be the gateway into community colleges. We should be expanding the Pell grants, not shrinking them. It is a new economy, and it is a new family profile.

I could go over this line item by line item. I know others will be talking. When we look at women who need health care for themselves, for their children and their aging parents, the so-called sandwich generation, the Ryan budget vitiates it, but the Murray budget has a way to deal with this.

For education and opportunity, for our children, workforce, and community colleges, the Ryan budget shrinks opportunity and shrinks the ability of people rising to the middle class or staying in the middle class.

I think the Ryan budget is a bad prescription for America. The way I want to deal with the Ryan budget is replace it with a sensible, balanced approach which looks for the hopes and dreams of the American people and is not protecting lavish subsidies and lavish tax breaks to subsidize corporate jets and other such items.

I salute the Senator from Washington State for the great job she accomplished. I look forward to further debate.

Yesterday, we were able to move the continuing resolution for funding. I could not have done it without the great staff I have.

RETIREMENT OF CHARLIE HOUY

Mr. President, in a few days the U.S. government will say congratulations and happy retirement to one of our finest public servants, Charlie Houy. After more than three decades of federal service Charlie will retire from the Senate Appropriations Committee.

He has served on the Appropriations Committee for more than 30 years, always following the dictum of his first supervisor, Senator Ted Stevens, that staff, like children, should be seen and not heard. Charlie began his Federal service in 1981 working for the Naval Sea Systems Command as a Presidential Management Intern. He was detailed to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in 1983 and worked as a majority professional staff member for Chairmen Ted Stevens, John Stennis, and Daniel Inouye. Charlie was appointed Democratic clerk of the subcommittee in 1995 by Chairman Inouye and remained in that position through 2010.

In 2009, Charlie became the 23rd staff director of the full Appropriations Committee under Chairman Inouye's leadership and did an outstanding job keeping the trains running to get the committee's work done and maneuvering the committee through numerous budget minefields.

During the transition following Chairman Inouye's sudden passing, Charlie expertly brought me up to speed on the short term and long term issues I would be facing as the new chairwoman. Just one day after becoming chairwoman, I found myself managing the Sandy Supplemental on the Senate floor. Charlie was on my side, and at my side. His advice and during this period were invaluable. It more than made up for the fact that he is an avid San Francisco 49ers fan.

His spirit of bipartisanship has earned him praise from members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Dome. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID described Charlie as a person ''who has a fantastic knowledge of what goes on in this country as it relates to money.'' The late Senator Ted Stevens had this to say about Charlie: ''He is a consummate expert on defense issues and is well respected by those at the Department of Defense and his colleagues on the Hill . . . I am proud to say he is my friend.'' The late Chairman Daniel Inouye described Charlie as ''one of the finest staff members in the whole Senate . . .''

His accomplishments and expertise earned him a coveted spot on Roll Call's Fabulous 50 staffers for his mastery of policy and procedure and his ability to influence agendas and legislation.

President Harry Truman once said, ''It's amazing what you can accomplish if you don't care who gets the credit.'' This personifies Charlie. In a town where most people are clamoring over each other for the spotlight, Charlie has used a quiet humility and a tireless work ethic to accomplish great things for our country.

I would also like to recognize and thank Charlie's wife Sharon and his daughter Cassie. Working in the Senate for more than 30 years, there were many late nights and weekends that required Charlie to miss out on family events, crew regattas, and vacations. Thank you for lending us your husband and father during those times.

Mr. President, I stand here today to express my deepest appreciation to Charlie Houy for serving the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senate, and the American people with integrity and intelligence. His tireless contributions to our nation have been outstanding. I wish him well as he leaves the U.S. Senate for new adventures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this discussion be taken from the resolution time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Let me thank all the women Senators who are down here speaking so eloquently about the importance of passing a budget resolution which reflects the values and needs of women in this country and the men who are important to them.

I wish to especially thank our dean of women, Senator MIKULSKI, who has made this a lifetime passion to ensure the women who come after her have the strength and ability to participate in the economy in any way they wish. I thank her and the other Senators for their leadership.

Senator KLOBUCHAR will continue this discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I wish to thank Senator MURRAY for her leadership on this budget. This is not an easy thing. We all know this. She actually has been working on this many years. I am very proud of this budget and the work which has been done here, the balanced approach which has been taken.

I wish to thank Senator MIKULSKI, the Senator from Maryland, our fearless leader of the women Senators, who has been there since the beginning and understands these fights in a different way than many of us who are new can't imagine. We will need to continue moving forward for the women of this country and can never step backward, which is where I wish to begin discussing this budget.

The budget Senator MURRAY has proposed is a budget which moves us forward. For a long time, Democrats and Republicans in the Senate have been talking about how we need to get $4 trillion in budget reduction and deficit reduction over the next 10 years.

We have done $2.4 trillion. It is a start. It is not all we need to do, but it is a start. Of that amount, the $2.4 trillion, 70 percent was in cuts. When we look at the proposals which have been made by Simpson-Bowles, Rivlin-Domenici, the Gang of 6, all the groups which have worked on a very strong bipartisan basis, they have all proposed something like 2 to 1 on spending cuts to revenue.

The proposal which has been made on the House side which passed in the House today isn't even close to that. In fact, when we look at Congressman RYAN's budget, there isn't revenue in this budget. He does include some of the past revenues. Even when you do that, that is a 10-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue for this country going forward. It is not the right mix. Yes, we need to balance our budget, but we also need a balance which is budgeted.

The last thing we need to do is balance our budget on the backs of women and children. This is why it is important for people. I will return later to speak about some of the economic issues in my State and why it is so important to move forward and have a budget with a balanced mix of spending cuts and revenue. I truly believe we need a deal here. We need to bring this debt down. It is very important to me because I think it will trigger investment. We need to do it in the right way.

Today, I am focused on one issue; that is, the effect this budget would have on women and children, the budget proposed in the House versus the budget Senator MURRAY has put together.

It is no coincidence the Senator who is leading us through this budget process is the same Senator who joined me last spring when the Violence Against Women Act was on the floor. We needed to rally all 17 women Senators behind us. At the time people thought it was stuck, it was a gridlock and wasn't going anywhere. Then all the women Senators, Democrats and Republicans, came together.

PATTY MURRAY was the leader in this effort. This is why this Senate budget not only maintains but increases critical funding for the Violence Against Women and Family Violence Program. This will give law enforcement better tools for responding to cases of domestic violence and sexual assault, programs which make sure mothers and children have a safe place to go and programs which help victims get back on their feet again. Even more important, this includes programs which save lives.

As a former prosecutor, I know firsthand how important the Violence Against Women Act has been. We were very pleased it was reauthorized on such a strong bipartisan basis. It is incredibly important, not just for those individual victims but for entire families and entire communities. Statistics show kids raised in violent homes are 76 times more likely to be perpetrators of these crimes when they grow up.

This is why I truly appreciate Senator MURRAY's work to ensure we have a policy in place, which is something we worked on in the Judiciary Committee. I see Senator HIRONO from Hawaii. We worked hard on this, as it is important, but also the funding is in place. We consolidated programs, reduced funding with the Violence Against Women Act and did different things in the last Violence Against Women Act to make it more efficient. This is fully funded in this bill, and it is very important for people to know who care about this.

As to health care, something which is very important to our kids, the House budget, as has been noted by Senator STABENOW and others, would slash billions of dollars in basic health care services for children, including prenatal care for expectant moms and vaccinations for kids. Under the House proposal, more than 33,000 women would lose access to maternal and child health care services in Minnesota alone. Meanwhile, another 8,551 children would lose access to lifesaving immunizations. This is only in my State.

Sadly, after the devastating flu season we just experienced, with many children dying across this country, how could anyone think it is a good idea to cut funding for vaccination programs? How could that be one of the proposals in this budget. There are so many loopholes we could close, so many tax subsidies we could eliminate. Why would we cut kids' vaccinations? Sadly, this is what happened in the House today.

While we are on the subject of health care, I also wish to point out the House budget would cut funding for the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, meaning hundreds of thousands of women would lose access to mammograms, pap smear tests, cervical cancer screening, which is the tip of the iceberg. By repealing the Affordable Care Act, the House budget would threaten preventive care for women across this country. The Ryan budget would eliminate the important reforms to improve patient care, already noted by Senator MIKULSKI and Senator STABENOW. It would eliminate the important reforms to improve patient care and the delivery system which is included in the health care bill.

What is interesting to me is Congressman RYAN does acknowledge the Affordable Care Act has some very good savings in it because he includes those over $700 billion in savings in his budget.

This is great, but then he cuts out all those budgets I spoke about which were so important to the American people: to not be banned from health insurance because you have a preexisting condition and to be able to keep kids on their parents' insurance until they are 26 years old. I am looking forward to that with my own daughter.

The third thing I mentioned is closing the doughnut hole for our seniors. Those things are all being cut under this budget.

We have had this debate too many times already. I wish to be clear; the Senate budget not only protects core funding for preventive services but upholds the Affordable Care Act and its most important provisions for women and children.

Let's turn to another front to see how women and children of this country, particularly children, fare and this is education. On the education front, the Senate budget—while still making $975 billion in cuts, $975 billion in spending cuts—still maintains core funding for early education through the Head Start Program. The House budget, when combined with sequestration, would push almost 200,000 low-income children out of the program in 2014.

We all know education is one of our best investments. When we look at the global economy and education growing across this country, we are getting real competition from other countries. The last thing we need to do is cut back on education.

This is why the Senate proposal includes continued support for elementary and secondary schools through programs such as IDEA, the ladder which provides early intervention in special education services to kids with disabilities. Our budget also makes key investments in improving literacy and increasing the emphasis on STEM, science, technology, engineering, math.

This is the future. We want to train our own kids in America, as Senator SANDERS is well aware, to ensure they have the skills to be able to compete on the international stage.

What does the House budget do? It slashes close to $1.2 trillion of investments in education, skills training, science and technology, R&D, transportation and infrastructure over the next 10 years.

Do you know what I think. I think that is being penny wise and pound foolish and not what we should do in the budget for the United States of America. I truly believe we have an amazing opportunity right now. We have seen better unemployment numbers than we have seen in 4 years. The housing market is starting to turn around. People are starting to go back to work. It is not nearly where it should be. The last thing we need to do is go backward. The last people who want to see us go backward are the women of America.

I was listening as Senator STABENOW spoke about the health care bill, the Affordable Care Act, and during the Finance Committee there was a debate about whether maternity care should be included in the mandatory benefits. One of our colleagues at the time said: I don't understand why maternity benefits should be included. I never needed them.

Without missing a moment, Senator STABENOW looked across the table and said: I bet your mother did.

There are a lot of mothers around America right now who are looking at these budgets because these budgets represent values, the future of our kids and the women and men of this country.

Let's bring our spending down. Let's get over the $4 trillion figure we are supposed to get out of the debt reduction but do so in a way which doesn't hurt middle-class families and doesn't hurt the families most vulnerable. I know we can do it. We are a great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I wish to thank Senator MIKULSKI for the tremendous work she did on the continuing resolution. I know she worked so hard, and yet she is on the floor today to talk about how important passing the Murray budget is. And of course Senator MURRAY is on the floor also, and I want to thank her for her great work.

I stand in solidarity with all the men and women, my colleagues, who are going to be talking about how important it is to pass the Murray budget, which is a balanced budget that reflects our priorities and our values. The last few years have been hard for families across the country. Our economy is still struggling its way out of a great recession, the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. And we have made progress. For example, the economy has grown and millions of people are back to work. But this progress is not fast enough for too many families in Hawaii and across our Nation.

Regrettably, that doesn't seem to concern some of our colleagues in the House of Representatives. The budget proposed by the House majority, the Ryan budget, would set our economic recovery back and it would do so on the backs of those who can least afford it. Some of the hardest hit will be women and children, the very people who face some of the biggest challenges in today's economy. So I want to focus on how the Ryan budget negatively impacts women in our country.

Women in Hawaii make 82 cents for every dollar earned by a man for the same job. Monthly food costs in Hawaii are 61 percent higher than in the rest of the country. Forty percent of Hawaii households pay more than 40 percent of their monthly income on housing. Hawaii residents pay some of the highest gasoline prices in the country, which we all know can be a serious hardship on family budgets. Our high cost of living is one of the reasons we have a high percentage of women working in two-parent households in Hawaii.

Across my State and across our country, women are waking up every day, working hard, and making ends meet in any way they can. These challenges I mentioned are being overcome every single day by determined women. They work hard to improve their lives and to give their children an even greater shot at success than they had. For many, the support they receive for health care, education, childcare, paying for food and housing, makes all the difference. Unfortunately, the Ryan budget lays out a vision of America where these people, our families, are left behind.

We are told that budgets reflect our values. I agree. What are the values exemplified and reflected by a budget, the Ryan budget, that makes deep cuts in supports such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—SNAP—and the Women, Infants and Children—WIC—Program? Combined, SNAP and WIC help put food on the table for over 50 million—I repeat, 50 million—Americans, primarily women and children. The SNAP cuts in the Ryan budget would put over 180,000 families in Hawaii at risk of losing the ability to put food on their table.

What could be more fundamental than putting food on the table? I don't know anyone who could look these families in the eye and say: Sorry that you can't afford to feed your children anymore. We have to balance the budget. We need to close the deficit. Sorry. That, to me, is unconscionable and runs counter to our core values.

The Ryan budget would also deeply cut childcare assistance and Head Start, as mentioned by my other colleagues, leaving more than 2 million children and their families without realistic early childhood or daycare.

In addition, the Pell Grant cuts in the Ryan proposal would make college

less affordable for 6 million women students. Add to that the millions of male students and you are affecting the future education of our country.

These cuts don't just hurt families now, they force parents to choose between jobs and caring for children. They prevent kids from accessing early learning opportunities that we know are vital to enabling these children to succeed in school and in life.

The Ryan budget also slashes support for things such as public transit, housing assistance, and community development. Each of these investments helps make our communities better places to raise a family, which attracts businesses and creates jobs.

Finally, and most egregiously and seriously, in my view, the Ryan budget cuts health care for women of all ages by repealing ObamaCare. By repealing ObamaCare, the Ryan budget takes us back to when being a woman was a preexisting condition, thereby disqualifying her for health insurance or costing her many times more for coverage. If we repeal ObamaCare, analysts project that insurance companies could charge women over $1 billion more in premiums than men are charged for the very same coverage. So by repealing ObamaCare, the Ryan budget discriminates against women. And since when is discriminating against women a core value?

While ObamaCare requires that insurers cover maternity care, only 12 percent of plans on the individual market do so currently. Repealing ObamaCare would also undermine access to reproductive health and family planning services.

Now let's talk about how the Ryan budget would affect seniors. Seniors in our country know the Ryan budget will end Medicare as we know it. They know these changes will force millions of women—and, of course, men—to make do with a voucher for their medical care—a voucher of decreasing value. And since so many women receive lower Social Security benefits than men, while paying higher out-of-pocket health care costs, losing Medicare coverage could be the difference for them between food, housing, or life-saving medication. Now is not the time to be making huge cuts to investments in programs that provide the very economic security we should be working to improve.

Fortunately, the priorities laid out in Chairman MURRAY's budget would help to strengthen the economic security so many families are seeking. The Senate budget resolution prioritizes creating new jobs, expanding opportunity, and laying out a strong foundation for economic growth. It builds on the progress we have made over the past few years instead of tearing that progress down.

I applaud Chairman MURRAY for prioritizing the elimination of the sequester, which the Congressional Budget Office says could eliminate 750,000 jobs. I also applaud her foresight in including investments in early childhood education, clean energy, national security, our veterans and our seniors, and her bill preserves access to health care, opportunities for higher education, and programs such as SNAP and WIC. These supports are vital to keeping our economy moving in the right direction.

The Murray plan will help improve American competitiveness, foster innovation, and open more opportunities for small businesses to succeed, and it lays out a blueprint for responsibly paying for these investments and reducing our deficit in a balanced way. Each and every one of these priorities helps to improve the economic security of men and women and children—families—in our country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Murray plan, a plan that provides a foundation for growth, instead of a plan that takes a meat-ax approach to the economic security of millions of families in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Hawaii for joining a number of very strong Democratic women to talk about the importance of our budget for women in this country, and I appreciate her strong voice here in the Senate.

I yield 30 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Vermont, who is a great member of our Budget Committee and contributes so much thought to all of it. We appreciate all his work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURRAY for yielding, and I want to thank her and her staff for the excellent work they have done. As a member of the Budget Committee, I have enjoyed working with them.

Everybody knows our country has an $850 billion deficit and a $16-plus trillion national debt. But what has not been discussed as often as it should be is how we came into that financial position. How do we have the deficit and how do we have this huge debt?

Let us not forget, as we discuss this issue, that in January of 2001, when President Bill Clinton left office, this country had an annual Federal budget surplus of $236 billion. A surplus of $236 billion in January 2001. We now have an $850 billion deficit. So what happened?

Well, I think many Americans know what happened. When you go to war in Afghanistan and Iraq and you don't pay for those wars, you add to the deficit. When you give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country and you don't offset that, you add to the deficit. When you pass a Medicare Part D prescription drug program and you don't pay for that, you add to the deficit.

And on top of all of that, we must understand that right now, at 15.8 percent of GDP, revenue coming into the Federal Government is the lowest it has been in 60 years. The reason for that is we are in the midst of a very serious recession—a recession caused by the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior on Wall Street. Not only has that led to significant increases in unemployment and businesses going under, once again, it resulted in less tax revenue coming in to this government.

And by the way, when we talk about Wall Street and the greed and the recklessness and illegal behavior on Wall Street, I must say I was stunned when the Attorney General of the United States recently suggested it might be difficult to prosecute Wall Street CEOs who commit crimes because of the destabilizing effect that prosecution might have on the financial system of our country and the world. In other words, we have a situation now where Wall Street is not only too big to fail, they are too big to jail. The theory is, if you are just a regular person and you commit a crime, you go to jail. If you are the head of a Wall Street company, your power is so great, the tentacles of that company are so great, that if you are prosecuted, and there is destabilization in that company, it can have worldwide or national implications. That is an issue we have to think long and hard about. We are supposed to be a country of law, and that law should apply to the CEOs of Wall Street companies as well as everybody else.

The other point I want to make deals, if you will, with a moral issue. When you are dealing with a deficit situation—and I just described how we got into the deficit situation—and you say we need to make sacrifices, it is absolutely appropriate to ask who is best able to make those sacrifices. Right now, as I think most Americans know, the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well. Large corporations are enjoying record-breaking profits. That is one group of people. Meanwhile, the middle class of this country is disappearing, and we have 46 million people living in poverty. So common morality, basic morality, says who should we ask most significantly to help us with deficit reduction? Do we tell an unemployed worker who is struggling to keep his or her family afloat that we are going to balance the budget on their back or do we ask, a huge profitable corporation, that in some cases is paying nothing in taxes, to help us with deficit reduction?

It is important for us to do what we do too rarely on the floor of the Senate—take a hard look at what is happening to the American people right now. I am very pleased we are seeing more job creation. Good thing. We are seeing somewhat of a recovery in housing. Very good thing. But let us understand where the middle class of this country is today, where the working class of this country is today before we demand that we balance the budget on their backs, as the Ryan budget in the House does.

Since 1999, the average middle-class family has seen its income go down by nearly $5,000 after adjusting for inflation. Median family income today is lower than it was in 1996. Real unemployment is not 7.7 percent, it is 14.3 percent if you count those people who have given up looking for work and are working part time. Youth unemployment is even higher. More than 25 percent of young Americans are unemployed. In terms of the African-American community, unemployment is off the charts.

When we talk about job creation, we all want job creation. However, it is important to understand that nearly 60 percent of the new jobs that have been created since 2010 are low-wage jobs paying between $7.80 an hour and $13.80 an hour.

Jobs, yes. But we want jobs that can take care of families, not just low-wage jobs.

Further, when we are talking about the budget, we don't talk about this at all. I know my Republican friends don't talk about it; most of my Democratic friends don't talk about it. It is anathema here to talk about issues of distribution of wealth and income, but I think it is important before we talk about on whose backs we are going to balance the budget.

Today the United States has the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth, and the gap between the very, very wealthy and everyone else is growing wider and wider. Incredibly, the wealthiest 400 individuals in this country today own more wealth than the bottom half of America, 150 million people. I think that is an issue we might want to discuss even if it offends some of our wealthy campaign contributors, but I think we should put that on the table.

Today one family—the Walton family of Walmart—owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of families in this country. And by the way, you will all be delighted to know they got a huge tax break recently.

Today the top 1 percent owns 38 percent of all financial wealth. That is a stunning number. What is even more stunning is the bottom 60 percent owns 2.3 percent of the wealth in this Nation. One percent on top owns 38 percent of the wealth; the bottom 60 percent owns 2.3 percent. And who do Mr. RYAN and my Republican friends want to balance the budget on? Those 60 percent, the working families who already have nothing, who are losing what they have, who are struggling to keep their heads above water.

But it is not just distribution of wealth, it is distribution of income. If you can believe it—this is again a stunning fact which, for some reason, we don't talk about too much here on the floor. A recent study shows that had all of the new income gained from 2009 to 2011 gone to the top 1 percent, 99 percent gained nothing. So who do we balance the budget on? Of course you go after the middle class, go after the working class, go after low-income people. Well, maybe somebody might want to ask that 1 percent to start paying a little bit more in taxes before we cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, and nutrition.

One of the good parts of the Murray budget is that it provides $100 billion in funding to put millions of Americans back to work rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure. I would have gone much higher. Because while deficit reduction is a very serious issue, it is even more important that we start putting millions of people back to work who are in desperate need of employment. The fastest way to do that is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. One hundred billion is a good start. We need more.

During the consideration of the budget resolution, I plan on offering two amendments. The first, amendment No. 264, would create a reserve fund to reduce the deficit and create jobs by eliminating offshore tax abuse by large profitable corporations. The second, amendment No. 198, would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect the benefits of disabled veterans—and I speak as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee—disabled vets and their survivors by not enacting the so-called chained CPI. I am pleased that this amendment is being cosponsored by Senator HARKIN and Senator HIRONO. Let me take a few minutes to describe both of these amendments.

At a time when corporate profits are at an all-time high, when the effective corporate tax rate is at a 40-year low, when one out of four profitable corporations pays zero in taxes, it is time for large profitable corporations to significantly contribute to deficit reduction.

The first amendment I will be offering would create a reserve fund to reduce the deficit and create jobs by eliminating offshore tax abuse by large profitable corporations. In 2011, corporate revenue as a percentage of GDP was just 1.2 percent. That is lower than any other major country in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, lower than Britain, Germany, France, Japan, Canada, you name it. Each and every year, corporations and the wealthy are avoiding more than $100 billion in U.S. taxes by sheltering their income offshore. Offshore tax schemes have become so absurd that one five-story building in the Cayman Islands is now the home to more than 18,000 corporations.

When the Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, and Citigroup needed a taxpayer bailout in 2008—and I did not vote for that bailout—they told us what great Americans they were, how much they love the United States of America, proud to be an American. But when it comes to paying their taxes, these large Wall Street companies are proud to be with the Cayman Islands. So my suggestion to these corporations: Next time you need a bailout, don't come to the taxpayers of America. Go to the people of the Cayman Islands and get your bailout there. But so long as you are an American company, how about helping us with deficit reduction and paying some taxes in this country?

But it is not just Wall Street. You have pharmaceutical companies such as Eli Lilly and Pfizer also using offshore tax havens. Apple wants all the advantages of being an American company, but it doesn't want to pay American taxes or American wages. It creates the iPad, the iPhone, the iPod, and iTunes in the United States, manufactures most of its products in China, and then ships most of its profits to Ireland, Luxembourg, the British Virgin Islands, and other tax havens to avoid paying U.S. taxes.

This is a huge issue. By the way, it is not just an American issue. It is an issue facing governments all over the world: Corporations run to tax havens, Cayman Islands, Bermuda, and elsewhere. We have got to address that issue.

I am going to list for the RECORD 15 large profitable corporations that have used offshore tax havens to avoid paying U.S. income taxes in recent years. At the top of the list, Bank of America. In 2010, Bank of America set up more than 200 subsidiaries in the Cayman Islands to avoid paying U.S. taxes. It worked. Not only did Bank of America pay nothing in Federal income taxes but it received a rebate from the IRS of $1.9 billion that year.

Before you cut Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare, do you think maybe we might want to ask Bank of America—which we bailed out, by the way—to help us with deficit reduction?

General Electric during the last 5 years made $81 billion in profits. Not only has General Electric avoided paying Federal income taxes during these years, it received a tax rebate of $3 billion from the IRS. GE has at least 14 offshore subsidiaries in Bermuda, Singapore, and Luxembourg.

Citigroup, Verizon, Honeywell International, JPMorgan Chase, Merck, Corning, Boeing, Goldman Sachs, Microsoft, Qualcomm, Caterpillar, Cisco Systems, Dow Chemicals, major profitable corporations using tax havens to avoid paying in the United States of America. We have an amendment to deal with that issue, and I hope we can have bipartisan support for that amendment.

Now I want to talk about my second amendment, and now I speak as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

This amendment, No. 198, would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors by not enacting the so-called chained CPI. I am pleased this amendment is being cosponsored by Senators HARKIN and HIRONO.

The time has come for the Senate to send a very loud and clear message to

the American people: We will not balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans who have lost their arms, their legs, and their eyesight defending our country. We will not balance the budget on the backs of the men and women who have already sacrificed for us in Iraq and Afghanistan, nor on the widows who have lost their husbands in Iraq and Afghanistan defending our country. And we will not balance the budget on the backs of those who served so valiantly in World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, the gulf war, and other conflicts, by cutting Social Security benefits. We will not the adopt the chained CPI.

The chained CPI is forcefully opposed by every major veterans organization in this country. I have talked to many of them, and they are outraged after the sacrifices veterans have made that people want to balance the budget on their backs. All veterans organizations are in opposition to the chained CPI, and that includes of course the American Legion, the VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Gold Star Wives, DAV. You name the veterans organization, and they are in opposition.

But it is not just the veterans organizations that oppose the chained CPI. The chained CPI is opposed by every major senior citizen group in this country—including the AARP, the largest senior group. And I understand they have been calling Members of the Senate and the House, and I hope Members will listen to what the AARP has to say—and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, and the Alliance for Retired Americans.

The chained CPI is opposed by every major union in this country. I had a press conference not so long ago with Rich Trumka of the AFL–CIO. They are strongly opposed to the chained CPI. The chained CPI is opposed by every major disability group in this country. It is opposed by the National Organization for Women, because they understand what the chained CPI would mean for women.

There are some who believe that lowering costs of living adjustments—COLAs—through the adoption of a chained CPI would be just a minor tweak in benefits. Let's be clear. For millions of disabled veterans and seniors living on fixed incomes, the chained CPI is not a minor tweak. It is a significant benefit cut that will make it harder for permanently disabled veterans and the elderly to feed their families, heat their homes, pay for their prescription drugs, and make ends meet. This misguided proposal must be vigorously opposed.

In one moment or another everybody here has talked about how they want to save Social Security, because they know that back home Social Security is enormously popular. In poll after poll—whether you are Democrat, Republican, Independent—what people are saying is, Don't cut Social Security. Don't cut benefits for disabled veterans. Now we are going to give Members on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to act on what they have been saying for many years.

Supporters of the chained CPI want the American people to believe that the COLAs for the disabled vets, senior citizens, and the surviving spouses and children who have lost loved ones in combat are too generous. For any senior citizen who is listening to this, the theory behind the chained CPI is the benefits that you have been getting are too generous. And whenever I say this in Vermont, people start laughing. They really do. And I have to say, No, they are not kidding, they are serious.

At a time when some think these benefits are too generous, we should understand that in 2 out of the last 4 years disabled vets and senior citizens did not receive any COLA at all, zero. So I guess a zero COLA is too generous. And this year's COLA of 1.7 percent is one of the lowest ever at a time when prescription drug costs for seniors are going up, health care costs for seniors are going up, heating costs in cold weather States such as mine are going up, food costs are going up. And yet seniors got a 1.7 percent COLA, and there are people who say that is much too generous.

Today, more than 3.2 million disabled vets receive disability compensation benefits from the VA and would be negatively impacted by the chained CPI. Are you really ready after all the great speeches we hear—speeches of thank you to the veterans who put their lives on the line, who gave their lives defending this country—do you really want to cut those benefits for those who lost their arms, their legs, their eyesight? I hope not.

Under the chained CPI, a disabled veteran who started receiving VA disability benefits at age 30 would have their benefits cut by more than $1,400 at age 45; $2,300 at age 55; and $3,200 at age 65. For our Wall Street friends, the people who make millions of dollars a year, that is not a lot of money. But for people who are trying to survive on $20,000, $25,000, $15,000 a year, that is a big hit. In my view, if you respect veterans and the sacrifices they have made, if you respect the ''greatest generation'' and what they have done to make this country great, you do not balance the budget on their backs.

Let me just conclude by saying I have been to Walter Reed, and I have seen what war has done to veterans. Many of my colleagues have done the same. In Vermont we paid a very heavy price for the Iraq war. I have been to too many funerals. I know many of my colleagues have done the same. I just ask that before we support this so-called chained CPI, which will make devastating cuts on the backs of disabled veterans and senior citizens, we remember the sacrifices those people made.

Let me ask unanimous consent to have printed letters in opposition to the chained CPI that I have received from the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars and several other veterans organizations.

Let me quote from a letter I received from the National Commander of the American Legion, Jim Koutz, in opposition to the chained CPI:

> On behalf of the 2.4 million members of The American Legion I voice our opposition to [the chained CPI] because of the harmful effects it will have on veterans' and Social Security benefits . . . Under the chained CPI, which cuts the formula used to determine the COLA for VA benefits, disabled veterans who receive this benefit would have their benefits reduced by thousands of dollars over their remaining lifetimes . . . The American Legion understands the need to restore fiscal discipline, but it should not be done by reneging on this country's promises to its veterans who already have earned these benefits through their service to country . . . For these veterans and their families, reducing the current COLA represents real sacrifice . . . We ask you not to do harm to those who have already sacrificed so much for this great nation.

I ask unanimous consent to include the American Legion letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me also quote a letter I received from the Executive Director of the Disabled American Veterans—DAV, Barry Jesinoski:

> On behalf of all disabled veterans and their families, we stand with you in firm opposition to the application of the chained CPI to disability and pension payments for veterans, dependents and survivors of veterans. In recent years, it has become apparent that even the current COLA has failed to meet the rising costs faced by disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors. Lowering VA benefit payments using a new formula designed to reduce federal spending at large seems an unconscionable policy and would threaten their financial security and must be rejected. America's heroes deserve better from a grateful and caring nation.

I ask unanimous consent to print the DAV letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me also quote from a letter I received in opposition to the chained CPI from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blinded Veterans Association, Gold Star Wives, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and several other veterans' groups, in one letter. They came together and here is what this letter says:

> As efforts to address our nation's debt continue, we are writing to express our opposition to changing the formula used to calculate the annual cost of living adjustment (COLA) because of the harmful effects it will have on veterans and Social Security benefits. We agree that political leaders need to restore fiscal discipline, but we believe it should be done with great care and without reneging on this country's promises to veterans, including the promises of Social Security and VA disability compensation and pension benefits—all of which are modest in size. Many veterans who rely on these programs live on fixed incomes and very tight budgets. For them, every dollar of hard-earned benefits counts in meeting basic expenses, attaining quality of life, and building

a better future for themselves and those who depend on them. For many of them, reducing the annual COLA would mean real sacrifice. We ask that you not do that for those who have already sacrificed so much for this great country.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

So here we are. We are in this deficit situation because of wars that were unpaid for, tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, Medicare Part D not paid for, and a recession caused by Wall Street. Now we have folks who are saying we have a serious deficit problem. I agree.

The way we are doing it is to make devastating cuts on the backs of some of the most vulnerable people in this country, including disabled vets and including people who receive Social Security and disability benefits. I do not think that is the moral thing to do. I do not think that is the economically appropriate thing to do.

When you have one out of four major corporations, huge corporations, profitable corporations paying zero in taxes; when the corporate tax rate today, the effective corporate tax rate is the lowest it has been in decades; when the gap between the very wealthy and everybody else is growing wider; there are ways to do deficit reduction that are fair.

I will do everything I can to make sure that as we go forward with deficit reduction we do it in a way that is fair and not on the backs of some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

December 12, 2012.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER REID, LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER BOEHNER, AND LEADER PELOSI: As efforts to address our nation's debt continue, we are writing to express our opposition to changing the formula used to calculate the annual cost of living adjustment (COLA) because of the harmful effects it will have on veterans and Social Security benefits.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that adopting the chained consumer price index (CPI) to calculate annual COLAs could save the government $208 billion over ten years by reducing Social Security, disability, and other benefits, and by increasing revenues. More than half of this amount—$112 billion—would come from Social Security cuts, which veterans rely on very heavily for both retirement and disability benefits. Another 11 percent of the savings—$24 billion—would come from VA benefits, civilian pensions, and military retirement pay.

We estimate that use of the chained CPI would have a significant effect on benefits that millions of veterans depend on in the following ways:

Social Security Retirement Benefits: Social Security is one of our nation's most important programs serving veterans and their dependents and survivors. It currently pays benefits to over 9 million veterans—about 4 in 10. The average retirement benefit of a veteran receiving Social Security was about $15,500 in 2010. Adopting the chained CPI would significantly reduce those benefits, by changing the manner in which COLAs are determined. A veteran with average earnings retiring at age 65 would get nearly a $600 benefit cut at age 75, and a $1,000 cut at age 85. By age 95, when Social Security benefits are probably needed the most, that veteran would face a cut of $1,400—a reduction of 9.2 percent.

Not only would a Social Security COLA cut hurt veterans and their families; it is also misguided policy. Social Security is self-financed by the contributions of workers and employers. In effect, it belongs to its contributors. It is separate from the rest of the budget. To use it to reduce the federal deficit, which it did not cause, or effectively to fund other parts of the government or to help maintain tax breaks unrelated to Social Security, is to break the promise of Social Security.

VA Disability Compensation Benefits: Veterans are generally eligible for VA disability compensation benefits if they become disabled due to injuries or illnesses sustained during, or as a result of, military service. There were 3.2 million veterans receiving these benefits in 2010. A veteran receiving VA disability compensation due to a service-connected disability rated at 100 percent is currently entitled to receive $33,288 a year. Under the chained CPI, which is a cut in the formula traditionally used to determine the COLA for VA benefits, a disabled veteran who started receiving benefits at age 30 would have their benefits reduced by $1,425 at age 45, $2,341 at age 55 and $3,231 at age 65.

VA Pension Benefits: Veterans with low incomes who are either permanently and totally disabled, or age 65 and older, may be eligible for pension benefits if they served during a period of war. More than 310,000 veterans received VA pension benefits in 2010. The current benefit for a veteran is just $12,256 a year. Under the chained CPI, VA pension benefits for veterans aged 65 and older living in poverty would be reduced by $353 at age 75, $696 at age 85 and $1,029 at age 95.

Social Security and veterans' benefits need to be based on an accurate measure of inflation. The current COLA formula understates the true cost-of-living increases faced by seniors and people with disabilities because it does not take into account their higher share of spending devoted to health care, and that health care prices rise much more rapidly than overall prices. Although veterans who have service-connected disabilities and those receiving pension benefits are eligible for VA health care, they may still be impacted by rising out-of-pocket health care costs. Adopting the chained CPI would make the situation worse.

Instead, Social Security and VA benefits should be based on a formula that takes account of these higher health care costs called the CPI–E (Experimental CPI for the Elderly) developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The CPI–E rises at a slightly faster rate than the formula currently used to calculate the COLA, and at a still faster rate than the proposed chained CPI, providing a modestly more generous COLA for seniors and people with disabilities.

We agree that political leaders need to restore fiscal discipline, but we believe it should be done with great care and without reneging on this country's promises to veterans, including the promises of Social Security and VA disability compensation and pension benefits—all of which are modest in size. Many veterans who rely on these programs live on fixed incomes and very tight budgets. For them, every dollar of hard-earned benefits counts in meeting basic expenses, attaining quality of life, and building a better future for themselves and those who depend on them. For many of them, reducing the annual COLA would mean real sacrifice. We ask that you not do that for those who have already sacrificed so much for this great country.

Thank you for your serious consideration of our views. We look forward to working with you on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Air Force Sergeants Association; Air Force Women Officers Associated; American Military Retirees Association; American Military Society; Association of the United States Navy; Blinded Veterans Association; Gold Star Wives; Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America; Jewish War Veterans; Military Officers Association of America; National Association for Uniformed Services; National Guard Association of the United States; National Military Family Association; Paralyzed Veterans of America; Veterans for Common Sense; Veterans of Foreign Wars; VetsFirst, a program of United Spinal Association; Vietnam Veterans of America.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, December 14, 2012.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER REID, LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER BOEHNER, AND LEADER PELOSI: As efforts to address our nation's debt continue, we understand many proposals and policies are being reviewed. One proposal appears to be the changing of the formula used to calculate the annual cost of living adjustment (COLA) that affects Social Security and other beneficiaries, including many veterans. On behalf of the 2.4 million members of The American Legion I voice our opposition to this proposal because of the harmful effects it will have on veterans' and Social Security benefits.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates adopting the chained consumer price index (CPI) to calculate annual COLAs could save the government $208 billion over ten years by reducing payments of Social Security, disability, and other benefits. More than half of this amount—$112 billion—would come from Social Security cuts, which many veterans rely on for both retirement and disability benefits. Another 11 percent of the savings—$24 billion—would come from Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) benefits, civilian pensions, and military retired pay. The American Legion opposes the use of the chained CPI because using it would have significant deleterious effects on the benefits millions of veterans depend on in the following ways:

Social Security Retirement Benefits: Adopting the chained CPI significantly reduces these benefits by changing the manner in which COLAs are determined. Not only would a Social Security COLA cut hurt veterans, their families, and their survivors; it is misguided public policy. Social Security is financed by the contributions of our members and their employers. In effect, it belongs to its contributors. It is separate from the rest of the budget. To use it to reduce the federal deficit, which it did not cause,

breaks the promise of Social Security and it could have harmful effects on the recruitment and retention of the Armed Forces.

VA Service-connected Disability Compensation: Veterans are eligible for VA service-connected disability compensation if they become disabled due to injuries or illnesses incurred during, or as a result of, military service. Under the chained CPI, which cuts the formula used to determine the COLA for VA benefits, disabled veterans who receive this benefit would have their benefits reduced by thousands of dollars over their remaining life times.

VA Pension Benefits: Veterans with low incomes who are permanently and totally disabled, or are age 65 and older, may be eligible for pension benefits if they served during a period of war. Under the chained CPI, VA pension benefits for veterans aged 65 and older living in poverty would be reduced over their remaining life times.

Social Security and veterans' benefits do need to be based on an accurate measure of inflation. The current COLA formula already understates the true cost-of-living increases faced by seniors and people with disabilities because it does not take into account their higher share of spending devoted to health care, and health care prices rise more rapidly than overall prices. Even though veterans who have service-connected disabilities and those receiving pension benefits are eligible for VA health care, they will still be impacted by rising out-of-pocket health care costs not covered by the VA. Adopting the chained CPI would make their situations much worse over time.

The American Legion understands the need to restore fiscal discipline, but it should not be done by reneging on this country's promises to its veterans who already have earned these benefits through their service to country. For these veterans and their families, reducing the current COLA represents real sacrifice. We ask you not to do harm to those who have already sacrificed so much for this great nation.

Thank you for your consideration. And thank you for what you have done on behalf of the nation's servicemembers, veterans, and their families and survivors.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. 'JIM' KOUTZ,
National Commander.

DAV,
Washington, DC, December 17, 2012.

Hon. BERNARD SANDERS,
U.S. Senate,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SANDERS: On behalf of the DAV, a national veterans service organization with 1.2 million members, all of whom are wartime disabled veterans, I write to express our strongest opposition to any attempts by Congress to replace the current consumer price index (CPI) formula used for calculating the annual Social Security cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) with the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) new formula commonly termed the ''chained CPI.'' As you know, the Social Security COLA is applied annually to the rates for VA disability compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, and pensions for wartime veterans and survivors with limited incomes. Since the chained CPI is specifically intended to lower the annual Social Security COLA, its application would mean systematic reductions for millions of veterans, their dependents and survivors who rely on VA benefit payments.

In recent years, it has become apparent that even the current COLA has failed to meet the rising costs faced by disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors. These men and women are not traditional consumers of goods and services in the U.S. economy; they are significantly older and suffer disabilities at higher rates than average citizens across the age range of residents of this country. In general, they are heavy consumers of health care, both within the VA and DOD systems, from Medicare and Medicaid, and from private sector providers. The sickest and most infirm among them are unemployable. They are substantial consumers of prescription medications and other health aids. In many cases, they live on fixed incomes and some must subsist on a single source of income: their monthly government disability or pension payment. The current COLA does not even take into account the rising costs of food or fuel. Lowering VA benefit payments using a new formula designed to reduce federal spending at large seems an unconscionable policy and would threaten their financial security and must be rejected. In addition, we urge you to examine whether there are better, more appropriate indexes that recognize the uniqueness of this population's needs and consumption patterns.

Furthermore, these millions of disabled veterans, dependents and survivors suffer the additional indignity of the novel ''rounding down'' policy Congress imposed in 1991 as a ''temporary'' means to lower the federal deficit in fiscal year 1992 by reducing the annual COLA increase to the next-lower dollar. Adding a chained CPI formula to this reduction of benefits would serve to lower their standard of living even more, an ironic reversal of the very purposes of these payments.

On behalf of all disabled veterans and their families, we stand with you in firm opposition to the application of the chained CPI to disability and pension payments for veterans, dependents and survivors of veterans. America's heroes deserve better from a grateful and caring nation.

Sincerely,

BARRY JESINOSKI,
Executive Director
Washington Headquarters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I will be yielding to Senator THUNE, one of the experienced former members of the Budget Committee. He will be sharing his thoughts. I would say to my colleagues, we have been hearing that the Democratic plan is a balanced approach. It is balanced, but it is not a balanced budget. What we need is a balanced budget. That means the amount of money that comes in is the same as the amount of money that goes out.

We can do that and increase spending every single year by 3.4 percent. This is very doable. It does not require the slashing of spending on every important account that we care about in Washington. That is what we are here for, and the administration, the Cabinet Secretaries and so forth, they will make sure the limited amount of money any government has is wisely spent. Therefore, we are not talking about devastating cuts. We are talking about better management and working with how to grow spending over the next 10 years—growing spending over the next 10 years by 3.4 percent, not at 5.4 percent. That balances the budget even under the assumption of 2.5 percent inflation. It can be done. That is what the experts tell us, and that is the best estimate we have today.

The motion to recommit the budget is now on the floor—recommit to the committee, with instructions that they decide what to do to alter it so that when it comes back it is balanced, a real balanced budget—not a balanced plan, not a balanced approach, not some balanced theory—but a real balanced budget. Presumably our colleagues think balance is important because they have mentioned the word about 40 times. We have been counting them since we have been on the floor. I think when we get to that vote we will be asking our colleagues: Do you really want to achieve a balanced budget?

Senator SANDERS said: We think you do not tax the rich enough. You need to tax the rich more and more—as if taxing and punishing them will fix the problem of growth in this economy that is truly too slow. We are having the slowest recovery in our Nation's history, at least since World War II. So we do not have a good recovery coming on. We need to be talking about that.

But I guess my final statement is we do not need a balanced approach, we need a balanced budget. There is a gulf of difference between the two.

The plan before us today raises taxes $1 trillion. They claim it cuts spending nearly $1 trillion and that it is a balanced approach: tax increases, spending cuts, and deficit reduction. That is the message that has been coming from the other side. Except it is not accurate. This budget increases taxes by $1.5 trillion. It also increases spending. That is what it does.

We are concerned about that. The net result is there is no change, it seems to me—no change, a good analysis shows, in the debt course we are on.

I see my colleague, Senator THUNE. It is now time to yield to him. I yield to Senator THUNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator be yielding off the resolution or off the motion?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. It will be yielding off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today along with my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, to offer a couple of amendments that have been filed and that I hope we get an opportunity to vote on before this process concludes. If you look at the base Democratic budget that has been put before us, it has large tax increases in it; in fact, up to $1.5 trillion in new taxes.

What we would attempt to do is to ensure that those taxes, higher taxes, do not come by eliminating or capping the Federal tax deduction for charitable giving. We have tens of millions of Americans mired in poverty, and government budgets are more constrained than ever before and what fills that gap is the charitable giving. It is the generosity of people around this country who keep organizations going that are providing these essential and basic functions for many Americans.

In fact, in 2011, Americans gave nearly $300 billion to support charitable causes. This generosity not only helps to feed the hungry and clothe the needy, it has a real budgetary impact because this is an instance where the private sector is fulfilling a need that would otherwise have to be met by government spending.

Unfortunately, as we know, the White House has proposed limiting the value of itemized deductions for those earning above $200,000 for singles, and $250,000 for married couples to 28 percent. Previous estimates were that this proposal would reduce charitable donations by up to $5.6 billion a year. As the Charitable Giving Coalition has recently stated, that amounts to more than the annual budgets of the Red Cross, Goodwill, YMCA, Habitat for Humanity, the Boys and Girls Clubs, Catholic Charities, and the American Cancer Society combined.

But even this impact understates the degree to which charitable giving could be harmed under the White House proposal because we now have a new baseline with a higher top income tax rate. A new study by the American Enterprise Institute estimates that the President's itemized limitation under the new tax rates will lower total giving by individuals by more than $9.4 billion per year.

We ought to be exploring new options to expand charitable giving rather than limiting the charitable donations in order to fund higher levels of government spending. If we are going to explore any changes in the charitable deduction or any other tax provisions that we have in the Tax Code today, it ought to be in the context of progrowth revenue-neutral tax reform, not as a way to pay for higher spending, which is what these proposals would do. I hope the vote on this amendment this time around will be just as broadly bipartisan as the one I offered back in 2009, where we got 94 votes in support.

The second amendment will put the Senate on record in support of eliminating the destructive Federal estate tax, better known as the death tax. That amendment I offer with the Senator from Missouri and several others of my colleagues.

I have long believed the Federal estate tax is an unnecessary, counterproductive, and inefficient tax. More important, the death tax strikes many of us as not simply being bad tax policy but a policy that runs counter to the very essence of the American free market system. This is not a tax on rich fatcats, as some will claim. We already have an income tax, and it is one of the most progressive income taxes in the developed world.

The death tax is different. It is a tax on success, a tax on assets that have been accumulated through a lifetime of hard work and generated from income that was already taxed when it was earned. Many of these businesses are ''land rich and cash poor,'' meaning that the value of the business is in the land and in the business assets. These businesses do not have substantial liquid assets sitting around to pay a second layer of tax that is imposed when a loved one passes way. As a result, the death tax often requires that business assets are sold simply to pay the tax.

Consider South Dakota, where we have seen farmland prices increased by over 50 percent in just the past 5 years. States such as Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, and North Dakota have seen similar increases.

Finally, my amendment will give farmers, ranchers, and family business owners peace of mind, and it will do so in a deficit-neutral way. When we voted on a sense-of-the-Senate to eliminate the death tax in 2002, 11 Senate Democrats supported that, including a number of Senators who are still in the Senate today. Much has changed since 2002, but I believe the death tax was a bad tax law then, and it remains so today. I hope to get a strong bipartisan vote on this as well.

Before I shift to my colleague from Missouri, I simply want to say, as I have said before, that when we look at this budget process and the budget proposal put before us by the Senate Democrats, the question we ought to ask is, What does this do to promote economic growth? What does this do to create jobs? More than anything else, what we need in this country is increased economic growth. Increased economic growth will get the people who are unemployed back to work, which will increase the take-home pay of middle-class Americans.

We have seen a sluggish economy, chronic high unemployment, and a massive amount of debt over the past 4 years. It is time to chart a different course, and the way to do that is to put policies in place that will encourage economic growth. A $1.5 trillion tax increase is not the way to do that, and we certainly do not want to take away the incentive people in this country have to continue to give out of the generosity of their hearts to our charitable organizations all across the country.

It is also important that once and for all we get rid of the death tax, which is so punitive to people who work so hard and want to pass that on to the next generation of Americans.

I am happy to yield to my colleague from Missouri, who, like me, represents a lot of farmers, ranchers, and hardworking small businesspeople for whom the tax issues are important. He will offer comments on the impact of some of these tax policies and the impact some of the budget proposals coming from the Senate Democrats would have on the State of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I am glad to join Senator THUNE in proposing these two important amendments and also to join him on the overall point on which we ought to be focused, which is economic opportunity and economic growth.

How do we get people onto the pathway of more opportunity for them and their families? Private sector job creation should be the No. 1 domestic goal of America today. Frankly, it should be the No. 1 domestic goal of everything we do.

When we are dealing with a budget or an appropriations bill that deals with any kind of domestic policy, we ought to be thinking about how this would impact private sector job creation. How does this impact economic growth? How does this impact opportunity? What do we do to change our society for the better and not the other way around?

Clearly, I think we all appreciate the fact that Americans are more generous in giving to religious organizations and charities than anybody else in the world. My belief is that there is no country that comes anywhere close in charitable giving. It is not just the top earners in America who give money to charitable organizations, sometimes it is given by families who have to stretch the dollar to make the contribution they want to make to their church that Sunday or to make the contribution they want to make to the Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts activities or the YMCA or YWCA in their community. Nobody does this the way we do it.

I am proud to join Senator THUNE as he works on these issues. We have worked together for a long time, and Senator THUNE has always been a critical advocate for our charities as well as for families who work hard and create a small business or a family farm or ranch so they are able to pass it along to the next generation.

Let me first talk a little bit more about charities. The ability to voluntarily come together and do things is provided in the first amendment. It is not just an amendment that protects speech and religion, but it protects association, it protects people who make things happen in their community that otherwise would not happen.

Americans give like nobody else in the world. Every day our religious institutions, charities, hospitals, museums, and others come together to take private resources and meet a number of community needs which are met in the best possible way by people who are doing that through a charitable effort. They help to feed the hungry, care for the sick, serve the poor, and contribute to all kinds of educational institutions.

Americans help by undertaking critical research and giving money that goes to either help operate or actually support museums and parks. This is a small example of what Americans do because they give to charity, which is often done better than government bureaucracies; it is cheaper, more effective, more reasonable, and we need to do everything we can to continue to do that.

In 2011 Americans gave nearly $300 billion to charitable causes, and 75 percent of that giving was done by individuals. Of the 41 million American households who itemize on their taxes—where they can specifically see what they did—86 percent of those households take advantage of the charitable contribution as they calculate their taxes.

The vast majority of people don't give to charities for tax breaks. I was the president of a southern baptist university for 4 years before I came to Congress. Every university president I know knows a little bit about raising money, and every one of them knows that not every contributor is motivated by the Tax Code, but the Tax Code has an impact on whether they meet their goals. However, some contributors are concerned, and the size of that contribution matters as it relates to how they can leverage, frankly, the Tax Code in a way that makes it easier for them to give more to help take care of the things they care about.

We want to be sure we are doing what we can as we try to grow the economy, and an awful lot of our economy comes from the private sector. About 1 out of 10 jobs is in the charitable sector—1 out of 10 jobs is in the charitable sector. When we restrict that charitable sector, we restrict people from doing what they would do otherwise.

Senator THUNE mentioned $9 billion. Now, $9 billion of $300 billion, does that sound like a lot? It sounds like a lot to the kid who got the last scholarship. It sounds like a lot for the park that doesn't get the new playground equipment because the local Kiwanis club could not get to their goal so they could help their community. If we add up charitable contributions that anyone here gives to, in all likelihood, collectively it would amount to less than $9 billion. So of course it makes a difference, and it is a difference in whether or not they get there. The nonprofit sector employs 1 out of 10 U.S. workers and provides almost 14 million jobs and paid almost $600 billion in wages and benefits. It is about exactly the same in our State.

This is a part of who we are that we don't want to discourage. There is a reason Americans give more generously to charitable causes than anybody else in the world. Let's not walk away from that.

This amendment will ensure that the limits on charitable giving that are in place in the budget of the majority don't go toward just more government spending. If we want to have a discussion about how we might cut tax rates and encourage the economy, that is one thing, but if the discussion is to discourage people from giving to charities so there will be more money for government to spend, I just say that is the wrong discussion to have.

We should not increase government spending at the expense of America's churches and charities. And, of course, the death tax, small businesses, family farms, ranches have all paid taxes on everything they have. Lots of times they pay taxes on everything they have, such as the income tax and the annual property tax.

Everybody can think of 1 example, if not 100, of the family who works side by side. Frankly, by the time parents leave this Earth, it is really hard to determine who created the wealth. Was it Mom and Dad or was it the son or daughter who was standing right there beside them in the grocery store every day or working with them on the family farm or ranch?

In our State of Missouri, we have more than 100,000 individual farms. It is the second highest number of farms in America. We do not have the biggest farms and ranches in America, but we have more of them than any other State but for one. Those individuals and families have done what they could to try to create opportunity and a livelihood, and they would like to pass that along. What is wrong with that?

Clearly, the point we are at right now with the tax at the time of death is better than it has been in a while—I suppose not better than the 1 year there was no death tax. For 1 year we had no death tax, and that is the ideal that government should try to achieve again.

I am pleased to join Senator THUNE in this effort. I hope we will do what we can to encourage families who have businesses that they can pass along without having death as a taxable event. There are plenty of taxable events in life without having death as a taxable event.

I again thank Senator THUNE for his long advocacy of eliminating this unfairness in our Tax Code. I have been glad to join him in debate after debate over the years on this issue. Let's not move toward thinking we are doing the right thing by doing the wrong thing as it relates to family farms and business.

I also want to say as I conclude that I am going to be offering an amendment on the carbon tax as well. We should not have a carbon tax because the carbon tax that is anticipated in some of the language of this budget raises utility bills. Who is impacted most by a higher utility bill? It is the most vulnerable among us. It is the family who is the last family to get the new refrigerator, it is the family who is the last family to get the better insulated windows, it is the family who is the last family to get more insulation in their ceiling. All of the things we do that raise utility bills have a real impact on them just like whenever we are doing anything that raises costs, such as gasoline prices. The last person or family to get the fuel-efficient car is the one who can least afford to see what happens to their utility bill or their gasoline costs. I am opposed to this kind of tax being passed along to people who have a hard enough time paying their utility bill.

So whether it is the carbon tax or the death tax or a tax on charitable giving, let's not do the wrong thing for the sake of more government spending. Let's do the right thing for jobs and American families.

I ask through the Chair if Senator THUNE has anything he wants to say in conclusion on these amendments.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Missouri. He has a great deal of experience. As he said, we worked together on these issues for a long time. We both recognize the importance of economic growth. We see a budget put before us by the Senate Democrats that grows the government and not the economy. We believe the focus should be on growing the economy, not the government. The amendments we offered have that thought in mind.

There are other colleagues who are here to speak to the basic budget proposal the Democrats have put forward and talk about some of the amendments they intend to offer.

Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I see we have Senator VITTER of Louisiana ready to speak. I ask unanimous consent that their time be taken off the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I come to the floor on this budget debate and will specifically highlight several amendments that I am presenting that will be voted on in the context of the debate. We address several provisions that I think are important as we vote on moving forward with the budget.

One issue is a reform idea. It is very simple, but it is very basic, and I think it is important in terms of our leading through these fiscally tough times; that is, ending automatic pay raises for Members of Congress. I am joined in this amendment by Senator MCCASKILL of Missouri, and I thank her for her leadership. There is existing Federal law that establishes automatic pay raises for Members of Congress. We don't have to put in a bill, we don't have to debate the measure on the floor, much less vote. I think that is offensive to the American people, particularly in tough economic times such as these.

To Congress's credit, we have passed stopgap legislation to refuse pay raises since 2009, but we need to go the next legitimate step. We need to end all automatic pay raises and have the courage, if it is ever justified over time with inflation, to put in a proposal, to debate it, to vote on it, not to have automatic pay raises for Members of Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

A second amendment would require photographic IDs for voting in Federal elections. This is largely provoked by the actions of the Obama administration's Justice Department which has been fighting States that are trying to institute photo IDs. That is allowed under Federal law, and several States

are doing that and doing it properly, including Texas and South Carolina, but this Justice Department is trying to shut that down, even though it is allowed by Federal law. Interestingly, that assault on States trying to do their job, trying to do things properly, has been made by the head of the Civil Rights Division at Justice, Thomas Perez, who is now nominated for a Cabinet position—Labor Secretary. This amendment and this proposal would clarify it by actually requiring photo IDs for voting in Federal elections.

We require photo IDs for traveling in airports. We require photo IDs for going into a conference. We require photo IDs for a myriad of things, including visiting the White House. Surely it is a very legitimate, simple requirement that doesn't disenfranchise anyone to make sure the integrity of our election system is preserved. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Third, another amendment I will bring would finally require the US–VISIT system to be properly and fully executed and put in place. The US–VISIT system, as the Presiding Officer knows, is an entry and exit control system to track foreign nationals who are properly visiting our country with visas, so it tracks them as they come in and go out, and if they don't go out in time, if they overstay their visa, it brings up a red flag that is sent to law enforcement officials.

This is not a small matter because, as we all remember, the 9/11 terrorists overstayed their visas. A proper US–VISIT system would have tracked that, would have caught them, would have done something about it. There has been a crying need since at least 1996. In 1996, Congress passed legislation that mandated the executive branch, within 2 years, establish this sort of system. Of course, it wasn't done in time for 9/11. After 9/11, the 9/11 Commission specifically went back and recommended that we get on this, that we finish the work, that we fully establish the US–VISIT system. It said:

> The Department of Homeland Security, properly supported by the Congress, should complete as quickly as possible a biometric entry/exit screening system.

Yet, even now, over a decade after 9/11, 12 years after 9/11, we don't have that system fully in place. We need that system, and this amendment would not just mandate the system but it would say that the Department of Homeland Security cannot grant legal status to those illegally present within the United States until we all comply with Federal law relating to the entry and exit data system required under the law originally passed in 1996.

In the context of immigration reform, I don't think we should consider granting legal status to those here illegally until we have this US–VISIT system, which is an absolutely essential component of enforcement.

A fourth amendment I have that we will be voting on over the next few days is in support of the Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act. This amendment would support that act and express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact it. What does that act do? It provides that whoever knowingly performs an abortion that is sought based on sex or gender selection would be guilty of violating the law. So it prohibits discriminating against the unborn in the form of abortion sex selection.

A lot of folks don't realize it, but, again, this is not a theoretical issue. This, unfortunately, is an ongoing practice. There are at least four studies from universities—not from ultraconservative think tanks; UC-Berkeley is not a conservative think tank, University of Connecticut, Columbia University—there are at least four studies that found there is a strong son bias within certain American communities, a bias toward having sons, not daughters. These studies say that is ''clear evidence of sex-selection, most likely at the prenatal stage.''

That is sort of academic speak. What does it mean? It means that parents are selecting and using abortion to that outcome. It is always selection against women, against girl babies, in favor of sons. That is outrageous and it is tragic. We need to follow other countries that have prohibited this practice.

Other countries—the United Kingdom, India, China—have enacted these sorts of bans. The medical community, including the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Society of Reproductive Medicine, and the President's own Council on Bioethics, have all condemned sex selection abortions.

In 2007, the United States even spearheaded a resolution to condemn these sorts of sex selection abortions at the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. Yet we are doing nothing about it in this country. So we should start doing something about this horrible practice in this country. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Fifth and finally, I will have an amendment with regard to China, India, and Russia, and greenhouse gas regulation. The amendment and the idea are very simple. It creates a point of order against funding for greenhouse gas regulations until the administration can certify that China, India, and Russia are similarly implementing greenhouse gas regulations to reduce their own emissions.

There are big disagreements and debates about global warming, climate change, greenhouse gas regulation. I wish to forego all that and put it to the side. No matter what one thinks about that—causes and effects, trend lines, or lack of trend lines—one thing is perfectly clear and beyond dispute; that is, whatever the United States does is irrelevant if major players globally, such as China and India and Russia, don't do the same. Clearly, our action is irrelevant unless all three of those countries do the same. China has just surpassed the United States as the world's largest producer of CO_2. China now produces more than the United States and Canada combined. India is now the world's third largest offender of CO_2, and Russia is fourth. So unless these three countries adopt some sort of similar regime, our actions do zero in terms of the environment. But our actions would do a lot in terms of costing us jobs, killing jobs, and suppressing economic growth.

This is a very commonsense regulation. It shouldn't matter what one thinks about climate change with regard to how a Senator votes, because, again, our actions will have zero effect if China, India, and Russia are not taking similar action. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise in support of Senator SESSIONS' motion to recommit on a balanced budget. I think it is important that we have a balanced plan before us, as we have talked about a lot today, but that means balancing the budget, just as we ought to do in our families and people have to do in their businesses. States all around the country have to do it. Local governments have to do it.

Let's stop spending more than we take in. We can do it over time and without making the kind of severe cuts that were alleged earlier. We can do it by growing the economy and restraining spending. So I am happy to stand in support of that.

I stand here because I am worried about where we are headed. Our debt now is about $140,000 per household. Think about that. For all of the folks watching today, on average, $140,000 is what every household in America owes on this debt. This is now something that, in my view, can put us in a perilous situation. Our economy is already weak and we have this huge debt and deficit, which is something that worries me. I think our country is in trouble.

The Democrats have a proposal. Their budget is before us now and this is what we are talking about. It adds another $7 trillion to that debt. It actually doesn't deal with our budget problems. In fact, it actually makes them worse, which I will talk about soon.

Let me for a minute, if I could, talk about where we are. There is a lot of discussion on the floor about, Gosh, we need to raise more revenue and how this is not about spending; it is about taxes. Republicans are saying, No, the problem is spending. Let me explain why we are saying that. It is arithmetic. It is math. It is what the numbers show.

This is from the Congressional Budget Office. This is the nonpartisan group

here in Congress that tells us how much we are spending, how much revenue we are bringing in, and then they make a projection. They did this about 3 years ago. They said, Here is where we are heading as a country. Here is where we are now. Tax revenue is the blue line and spending is the red line. By their projections, by 2015, a couple of years from now, we are going to be back up above the historical levels.

Historically, taxes have been about 18 percent of the economy, and that is the way economists like to look at it: What is the percentage of the economy? Revenue has been about 20 percent. So here is 18 percent and here is 20 percent. This has been the average.

What they are saying is, actually it gets up to just over 19 percent in a couple of years, by 2015, and then stays up above the historical average over the next decade. In fact, what they tell us is that over the next decade we are going to have the second highest amount of revenue that we have had in the history of our country except for one other decade.

So when we say it is spending, that is the issue. It is because the revenue which, as we know, impacts the economy—the more revenue we take out of the economy the harder it is for the private sector to get ahead and to create jobs. We are saying, by the projections of this nonpartisan group, they are going to be slightly above the average.

The problem is spending. What they tell us is that in a few decades—here is 2040—spending is going to get so high that there is no way to catch up to it with taxes. We can't even do it under the income tax system. It is impossible.

Why do we say spending is a problem? Because if we don't deal with this issue, our kids and grandkids are not going to have the economic future we hope for them. The prosperity of this country will go down the drain because this spending level will make it impossible to create prosperity. That is the issue before us today. Yet, again, we have a budget before us that, unfortunately, doesn't address that issue. In fact, I would argue that it makes it worse.

Some have said, Gosh, we ought to be increasing taxes $1 for every $1 of spending reductions. What I would say to that is pretty simple. This line here is about 19 percent of the economy. That is the revenue line. And that is very close to the historical spending line, which is about 20 percent. So let's take 19 percent as the revenue line. The Democrats, who have talked today on the floor about $1 of revenue for every $1 of spending cuts, what do they mean by that? Well, this is 39 percent up here, here is 19 percent. So if we take $1 from each as a percent of the GDP, it would go to about this line here. Where is that? Well, 19 and 39, it is about 29 percent. What does 29 percent mean? That means we would have a government bigger than we have ever had in the history of this country. Again, the average has been about 20 percent in this country. That means we would have to have huge tax increases to get to balance. Nobody on this floor, Democrat or Republican, is talking about tax increases of that magnitude.

Why? Because that would be about doubling the taxes in this country. So everybody listening today would be looking at their taxes and saying: My gosh, my taxes just went up by 100 percent. That is what that would mean. It would mean the biggest government in the history of our country, so the scope and the size of government would grow.

So when you hear ''1 to 1,'' I hope you will just think about it in terms of what does this mean based on these projections that have been given to us by this nonpartisan group. It means a different country. It means a much bigger government. It means a much bigger burden of taxation. It means we end up not looking like the entrepreneurial, innovative America that has been on the cutting edge and has created the greatest economy on the face of the Earth.

That is our concern. That is why we say we have to deal with the spending. It is pretty simple. Again, it is really a question of math.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PORTMAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. Senator PORTMAN is such a valuable member of the Budget Committee. He served as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He knows how this situation works.

But that dotted line on the chart, it is just spending, isn't it? It is spending as a percentage of the American economy. So in some sense that surging upward line of spending is even worse than at first glance it might appear.

Mr. PORTMAN. That is true. This chart is as a percent of the GDP. So, look, we all want the economy to grow. Actually, they projected it will grow under the Congressional Budget Office analysis. Even so, that growth in the economy cannot keep up with this great surge in spending.

So other folks have said on the floor over the last 24 hours: Well, gosh, let's go back to the Simpson-Bowles 3-to-1 ratio, where you have $3 in spending cuts for every $1 of revenue. That is what Erskine Bowles testified before the supercommittee on, that that was what their revenue was, $1 of revenue for every $3 in spending cuts.

That is also not what this budget does, this underlying budget, because it actually increases taxes dramatically. Even under their own calculus, again, it is 1 to 1. We have looked at it. We think the tax increase is between $1 trillion and $1.5 trillion in this budget. So it is the biggest tax increase in the history of the country.

What does $1 trillion mean—or $1.5 trillion? Well, it means that you are going to have to tax a lot of people other than rich people. I would refer you to an economic expert on this, a guy named Gene Sperling, who is down at the White House, who talks about these economic issues a lot. Here is what Gene Sperling said about raising $1 trillion. He said you cannot do it without hurting middle-class families. This is his quote:

> [A] careful look at the math of these types of caps and limits [on tax preferences] shows that, once one takes into account the reality of their impact on the middle-class families and on charitable donation, plausible limits raise only a fraction of the $1 trillion or more some have suggested.

It is just too much to raise without going to the folks who are making less than $200,000 a year, less than $100,000, less than $50,000. So I would just suggest today that we have a problem in this country. It is a spending problem. Yes, we want to get the economy moving, and that will create more revenue. But we have to address that issue and, unfortunately, the budget before us does not do it.

In addition to having these huge tax increases—the biggest in the history of our country—this budget also has huge spending. The spending is actually an increase. When you wipe away the gimmicks that are in the budget that they have proposed—and we have talked a lot about OCO. That just means the spending in Afghanistan. They project that all this spending is going to occur that nobody expects is going to occur, so because it does not, they say, well, that is a savings. Then you are going to be able to spend more to make up for that.

Well, we are going to spend some more in Afghanistan. We all understand that. But we are not going to spend as much as the CBO projects. So those savings are not real, unfortunately. That is in their budget. That is a gimmick.

They also say: Let's do away with this so-called sequester. This is the thing that the Budget Control Act put in place. The Budget Control Act said: Let's find these savings of $1.2 trillion in spending. Yet in this budget, they say: No, let's replace that. So you have to add that as well because instead of $1.2 trillion, they are saying half of that is going to be new taxes. So that is less spending cuts.

So when you add all that up, and when you wipe all that away, it looks like the spending increases are about $900 billion over the next decade. So despite all these problems, we are talking about a huge spending increase.

Now, let's just talk for a second about what the spending increase is on. Here is the debt chart I have in the Chamber that shows the debt climbing to $24 trillion over the next 10 years, under the Murray budget, under the Democratic budget we are talking about today. But what is the problem? Well, we are starting to do more to get the discretionary spending under control. That means the spending that Congress appropriates every year.

But when you think about the budget as kind of a pie, 62 percent of that

budget—the biggest piece of that pie—is not spending that Congress appropriates every year. Congress does not do it because it is on autopilot. That is interest on the debt that you have to spend; and then it is the very important, vital entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security—but that are not sustainable in their current form.

By the way, everybody agrees with that. The President talks about it publicly. Everybody talks about it privately. But the fact is, these programs are incredibly important. We want to ensure that they can continue into the future. That is why we need reform—to preserve and protect them. Yet, unbelievably, this budget before us does absolutely nothing there. In fact, when you add up the changes on the entitlement programs over the next 10 years—which, again, is the biggest reason for these huge spending increases; in fact, as a percent of GDP, it is the only reason—all of the spending increases are because of those entitlement programs and interest on the debt, all of them as a percent of the GDP, all of them. Yet this budget does not touch it. In fact, it slightly increases spending as compared to the CBO baseline, as compared to what we are going to do anyway that the Congressional Budget Office just told us about.

That, to me, is the most amazing part of the budget. It is the responsible thing to do. Again, the President has talked about it. Members of both parties acknowledge this. We have to deal with this issue. If we do not, we are not going to be able to have these programs going forward.

Under their budget, the disability fund in Social Security—and a lot of people rely on disability—runs out of money in 2016.

Under their budget, the Medicare trust fund itself goes bankrupt in 2024.

Under their budget, Social Security's fund for senior citizens would go bankrupt in 2033, to the point that under law—remember this is just 20 years from now—a 25-percent benefit cut would be put in place.

That is what this budget would lead to. So it is hard for me to take it very seriously as a budget. It is, I guess, more of a political document.

The final thing I will say is, if we do this, if we go down this path of more spending next year, more spending the next year, huge increases in spending and taxes over the next 10 years, we will not only have a budget that is out of control—and, as I said earlier, risk us having a meltdown in terms of our economy because of a potential crisis we could have, like has happened in southern Europe; Greece is a country people talk about—but think about what it does to our economy.

This huge overhang of debt and deficits everybody now acknowledges is bad for the economy. Some people think it is worse than others think. But if you look at these studies—the Rogoff-Reinhart study has been talked about on the floor. I know that is the one that says, when you get to the level we are at now, you lose about 1 million jobs per year.

Well, something is happening in our economy, and I think a lot of it—the negative part of it—is because of this debt and deficit. We are living through the worst economic recovery since the 1940s. All of us are discouraged by it, Democrats and Republicans alike. The average growth rate was less than 1 percent over the last 4 years, and that is not acceptable to any of us. We have to deal with this issue because it is the right thing to do for our kids and our grandkids, as we have talked about, the right thing to do for these programs so they are viable and their trust funds do not go insolvent, but also for today's economy. If we do not deal with this issue we are not going to have people taking the risk, making the investment.

There are companies making money out there. Do you know what they are doing with it? They are keeping it on the sidelines because they are afraid of this, because they see this coming. They are worried about making the investments. That is how we are going to create the jobs.

Right now, in the weakest economy we have had in a long time—and the worst economic recovery since the 1940s—we are looking at unemployment numbers that are unacceptably high. We are looking at a place such as Ohio where we have a struggle with manufacturing. We are trying to get back on our feet. We are looking for economic growth again. We are not going to get it unless we deal with this issue.

The Heritage Foundation has looked at this budget, and they have done an analysis of it in terms of its impact on jobs, on the economy. They have said the budget will result in losing 800,000 jobs in our country. In my State of Ohio, they said we will lose 40,000 jobs. We cannot afford to lose 40,000 more jobs.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—which I mentioned earlier and is the group in Congress that advises us on the economy—has said this new debt will reduce long-term economic growth and cost jobs.

So, ultimately, this is about a choice. Do we want to expand government or do we want to expand the economy? Do we want to create the opportunity to get the private economy moving or do we want to grow the size and scope of government?

We have a fundamental choice to make in this Chamber with regard to this budget today. I am hopeful we will be able to amend the budget so we can take out some of the taxes and the spending and the borrowing, so that it is better for the economy. Even if we cannot prevail—and if this budget passes over the next couple days here—I still hope, as a Congress, working with the President, we can address this issue.

Once this budget debate is behind us on the floor, I hope we can sit down as Republicans and Democrats alike, as Americans, acknowledging that if we do not deal with spending, we cannot get this economy back on track, acknowledging that trying to tax, spend, and borrow your way to prosperity does not work. We tried it. We have seen the results.

We have also seen the opposite, over time, through the great history of this country. The time-honored principles that have made us this cutting-edge economy, that have made us the envy of the world, relied on entrepreneurship, innovation, keeping taxes low, keeping government spending under control, and encouraging the private sector to do what they do best, which is, to create jobs. This is why I oppose this budget. This is why I also support a better way, to bring back the jobs and get our country back on track.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, there has been a complete abdication of fiscal responsibility in Congress, particularly in the Senate, for the last 4 years, in that there has been no budget passed in this Senate for that period of time. What better manifestation, what uglier manifestation of that fiscal irresponsibility than the $16.5 trillion in debt.

Another symptom of that problem is the fact that in addition to the Senate not passing a budget for the last 4 years, in 4 out of the last 5 years, the President of the United States has missed the statutory deadline on submitting his proposed budget to the Senate for consideration and to the Congress.

Really, when we are talking about budgeting, the House is going to pass a budget that limits the rate of growth of Federal spending from 5.4 percent to 3.4 percent. It limits the rate of growth. Now, most of America would not call that a cut. But for some reason that is called a cut in Washington. What I would call that is a limitation on the rate of growth of Federal spending.

It is important we get the President's proposed budget, as required by the law. The law requires the President to send his proposed budget to the Congress by the first Monday in February. He has not done so, and we have been advised that we probably will not even see the President's proposed budget until our work here is done. I do not know what the President could do that would render himself any more irrelevant to this important process than not contribute his proposed budget on a timely basis, as required by the law.

Because the President has not complied with the law, I am going to offer an amendment to this budget resolution called the No Budget No OMB Pay Act of 2013. OMB, of course, stands for the Office of Management and Budget, the executive branch agency responsible for preparing the President's proposed budget.

The No Budget No OMB Pay Act would prohibit paying the salaries of

the Office of Management and Budget Director, the Deputy Director, and the Deputy Director for Management for any period of time that the President is late in meeting the statutory requirement to submit his budget, as I said, by the first Monday in February.

I have also filed an amendment to the budget that would allow the Senate to express its support for this legislation.

It is certainly progress that now, after 4 years, Senator REID has seen fit to bring a budget to the floor. That is his prerogative as the majority leader, something we in the minority have no authority to do. But it represents progress—some small progress—that Senator REID has finally decided to bring a budget to the floor and that the Senate is now able to amend and debate that budget resolution.

As you have heard, the proposed budget that has come from the Budget Committee, Senator MURRAY's budget, raises taxes by $1.5 trillion and increases spending by 62 percent. What is worse, it actually fails to balance within 10 years, which is the budget window.

Equally as unfortunate, for the first time in recent memory, is that the Congress is acting before receiving the President's proposed budget. According to the National Journal, this marks an unprecedented break of 92 years of tradition in having the President make the first move in the budget process.

This is called leadership.

Current law requires the President to send his budget by the first Monday of February, which I have said. President Obama has ignored this requirement. He has missed the deadline 4 out of 5 years he has been President of the United States. This year he was required to issue the budget proposal on February 4, but he missed the deadline once again. While the Senate is acting this week, it has been 45 days since the President has failed to live up to the legal commitment for the President to submit his proposed budget. We all know nowhere else in America, whether in private life, private business, or in local or State government, can you fail to do your job and still be paid—only here in Washington, DC.

We know it is important the President and the executive branch live up to their responsibilities, just as it is important we do so ourselves. If the Office of Management and Budget does not do its job and produce a budget, its top official should not be paid.

Based on legislation we have already passed, both the legislative branch and now, if my budget amendment passes and if Congress embraces this requirement, both executive and legislative branches share responsibility when it comes to the budget. Without us doing our jobs and the President doing his job, spending will remain out of control. We all deserve better and the American people deserve better. They deserve the accountability which comes from the President fulfilling his legal responsibilities under the law of the land.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, as the Senate continues to debate the first budget resolution in more than 4 years, I am struck not only by the things we know about the Democrats' budget but also the things we don't know. For example, we know the budget would increase our debt by nearly $7 trillion over 10 years and it would continue on an upward trajectory thereafter. What we don't know is how, while amassing all that debt, our Nation will be able to respond to unforeseeable crises and emergencies in the future.

In addition, we know the budget does next to nothing to address our runaway entitlement spending. What we don't know is how programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security would survive over the long term if this budget were to be followed.

Finally, we know this budget includes as much as $1.5 trillion in new taxes. What we don't know is where all that revenue will be coming from. Last week before the budget was released I came to the floor to speak about the rumors the Democratic budget would include reconciliation instructions with regard to taxes. The concern I expressed at that time was the budget would instruct the Finance Committee to close so-called tax loopholes in order to raise revenue and this would, in effect, end ongoing bipartisan efforts on tax reform. As it turns out, my fears were not unfounded. Specifically this budget instructs the Finance Committee to find nearly $1 trillion in new revenues to pay for additional spending.

The deadline under these instructions would be October 1 of this year. That clashes directly with the schedule Chairman BAUCUS and I have set out for bipartisan tax reform deliberations in the Finance Committee. This budget would instruct the committee to set aside those reform efforts and, instead, comb through the Tax Code looking for new revenues. In addition, this budget includes deficit-neutral reserve funds and sequester replacement which total more than $500 billion. According to the Budget Committee, this new spending would be paid for by closing so-called tax loopholes for the wealthy and corporations.

In addition to the $1 trillion in reconciliation instructions, this budget includes potential for another half trillion in new taxes. This means up to $1.5 trillion in fresh taxes from this budget will be used to expand our already bloated Federal Government.

The budget repeats the common refrain we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that our Tax Code is so full of so-called loopholes which benefit only the wealthy. According to their arguments, these loopholes may be closed at any time to generate untold amounts of revenue without affecting the middle class or our economy.

During last week's Budget Committee markup, the chairwoman claimed they could hit their revenue target by ''closing loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code for those who need it the least.''

This statement is simply incorrect. First of all, a loophole is something created by accident or carelessness which is then exploited. When my colleagues talk about loopholes, they aren't talking about backdoors created unintentionally or sneaky abuses of the Tax Code, they are talking about tax expenditures, all of which were deliberately placed into the Code for specific reasons. More often than not my Democratic colleagues use the term ''loophole'' to describe items in the Tax Code they don't like. This doesn't make the label any more honest.

Earlier this week one of my friends on the other side of the aisle took this rhetoric about loopholes up a notch. He described the Tax Code as this treasure trove of special deals and earmarks for the rich and well-connected. He went further by saying, We are at the place where the lobbyists wield the sweet corporate tax deals. He blamed Republicans for this, arguing we were responsible for the existence of these so-called loopholes and earmarks.

Admittedly there are some narrow provisions in the Tax Code—too many, if you ask me. There are supporters of these provisions on both sides of the aisle. Let's be honest. There aren't any real loopholes in the Tax Code, nor are there any earmarks. There are simply tax expenditures. If you look at a list of the largest tax expenditures, you will find a number of deductions and preferences which disproportionately benefit the middle class, middle-income taxpayers. That being the case, if my colleagues want to raise significant amounts of revenue by eliminating tax expenditures, they will have to do so by raising taxes on the middle class.

Look at this chart. If you look at this chart, you will see the revenue targets in the Democratic budget. First up, there is $975 billion right near the reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee. Below that are additional revenues included in this budget. As I have mentioned, all told, if you include the specified revenue target for reconciliation and potential increases elsewhere, the budget may include more than $1.5 trillion in tax increases. Look at this.

Next we have a list of all the tax increases Senate Democrats have voted for over the last 2 years, including the elimination of tax breaks for oil and gas companies, increased taxes for carried interest and the so-called Buffett rule. All told, these tax hike proposals could raise about $108.3 billion in new revenues. At the bottom we see the difference between that number, the tax increases which Senate Democrats have actually voted for and the potential tax hikes which are included in the budget.

As I said, we can give the Democrats credit for having identified about $108 billion in tax increases they support, but that would mean there is as much as $1.4 trillion in unidentified tax increases in this budget.

How would they reach their target? The budget doesn't spell it out. It leaves more than enough room to speculate. For example, you might simply think they would adopt the idea from President Obama's past budgets to cap itemized deductions for higher income earners at 28 percent.

This seems unlikely for two reasons. First, to date very few Democrats in the Senate have come out in favor of that proposal. Indeed, it would impact things such as charitable contributions and pension deferrals which most have been unwilling to change. Second, and more important, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, that proposal would generate only about $423 billion in new revenues over 10 years, which would leave my colleagues about $1 trillion short of their revenue goal. Still, I can't help but wonder if the tide has shifted with regard to this proposal.

With the Senate budget staking so much on the elimination of so-called loopholes, it will be interesting to see how many Democrats shift positions and endorse the President's proposal, even though it will not yield nearly enough revenue to reach the targets outlined in this budget.

Staying in the world of capping itemized deductions, there is also the proposal outlined by CBO in 2011 to cap all itemized deductions for all taxpayers at 15 percent. This would effectively raise taxes on every tax filer in every bracket who itemized their deductions. Make no mistake. This would be a tax increase on the middle class, meaning it would violate the promises made by President Obama and other Democrats to protect the middle class from further tax increases.

However, it would also generate enough revenue to be in the neighborhood of what the Democrats have outlined in their budget. All told, this proposal would, according to CBO, raise about $1.2 trillion in revenue over 10 years. Given the outlandish revenue proposal in the budget, this idea, while punitive and damaging to the middle class, can't be ruled out entirely.

I have another chart here which lists the top 10 tax expenditures according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. These 10 items account for 71 percent of what Democrats have called spending in the Tax Code.

What is No. 1 on this list? I will give you a hint. It is not corporate jet depreciation or carried interest. No, it is the tax-free treatment of employer-provided health care. Do you want to do away with that?

What is No. 2 on the list? It is the tax-deferred benefit for retired savings plans.

How about No. 3? It is the measure which provides relief against double taxation on investments. I am referring to the reduced rate on long-term capital gains and dividends. This rate went up recently. It was raised by 59 percent in the fiscal cliff bill. Raising it even more is a sure-fire recipe for job destruction and even slower economic growth.

No. 4 is the deduction for State and local taxes.

No. 5 is the home mortgage interest deduction. Do you want to do away with that?

No. 6 is the tax-free treatment of Medicare benefits.

So far I don't see a lot of expenditures aimed solely at benefiting the wealthy. No, most of these provisions benefit a significant number of middle-income taxpayers or earners.

Three of the four next items on the list are refundable, meaning the person filing the return can receive a check even if they owe no income tax. This is truly where there is spending in the Tax Code. These provisions exclusively benefit lower and middle-income earners. They are not available to those making over $200,000 a year.

The point is not simply there are a lot of popular tax expenditures. I think people know that already. No, my point is, given the difference between the revenue target in the Democrats' budget and the tax increases they supported on the record, there is no telling how they plan to actually raise their revenue. If they are serious about closing so-called loopholes to the tune of over $1 trillion, this list is where the real money is. If we are talking about raising that kind of revenue by eliminating tax expenditures, we are necessarily talking about provisions which benefit the middle class. It can't be raised through eliminating tax breaks for oil companies. It can't be raised by instituting the Buffett rule. It can't be raised even by eliminating all itemized deductions for millionaires.

I am sure my colleagues will disagree with this assessment. However, the burden is on them to show where I am wrong, and they can't.

This is their budget and their revenue target. If they want this budget to be taken seriously, the Democrats should come out and state specifically their plan for raising their $1.5 trillion in additional revenue. You can't simply say: We want the Finance Committee to figure out how to raise taxes by another $1 trillion to finance our spending spree. That is irresponsible and, as I said, it poisons the well for fundamental tax reform. You can't simply say: We want to turn off almost half a trillion dollars of sequestration spending cuts, but we won't say how we will pay for it. This is irresponsible and misleading to the American public.

Finally, I wish to point out the budget would also mark a significant shift in the position held by many Democrats with regard to corporate taxes. The Obama administration has repeatedly expressed support for approaching corporate tax reform in a revenue-neutral manner. Prominent Democrats on the Finance Committee have also publicly expressed support for revenue-neutral corporate tax reform in order to make America more globally competitive.

However, the Democrats' budget states: Eliminating loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code for the biggest corporations must be a significant element of a balanced and responsible deficit reduction plan.

You cannot have it both ways. Revenue-neutral corporate tax reform means paring back corporate tax expenditures and lowering the corporate tax rate. Revenue-neutral corporate tax reform does not mean, and cannot mean, eliminating tax expenditures which some Members don't like because it polls well, and then using some or all of the resulting revenue gain to further expand the government. This is not tax reform of any kind, this is a tax hike pure and simple. I would be interested to find out whether the Democrats who have publicly expressed support for revenue-neutral tax reform will support this budget.

More generally, I wish to know where the Democrats stand on corporate taxes. Do they want to raise them, or do they want to make American companies more globally competitive? I hope it is the latter. You cannot do both.

When you look at the tax provisions of the Senate budget, it is clear it is nothing more than a political document.

I suspect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know they cannot hit their revenue targets without impacting the middle class. I think they also know we can't do revenue-neutral corporate tax reform and at the same time raise more tax revenue from the corporate sector. I think they know that in real-world terms, the tax provisions of this budget are several bridges too far. So in the end, I have to assume there is a political calculation being made.

My colleagues apparently believe it makes good political sense to talk about reducing the deficit on the backs of the wealthy and less popular corporations rather than making difficult choices on spending.

The American people need a real blueprint for our Nation's fiscal future, not more talking points. Once again, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this budget.

Now I wish to take just a few seconds to talk about one of the budget amendments I expect will be discussed and considered on the floor. I understand it is described as an amendment to ''establish a deficit neutral reserve fund to allow States to collect sales and use taxes already owed under State law.'' This amendment is intended to be a proxy vote for a bill called the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I greatly appreciate the diligent efforts of the supporters of this bill, including Senators ENZI and ALEXANDER.

Clearly, a lot of work has gone into this legislation. However, over the last few months, I have been on the floor several times to talk about the importance of restoring regular order in the Senate. The Marketplace Fairness Act has been referred to the Finance Committee. Both Chairman BAUCUS and I have the view that legislation is more properly considered within the context of the committee's current bipartisan efforts on tax reform.

However one feels regarding this amendment, it is undeniable that the Marketplace Fairness Act is controversial and that concerns about and suggestions for the legislation have been raised by many stakeholders. I have met with many people on both sides of the Marketplace Fairness Act, including people from Utah, and have heard many concerns. I am not here to take a position on the substance of this legislation, only to note that it deserves to be fully debated in committee and I am concerned this amendment might not allow those debates to occur.

For this reason, I intend to vote no on this amendment at this time.

What I have said is extremely important. It is not partisan. It is pointing out these doggone problems with this bill, and I hope my friends on the other side will start looking at things such as this. Because we can play politics with these things all day long, but that doesn't make it right and it doesn't make it so we can do what my friends on the other side would like to do, which is raise revenue so they can spend more.

It boggles my mind. We have to find some way of living within our means in this country. If we don't, we are creating a new generation of debtors—our children, our grandchildren, and in many cases—in my case—great-grandchildren as well. It is the debtor generation now. Every one of them owes well over $50,000 personally, and that is going to go up exponentially if we don't watch what we are doing.

In fact, even if we do watch what we are doing, it is still going to go up. But we have to do everything in our power to give them a future. The debtor generation is all those who are less than 50 years of age but especially our youth. We simply can't barter away their future because we don't have the guts to stand up and do what is right.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I think we will proceed now to the other side. Then there will be back and forth on the Internet Fairness Act; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it is my understanding there are a number of Senators who have come to talk on one of the provisions they would like to offer. I think we will start with their side, with Senator ENZI to be yielded to from their side.

If the Senator wants to yield time to him, I will then yield to a Democrat.

Mr. SESSIONS. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. For the information of my colleagues—and I guess this will not be in concrete—I will recognize Senator ENZI for 10 minutes, Senator ALEXANDER for 10 minutes, and Senators BLUNT and AYOTTE for 5 minutes each.

Senator ENZI, I know, has worked hard on this legislation, and I yield to him.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I note the time will come off the resolution on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise with Senators DURBIN, ALEXANDER, and others to discuss an amendment I am filing to the fiscal year 2014 budget resolution. The amendment establishes the deficit-neutral reserve fund that allows States to enforce State and local use tax laws and to collect taxes already owed under State law on remote sales.

The amendment captures the bipartisan, bicameral—the House and Senate—policy my colleagues and I are pursuing in S. 336, the Marketplace Fairness Act. I did hear my colleague from Utah mention he would like that to go through regular order. This does not preclude regular order. This would not be a final determination for the bill, but it would give us some kind of indication of the strength behind this idea.

As a former small business owner, I believe it is important to level the playing field for all retailers—in-store, catalogue, and online—so an outdated rule for sales tax collection does not adversely impact small businesses and Main Street retailers. The Supreme Court case earlier encouraged Congress to solve this problem. Thousands of local businesses are forced to do business at a competitive disadvantage because they have to collect sales tax and use tax and remote sellers do not, which in some States can mean a 5- to 10-percent price advantage. We should not be subsidizing some taxpayers at the expense of others.

Sales taxes go directly to State and local governments—that would be counties and cities and towns—which bring in needed revenue for maintaining our schools, fixing our roads, and supporting local law enforcement. If Congress fails to authorize States to collect tax on remote sales and electronic commerce continues to grow, we are implicitly blessing a situation where States can be forced to raise other taxes, such as income or property taxes, to offset the growing loss of sales tax revenue. Do you want that to happen? I sure don't.

Now is the time for Congress to act. Many Americans do not realize when they buy something online, order something from a catalogue from a business outside their own State, they still owe State sales taxes. It is just very difficult to comply with that. For over a decade, Congress has been debating how best to allow States to collect sales taxes from online retailers in a way that puts Main Street businesses on a level playing field with online retailers.

On February 14, 2013, the bicameral, bipartisan Marketplace Fairness Act was introduced to close the 20-year loophole that distorts the American marketplace by picking winners and losers, by subsidizing some businesses at the expense of other businesses, and subsidizing taxpayers at the expense of other taxpayers. All businesses and their retail sales and all consumers and their purchases should be treated equally.

The bill also empowers States to make the decision themselves. If they choose to collect already existing sales taxes on all purchases, regardless of whether the sale was online or in-store, they can, but it takes their action. If they want to keep things the way they are, it is the State's choice.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not tax Internet use, it does not tax Internet services, and it does not raise taxes. It gives States the right to collect what is owed by the purchasing individual.

I wish to provide some highlights of what the Marketplace Fairness Act accomplishes. The bill gives States the right to decide to collect or not to collect taxes that are already owed. The legislation would simplify and streamline the country's more than 9,000 diverse sales tax jurisdictions and provide two options by which States could begin collecting sales taxes from online and catalogue purchases. The bill also carves out small businesses so they are not adversely affected by the new law by exempting businesses with less than $1 million in online or out-of-State sales from collection requirements. This small business exemption will protect small merchants and give new businesses time to get started.

Do not let the critics get away with saying this kind of simplification cannot be done. The different tax rates and jurisdictions are no problem for today's software programs. As a former mayor and State legislator, I strongly favor allowing States the authority to require sales and use tax collection from retailers on all sales if the State chooses to do so. We need to implement a plan that will allow States to generate revenue using mechanisms already approved by their local leaders. We need to allow States the ability to collect the sales taxes they already require. If enacted, it would provide approximately $23 billion in fiscal relief for the States for which Congress does not have to find an offset. This would give States less of an excuse to come knocking on the Federal door for handouts and will reduce the problem of federally attached strings.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is about States rights and it is about fairness. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for the Enzi-Durbin amendment to support the goals of States rights and a level playing field for all businesses.

I yield the floor and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is a photograph of a store in Palatine, IL, called Soccer Plus. Bob Naughtrip opened this store and sold sporting equipment in the suburbs of Chicago. He had a pretty good business going, but then he ran into something called show-rooming. That consists of people walking into a store and saying: I would like to try on a pair of shoes or some equipment. They would find exactly what they wanted, write down all the information, and then say: Thanks, Bob, walk out the door and order it on the Internet, paying for it without paying sales tax on their purchase. So every time Bob tried to sell something and collect the sales tax in Illinois—which he was required to collect—he was at a disadvantage from the people buying over the Internet. Is that fair?

The Supreme Court said it was up to Congress to decide whether that is fair. It is up to Congress to decide whether Internet sales should be subject to State and local sales taxes. That is why we are here. To my way of thinking, this is just a question of fundamental fairness. We are not talking about imposing a new tax—not at all. We are talking about existing taxes.

In my State of Illinois, incidentally, when I buy something on the Internet, I have a legal obligation to pay sales tax on it, but it is done voluntarily. Many times it is not collected when I make the purchase. I do it on my State income tax return each year. Most people don't do it at all, so the sales tax is never collected on the Internet purchase.

The purpose of this bill is to allow States, if they wish—voluntarily—to start having Internet retailers collect sales tax for the sales that are made over the Internet to people living in their State. This is voluntary, so the States can decide whether to do it. Is this a new tax? No. In 46 States it is an existing tax. It is now going to be collected as opposed to voluntarily adding it to an income tax return by individuals.

So it is not a new tax, and it is certainly not a tax on the Internet itself. It is just that happens to be the point of purchase. We have on the floor my friend, Senator BAUCUS of Montana. He is from one of the four States in our Nation that do not have a sales tax, and they, of course, are concerned about this issue. Let me make it clear: Anyone purchasing an item on the Internet in Montana is not going to have to pay sales tax if Montana doesn't have a sales tax. The same will be true for New Hampshire, as well as Delaware and Oregon—the four States that have no sales tax. So we are not imposing a new sales tax on Montana or any other State. Those that have the tax will be collecting it under our bill.

How about the Internet retailers who will be covered by this? We created an exemption, as Senator ENZI said. The exemption says they have to have $1 million in sales on the Internet before they have to do this—$1 million.

How many Internet retailers would that mean? We think about 1,000, 975 sell more than $1 million worth of goods each year on the Internet. So about 1,000 retailers on the Internet would be collecting the sales tax. They would look at my home address and they would assess the tax that is owed.

Wait a minute. How will that be assessed when each and every Internet retailer has to go through the burden of establishing this technology, these computer programs? No. The burden is on the States to provide the computer software for the Internet retailers, not at the expense of the Internet retailers. So it is a simple process, and it is a fair process.

Bob was a good businessman. He hired a lot of local people. He collected sales tax and paid his property tax, and with that money they built this road right out in front of his shop, they provided the police and fire services and things that are part of civilization, living in America. He paid the taxes on this, and he lost his business because his competitors weren't collecting the taxes.

I find it interesting, though. I recently made a purchase on Amazon, and they collected the sales tax from me in Illinois—which they can do. Amazon supports our bill, incidentally. They delivered it, and I believe they used the Postal Service this time, but sometimes they use UPS and FedEx. Their trucks and delivery people use the streets of Chicago and the streets of Springfield. They rely on the basic services we all count on. So even the Internet sales are dependent on some basic services that are going to be provided by a community.

I have heard so many speeches on the floor of the Senate about how much we love and venerate and respect small businesspeople. We are told that if this economy is going to get well and move forward, it is going to be driven by small businesses expanding their employment. Well, I believe that. I have seen it over and over again in Illinois and every State I have visited. But if they are going to have a fighting chance to compete, there ought to be a level playing field, as Senator ENZI said. There ought to be a basic fairness here.

If Bob's business had to collect sales tax for sales to Illinois residents, why wouldn't those who purchase over the Internet be under the same obligation? That is what this says. It basically establishes that responsibility.

Now, of course we have a lot of support for this—support from Governors and mayors and business developers and, of course, small businesses. So if people want to come to the floor and decide what side they want to be on, I urge them to be on the side of the same small businesses they have given speeches about over and over again.

I believe in these men and women. Many of them have gone into small business and taken a lot of risks. They are the backbone of our communities, there is no question about it. Time and time again, we go to them to make sure they are going to build the economy and hire the people whom we need in our local communities. So let's give them a fighting chance. The marketplace fairness bill will do that.

Senator ENZI was on this bill before me, Senator Dorgan from North Dakota before me, and when Senator Dorgan retired, I asked if I could join him. But I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his leadership. As you probably heard, Senator ENZI, before he came to the Senate, was a small businessman himself, and so he knows this firsthand.

So let's stand for business and retailers across America and give them a fighting chance. Let them be competitive. Let them continue to hire and be good neighbors in our communities. And let's say to the Internet retailers: We are glad you are doing well, but play by the same rules and make sure there is a level playing field.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, if I might ask the Senator from Missouri to go ahead of me, if that is agreeable with the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank my colleagues for recognizing me to make a few comments.

I agree with everything that has been said. I believe this is the fair thing to do. I think it is wrong for government to penalize some businesses over others. I think it is wrong, frankly, to have laws on the books that we know aren't being enforced. To have laws on the books that you know create law violators is the wrong thing to do. And frankly, in almost every State where—as Senator DURBIN pointed out, in his State and my State, which is next door to his State, you are supposed to pay this tax. People just don't do it. I think last year in Missouri we had about 300 people pay this tax in the entire State. I would bet, more than the collective tax they paid, that more than 300 people bought something over the Internet in the State of Missouri last year. So this is a tax that is on the books, it needs to be collected, and we ought to

see what we can do to make that happen.

States that don't have a sales tax don't have to collect it. States that don't want to participate don't have to participate. But with all of the technology now available, with the $1 million exemption for businesses that want to sell a few things over the Internet—or maybe they want to sell everything over the Internet, they just don't sell very much—I think the objections that are reasonable to this have been more than met.

I saw in a publication just last week on this topic three pretty well known conservatives, one talking about the Internet at its inception when William F. Buckley said:

> If the advantage of tax-free Internet commerce marginally closes out local industry, reforms are required.

This was at a time when nobody was buying things over the Internet, when it was just getting started, when we didn't want to have a unique tax for the Internet. But in all of those discussions, I never heard a serious discussion that if you are on the Internet, you should avoid taxes that are required to be paid. And William F. Buckley at the time was saying that whenever this becomes a problem, something should be done about it, and that is what this bill would do.

One of my former colleagues when I was in the House, now the Governor of Indiana, Mike Pence, said:

> I don't think Congress should be in the business of picking winners and losers. Inaction by Congress today results in a system today that does pick winners and losers.

He is talking about this system.

Al Cardenas, the chairman of the American Conservative Union, said:

> There is no more glaring example of misguided government power that when taxes or regulations affect two similar businesses completely differently. Over time, the company that has to comply with a tax or a regulation will lose market share to its competitor who is carved out from this government interference.

That is what this is about.

I had a news conference on this in St. Louis a year or so ago, and as soon as the camera was turned off, the person interviewing me said: You know, one of my wife's friends has a wedding dress shop, and she sees people come in all the time who are clearly there to try on a wedding dress, get the number off the wedding dress, and order it on the Internet. And if the only difference in the cost of that wedding dress—I guess there are lots of variations but, say, 8 or 10 percent—if the only difference is the sales tax, that is not a fair competition.

And the person who went in the store to try on the wedding dress paid their local property taxes, they helped pay for the police protection, they helped pay for the sidewalk and the parking place, and then ordered the wedding dress from somebody who had contributed to none of that.

So I join my colleagues in saying this is the right thing to do. I hope we can get it done. And frankly, if we don't get it done, the States that say this tax needs to be voluntarily paid and know that is not happening should just get that law off the books. Having a law on the books that you know people violate is not the right thing to do.

Madam President, I would give back to Mr. ENZI or Mr. ALEXANDER whatever time I haven't used, and I look forward to hearing others talk on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the hour for Senators KLOBUCHAR and COATS now begin at 4:10 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the chair of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I think this amendment is not yet ready. It is premature. This is a very complicated question, and I think there has been a lot of easy talk and a little bit of herd instinct here that, gee, because most States are not sales tax States, therefore this amendment should be adopted.

The fact that is this is an extremely complicated question. For example, who is going to enforce this statute? Is the State of California, for example, or the State of Massachusetts going to enforce the noncollection of sales tax in another State? That is revolutionary. I cannot think of an instance where this Congress has legislated that a State can go into another State and enforce the taxation laws in that second State or when a State has empowered the State court in one State to go to another State and enforce the State taxation in that other State. It has not happened. It is not only complicated, but it is revolutionary. We have not done this before—nothing similar.

I understand the arguments of those who want to pass this. They make some good points. I have said to Senator DURBIN, Senator ENZI, and others that we in the Finance Committee will very seriously take this up as soon as we can and will probably in the context of tax reform.

Let me repeat. It raises lots of questions that have not been addressed with respect to States rights; that is, the degree to which authorities in one State or courts in one State are able to go to another State and enforce State taxation issues.

Certainly, we have the full faith and credit clause in the Constitution where if someone in California, for example, gets a court order or wants to enforce a collection of tax in California, that could not be overturned in another State. That is not this question. This question is whether courts in other States and citizens in other States can go to another State and force the court in that other State to enforce that other State's taxation law. We are not talking about the taxation law in California. We are talking about the other State taxation laws. We have never done that, and I don't think it is wise to start going down that road now.

Second, different States have different State taxation laws for different reasons. Some States have income taxes. Some don't. Some have sales taxes. Some don't. The State of Montana has decided no sales tax, but we will have a significant income tax. Other States say no income tax but a significant sales tax. That is their prerogative. That is how they want to run their State.

What does this do? This basically will have the virtual effect over a period of time of saying that all States have to have a sales tax—forget your income tax—and beyond that, it has to be the same rate. That is what is going to happen here over time if this is enacted into law. You are telling States they have to have a sales tax even if they don't want to. I don't think we want to do that, to say nothing of all the potential complications revolving around different jurisdictions.

I know the authors of this bill say: Computers can take care of it all. That is part of the problem. The computers get shut down, they get hacked. It is not the panacea a lot of people talk about. This is extremely complicated.

Sure, we have to have a full, complete hearing on this, and we should and we will. The best thing to do right now is to have this amendment withdrawn because otherwise there are going to be a lot of amendments offered today, tomorrow, and tonight that are going to show all the defects of this, and they are all going to pass, and that is going to seriously undermine and be a poison pill for this bill that is pending right now. So the best solution is to withdraw this amendment now. Let's not try to solve this here in the Senate budget resolution but, rather, it should be in the right forum in the right location, and that is the Finance Committee, with big hearings, and we will work all this out because there are very legitimate points to be made on both sides.

What bothers me is there is a lot of easy talk about how good this is, how fair it is, and nobody has thought through all the unintended consequences and all the problems that could arise, and I just started to raise a few of them.

My friend from Oregon had a good thought. What about Canada? What about direct sellers in Canada just across the border? They sell to the United States. Do we have jurisdiction over Canada? I don't think so. And I can see a burgeoning direct sales business and revenue to Canada, as my friend from Oregon thought of. There are a lot of others that we haven't

thought about because it has not become ripe. It has not become ripe because we haven't had a direct hearing in a direct forum.

So I just say this is not a good idea. I understand the reasons why some advocate it, but I might say this: If we assume Federal dollars—because someone has to come up with asking Uncle Sam for Federal dollars to enforce this question in another State. Do we want that? I ask, who is the enforcer here? Is it another State? Is it Uncle Sam? I don't know. That has not been thought through.

Therefore, I strongly urge that it not be adopted. Otherwise, we are going to have a ton of amendments that are not going to be appreciated by the supporters of this bill. If they pass, it will dramatically weaken any momentum they think they are going to have. So discretion is the better part of valor. Let's withdraw this, and let's consider this calmly in the right forum.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his comments, since Senator ENZI has probably been considering this bill his whole career. He came to the Senate nearly 18 years ago, and he introduced it 14 years ago. So even by Senate standards, it has had a good deal of calm deliberation.

We have also had a hearing in the Finance Committee, where the distinguished chairman is in charge, and we have asked for a markup, which we haven't had.

Mr. BAUCUS. You will get one.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the chairman for his commitment to a markup. I wonder if I might ask through the Chair when that would come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I can't guarantee a time. Nobody around here can. But I think it is appropriate that this is an issue that should come up in the context of tax reform, which the committee is pressing very vigorously. We had a meeting today in the Finance Committee on the first of many steps. Regrettably, Senator ENZI was unable to make it. It was on tax reform. And that is the appropriate forum for this to be brought.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I think this illustrates the problem we are having. How can this be a part of tax reform when it is not part of the Tax Code? It has been heard by the Commerce Committee in the Senate. It has been heard by the Finance Committee. It has not been marked up. It has been heard by the House Judiciary Committee. Senator ENZI has been working on it for 14 years.

This is a very simple question. It is a matter of States rights, two words. Does a State, any State, have the right to decide whether to collect existing taxes from some of the people who owe the taxes or from all of the people who owe the taxes?

In the State of Tennessee, at the Nashville Boot Company store, I walk in, I try on a pair of boots, then I go order it over the Internet so I do not have to pay the sales tax. What the State of Tennessee wants to do—the conservative Governor Bill Haslam, the conservative Lieutenant Governor Ron Ramsey, the Republican legislature, these are not a bunch of big tax people—they want to collect the sales tax from everybody who owes it and they would like to require those who sell into Tennessee to do the very same thing they do, what the Nashville Boot Company does when I buy from it: They add the sales tax to the bill. They collect it and send it to the State. How hard is that to do?

My wife gave me an ice cream maker for my birthday last year. I ordered some ingredients to make chocolate ice cream, over the Internet. When I did that they added to my bill the sales tax based on my ZIP Code. It is as easy as looking up the weather on your computer.

That is all we are deciding here. We are only deciding whether we in the Congress are going to make State governments in our constitutional framework play Mother May I, by coming and pleading with us to allow the State to decide what to do about its own taxes. The State of Tennessee wishes to reduce its tax rate. It wishes to avoid a State income tax. It doesn't like the idea of treating one taxpayer one way and another one another way; and one business one way and another business another way. It wants to make that decision for itself.

When I was the Governor of Tennessee, nothing made me more unhappy than to look up at Washington and see people of my own political party come up here and think since they had taken an airplane to Washington, they had gotten smarter than I was, suddenly, just by an hour plane ride, and they were going to tell me what to do.

Now we have an honor roll of conservatives, and I will just speak to the conservatives on my side for a while, who said we do not think States ought to be playing Mother May I to the Federal Government on this question. Give State legislatures the power to make these decisions for themselves. That is consistent with the tenth amendment. That is consistent with our constitutional framework. And most of them are saying, as ours is in Tennessee: If you give us this power, the right to do it, which the Supreme Court has said you clearly have the right to do it—you, Congress, are the most qualified to do it. You can make this decision. Give us this power and we will lower our tax rate. That is what our State wants to do.

It might use the money another way. They might use it to pay outstanding teachers more, to lower the tuition rate. But States have the right to be right, and States have the right to be wrong.

There was a Supreme Court case 20 years ago at a time when most Senators didn't even know there was an Internet. The Court did say that States could not impose a burden on interstate commerce. But it said Congress could write the rules for doing that. Now it is about as easy to add the sales tax if you are buying from a catalog or buying over the Internet as it is if you buy from a local store. There is no reason for us to take the position that only we know best about how States should make decisions about their services or their taxes.

Some are worried that this might increase taxes. I have said most Governors think they will lower tax rates. But here is the honor roll of conservatives who are asking the Congress to reaffirm our commitment and understanding of our constitutional system which allows States to make this decision: Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union; Governor Bob McDonnell, Virginia; Governor Tom Corbett, Pennsylvania; Governor Bill Haslam, Tennessee; Governor Chris Christie, New Jersey; Governor Rick Snyder, Michigan; Governor Butch Otter, Idaho; Governor Mitch Daniels, Indiana; former Governor Jeb Bush, Florida; former Governor Haley Barbour; the writings of the late William F. Buckley, et cetera, et cetera.

It is time after 20 years to take this simple 11-page bill that says States have the right to decide for themselves whether to collect an existing tax from some of the people who owe it or from all the people who owe it, by requiring the seller to collect the tax at the time of the sale: same tax, same store. They ought to be able to do that.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the comments of a number of conservative supporters of the Marketplace Fairness Act.

In our State of Tennessee this bill is an insurance policy against a State income tax. We don't have one. We don't want one.

It is also an opportunity for us to treat every taxpayer the same way. If you owe the tax, it is collected at the time of sale and you pay it, you don't avoid it. It is also a chance to treat all of the businesses that sell into Tennessee the same way. If you are going to sell to our 6 million people, we are going to treat you the same way we treat people in the State. We don't want to create an incentive for people to move out of Tennessee in order to sell into Tennessee. We want there to be a level playing field.

If Montana businesses do not want to sell in Tennessee, that is their prerogative. But if they do, we want to treat them in the same way we treat all the other businesses in Tennessee. Let's make it very clear: This is not a tax on the Internet. We have a Federal law that placed a moratorium on Internet access taxes. Let me repeat that. We have a Federal law that is an existing moratorium on taxing the Internet.

This is a question about whether the State of Idaho, the State of Wyoming, the State of Tennessee, the State of Massachusetts, or any other State, that may say if we are going to have a sales tax then we are going to collect it in the same way from all the people who sell to the people in our State. That is infinitely logical. With the advent of technology it is about as easy to collect it one way as the other. And it is fair.

I congratulate Senator ENZI and Senator DURBIN for their years of work. I appreciate very much the commitment of the chairman of the Finance Committee to say there will be a markup. I think it is absolutely wrong to think of it as part of tax reform since it is not part of the Tax Code. We might include a milk producers bill in tax reform as well by the Chairman's logic. They do not belong in the same place. This bill boils down to two words: It is a States rights bill. Do we have a tenth amendment, or the spirit of a tenth amendment, or do we not? Do we trust Governors and legislatures to make decisions, or do we not? Then they can decide whether they want to raise or lower taxes, whether they want to collect taxes from some of the people who owe it or from all the people who owe it. That is the issue, these two words: States rights. I think this issue is perfectly appropriate to bring up after 14 years of work by Senator ENZI, after hearing from the Senate Finance and Commerce Committee and the House Judiciary Committee. This is an opportunity for us to express our support for this principle of States rights and to give Governors and legislatures across the country a chance to treat businesses and taxpayers in the same way—stop picking winners and stop picking losers.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVES SUPPORT E-FAIRNESS

William F. Buckley, Editor At Large, National Review: ''If the advantage of tax-free Internet commerce marginally closes out local industry, reforms are required... The mattress maker in Connecticut is willing to compete with the company in Massachusetts, but does not like it if out-of-state businesses are, in practical terms, subsidized; that's what the non-tax amounts to. Local concerns are complaining about traffic in mattresses and books and records and computer equipment which, ordered through the Internet, come in, so to speak, duty free.'' (William F. Buckley, ''*Get That Internet Tax Right,*'' National Review Online, 10/19/01)

Al Cardenas, Chairman, American Conservative Union (ACU): ''A robust free-market system requires a level playing field, where the government doesn't get to pick winners and losers in the marketplace. Senator Enzi and Congressman Womack deserve praise for their efforts to empower states to make their own revenue policy choices and create a fair system of tax collection. The number one threat to the future of American competitiveness isn't other countries—it's our tax law. When it comes to state sales taxes, it is time to address the area where federally mandated prejudice is most egregious—the policy towards Internet sales, the decades-old inequity between online sales and in-person sales as outdated and unfair.'' (''*Statement from ACU Chairman Al Cardenas Applauding Efforts to Address Marketplace Fairness,*'' Press Release, 2/14/13)

Hanns Kuttner, Hudson Institute: ''Current policy gives remote sellers a price advantage, allowing them to sell their goods and services without collecting the sales tax owed by the purchaser. This price difference functions like a subsidy. It distorts the allocation between the two forms of selling. The subsidy from not collecting tax due means a larger share of sales will take place remotely than would occur in a free, undistorted market.'' (Hans Kuttner, ''*Future Marketplace: Free and Fair,*'' May 2012.)

Iowa Governor Terry Branstad: ''Gov. Terry Branstad of Iowa this week became the latest in a string of top Republican state officials to back federal legislation giving states more freedom to collect online sales taxes. Branstad's letter of support, obtained exclusively by The Hill, comes not long after another prominent Republican governor, Chris Christie of New Jersey, also urged Congress to get moving on sales tax legislation . . . In a letter sent Thursday, Branstad encouraged his home-state senators to support a solution that he said would close a long-standing loophole. 'I understand that the coalition supporting this legislation is now very broad which gives me hope that, under your leadership, this legislation can be passed yet this year,' Branstad wrote to Sens. Chuck Grassley (R) and Tom Harkin (D). 'The Internet is now a robust, mature and dynamic marketplace that does not warrant special protections,' he added. 'The application of sales taxes only to 'brick-and-mortar' retailers, many of which are small businesses, puts those very entities at a competitive disadvantage.' '' (Bernie Becker & Kevin Bogardus, ''*GOP Governors Bolster Sales Tax Push,*'' The Hill, 6/10/12)

New Jersey Governor Chris Christie: Governor Chris Christie: ''I just want to make clear that I have been working on this issue in my role on the executive committee of the National Governors Association because it is an important issue to all the nation's governors. And I too—along with governors like Governor Daniels and others—urge the federal government and the Congress in particular to get behind Senator Lamar Alexander's legislation to allow states to be able to make these choices for themselves. And I think Senator Alexander's legislation would be a great step forward in that regard. It would give states options to decide how they want to deal with this and not have to any longer deal with the federal prohibition on dealing with it. So, it would allow us to do it in a much more uniform and broader way. So, I'm with Governor Daniels on this and other Republican governors—Governor Snyder of Michigan and others who feel strongly about it. And we've been working on it at the National Governors Association and I know we will continue to and hope to get some type of resolution to it by the end of this year.'' (Press Conference, Governor Chris Christie, 5/31/12)

Michigan Governor Rick Snyder: 'Technology currently exists to quickly and effectively calculate taxes due on sales and can be easily be integrated into online retailers' operations,' wrote Snyder, a onetime venture capitalist and former executive at the computer company Gateway. 'It is time for Congress to grant states the authority to enforce sales tax and use laws on all retailers doing business in their state.' (Bernie Becker, ''Michigan Governor Joins Online Sales Tax Chorus,'' The Hill, 5/11/12)

Alabama Governor Robert Bentley: ''Alabama's Republican governor has urged lawmakers from his state to support online sales tax legislation, adding to the growing roster of GOP officials who are on board with the idea. Gov. Robert Bentley told Alabama's two senators and seven House members the online sales tax bills would improve the state's fiscal situation, and stressed that the legislation would not create a new tax. 'The bills will give Alabama the authority to collect sales taxes—as we currently do from local brick-and-mortar retailers—that are already owed from online retailers,' Bentley wrote in a letter dated April 19. 'Allowing us to effectively close this sales tax loophole would help both our state's finances and our state's small businesses.' '' (Bernie Becker, ''Alabama Governor Gets Behind Online Sales Tax Push,'' The Hill, 4/25/12)

Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval: '' 'The only way to completely resolve this issue is for Congress to enact legislation that, within a simplified nationwide framework, grants states the right to require collection by all sellers,' Sandoval said in a statement.'' (Ed Vogel, ''Gov. Sandoval Reaches Sales Tax Deal With Amazon,'' Las Vegas Review-Journal, 4/24/12)

Maine Governor Paul LePage: ''Last week, Gov. Paul LePage, R-Maine, wrote his state's two U.S. senators, Republicans Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe, to urge them to back legislation introduced by Sens. Mike Enzi, R-Wyo., Dick Durbin, D-Ill., and Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., that would close a loophole left by a 1992 Supreme Court decision. The high court ruled that states can't require retailers such as catalog and now online retailers to collect sales taxes from customers in states where those companies have no physical presence. 'There's no denying that passing the bill would give thousands of small Maine businesses a real boost,' LePage wrote. 'Through no fault of their own, federal policy now gives some out-of-state corporations an unfair advantage over other Maine retailers.' '' (Juliana Gruenwald, ''Tea Party Governor Is Backing Net Sales Tax Bill,'' National Journal, 3/20/12)

Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell: '' 'This bill helps to ensure that online retailers with a physical presence in Virginia are treated the same as traditional brick and-mortar retailers who are already required to collect and remit existing sales taxes on goods sold in the commonwealth.' '' (Press Release, ''Governor McDonnell Announces Agreement Reached On Tax Fairness Bill,'' Governor Bob McDonnell, 2/22/12)

Idaho Governor C.L. ''Butch'' Otter: ''Gov. C. L. 'Butch' Otter backs taxing Internet sales to level the playing field between virtual businesses and brick-and mortar establishments on Idaho's Main Street. Otter made the remarks to Idaho chamber of commerce leaders meeting in Boise on Monday.'' (''Idaho Governor Supports Internet Sales Tax,'' The Associated Press, 1/30/12)

Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels: ''[S]ales taxes that [states] impose ought to be paid, and paid by everybody equally and collected by everybody in the retail business ... We're not talking about an additional or new tax here—we're talking about the collection of a tax that's existed a long time.'' (Jeremy Hobson, ''Indiana Makes A Deal With Amazon On Sales Taxes,'' Marketplace Business, 1/12/12)

Georgia Governor Nathan Deal: ''Gov. Nathan Deal is considering extending the state sales tax to online purchases, he told newspaper publishers Thursday morning . . . 'In the absence of congressional activity on that . . . I think there will be some appetite to act on that in the legislature,' he said.'' (Walter C. Jones, ''Ga. Considers Online Sales Tax,'' The Augusta Chronicle, 1/12/12)

Indiana Governor and former Representative Mike Pence: ''I don't think Congress should be in the business of picking winners

and losers. Inaction by Congress today results in a system today that does pick winners and losers.'' (House Judiciary Committee, Hearing On ''Constitutional Limitations On States' Authority To Collect Sales Taxes In E-Commerce,'' 11/30/11)

Former Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour: ''. . . [E]-commerce has grown, and there is simply no longer a compelling reason for government to continue giving online retailers special treatment over small businesses who reside on the Main Streets across Mississippi and the country. The time to level the playing field is now. . .'' (Letter To Sens. Enzi And Alexander Endorsing S. 1832, The Marketplace Fairness Act, 11/29/11)

Tennessee Governor Bill Haslam: ''The National Governors Association applauds your efforts to level the playing field between Main Street retailers and online sellers by introducing S. 1832, the 'Marketplace Fairness Act.' This common sense approach will allow states to collect the taxes they are owed, help businesses comply with different state laws, and provide fair competition between retailers that will benefit consumers.'' (National Governors Association Letter To Sens. Durbin, Enzi, Tim Johnson And Alexander Endorsing S. 1832, The Marketplace Fairness Act, 11 /28/11)

South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley: '' 'And I will tell you regardless of what happens with Amazon, we want them. I have told them we want you to do business in this state, but we want you to do it on a level playing field. They got free property, they got tax incentives, they got plenty of things. Don't ask us to give you sales tax relief when we're not giving it to the book store down the street or we're not giving it to the other stores on the other side of town, it's just not a level playing field.'' ' (Press Conference, Governor Nikki Haley, 4/28/11)

South Dakota Governor Dennis Daugaard: ''On March 11, South Dakota enacted S.B. 146, sales tax legislation that requires out-of-state retailers that sell to in-state residents to notify their customers of their personal use tax obligation. Under the law, online sellers are required to provide clear notice to consumers during the checkout process that a South Dakota use tax is due.'' (Rosemary Hawkins, ''Sales Tax Bills Pass In Arkansas And South Dakota,'' American Booksellers Association, 3/3/11)

Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush: ''It seems to me there has to be a way to tax sales done online in the same way that sales are taxed in brick and mortar establishments. My guess is that there would be hundreds of millions of dollars that then could be used to reduce taxes to fulfill campaign promises.'' (Letter To Florida Governor Rick Scott, 1/2/11)

MARCH 19, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned companies and state and national trade associations respectfully request that you vote yes on a proposed amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Senate Budget Resolution to implement S. 336, the Marketplace Fairness Act. The Marketplace Fairness Act would level the playing field for all sellers while assisting the states in collecting approximately $23 billion in uncollected state sales and use taxes that are currently due on Internet and other remote sales. The bill was introduced by a strong bi-partisan group of Senators, led by Senators Enzi, Alexander, Heitkamp and Durbin—to address the inequality in today's marketplace.

At issue is a decades-old Supreme Court ruling, issued in 1992 before the pervasiveness of Internet commerce, which prohibits states from requiring remote sellers to collect sales and use taxes owed on purchases from out-of-state vendors. This has created an unfair price disadvantage for brick-and-mortar businesses, has led to budget shortfalls for states as sales and use taxes go uncollected, and has placed an undue burden on consumers who do not realize they owe the sales/use tax if it is not collected by the seller, leaving them to face penalties and increased scrutiny from state auditors.

We support the Marketplace Fairness Act because it would give states the authority to manage their sales tax laws while addressing this issue. Only Congress can grant this authority to the states. S. 336 represents the best thinking of all the stakeholders and provides a pathway forward for states to collect sales and use taxes, simplify their tax statutes, and assist vendors with compliance, while providing for a robust $1 million small business exemption.

As the Congress seeks solutions to address the federal budget and the impacts of sequestration, the Marketplace Fairness Act is a proposal that will help states facing their own budget shortfalls without increasing the federal deficit. Congress has an opportunity to enhance states' rights over sales and use tax collection authority and in the process level the playing field for all merchants. Please support the budget amendment on S. 336, the Marketplace Fairness Act, because the time has come to update our local and state tax laws.

Respectfully,

NATIONAL TRADE ASSOCIATIONS

American Apparel and Footwear Association
American Booksellers Association
American Farm Bureau Federation
American Independent Business Alliance
American Specialty Toy Retailing Association
American Veterinary Medical Association
Association for Christian Retail
California Association of College Store
Campus Stores of New England
Certified Commercial Investment Member Institute
College Stores Association of North Carolina
Consumer Electronics Association
Consumer Electronics Retailers Association
Food Marketing Institute
Heating, Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI)
Independent Running Retailer Association
Institute of Real Management
International Council of Shopping Centers
International Downtown Association
International Economic Development Council
Jewelers of America
Middle Atlantic College Stores
NAIOP, Commercial Real Estate Development Association
NAMM, National Association of Music Merchants
National Association of Chain Drug Stores
National Association of College Stores
National Association of Electrical Distributors
National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts
National Association of Realtors
National School Supply & Equipment Association
National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors
National Bicycle Dealers Association
National Grocers Association
National Home Furnishings Association
National Retail Federation
National Sporting Goods Association
North American Retail Dealers Association
Outdoor Industry Association (O1A)
Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
Professional Beauty Association
Real Estate Roundtable
Realtors Land Institute
Retail Industry Leaders Association
Soccer Dealer Association
Society of Industrial and Office Realtors
Southwest Association of College Bookstores
Tri-State Bookstore Association
World Floor Covering Association

STATE/LOCAL TRADE ASSOCIATIONS

Alabama College Bookstore Association
Alabama Retail Association
Alaska Veterinary Medical Association
Alliance of Wisconsin Retailers
Arizona Retailers Association
Arkansas Grocers and Retail Merchants Association
Association of Washington Business
California Business Properties Association
California Retailers Association
California Veterinary Medical Association
Campus Stores of New England
Carolinas Food Industry Council
College Stores Association of New York State
Colorado Retail Council
Colorado Veterinary Medical Association
Connecticut Retail Merchants Association
Delaware Veterinary Medical Association
Economic Alliance of Snohomish County, WA
Florida Association of College Stores
Florida Retail Federation
Georgia Association of College Stores
Georgia Retail Association
Georgia Veterinary Medical Association
Idaho Retailers Association
Idaho Veterinary Medical Association
Illinois Association of College Stores
Illinois Retail Merchants Association
Illinois State Veterinary Medical Association
Indiana Association of College Stores
Indiana Retail Council
Indiana Veterinary Medical Association
Iowa Retail Federation
Iowa Veterinary Medical Association
Kentucky Retail Federation
Kentucky Veterinary Medical Association
Local First Arizona
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Louisiana Retailers Association
Louisiana Veterinary Medical Association
Maine Merchants Association
Maine Veterinary Medical Association
Maryland Retailers Association
Massachusetts Veterinary Medical Association
Michigan Association of College Stores
Michigan Retailers Association
Michigan Veterinary Medical Association
Minnesota Business Partnership
Minnesota Chamber of Commerce
Minnesota Retail Association
Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association
Missouri Retailers Association
Mountains and Plains Independent Booksellers Association
Nebraska Retail Federation
Nebraska Veterinary Medical Association
Nevada Veterinary Medical Association
New Atlantic Independent Booksellers Association
New England Independent Booksellers Association
New Jersey Retail Merchants Association
New Jersey Veterinary Medical Association
New Mexico Retail Association
North Carolina Retail Merchants Association
North Carolina Veterinary Medical Association
North Dakota Retail Association
Northwest College Bookstore Association (WA, OR, AK, MT)
Ohio Association of College Stores
Ohio Council of Retail Merchants

Oklahoma Veterinary Medical Association
Pacific Northwest Booksellers Association
Pennsylvania Retailers' Association
Retail Association of Mississippi
Retail Association of Nevada
Retail Council of New York State
Retail Merchants of Hawaii
Retailers Association of Massachusetts
Rhode Island Retail Federation
Rocky Mountain Skyline Bookstore Association
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
South Carolina Association of College Stores
South Carolina Association of Veterinarians
South Carolina Retail Merchants Association
South Dakota Retailers Association
Southern Independent Booksellers Alliance
Tennessee Association of College Stores
Tennessee Retail Association
Tennessee Veterinary Medical Association
Texas Retailers Association
Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce
Tri-State Bookstore Association (ND, SD & MN)
Tri-State Jewelers Association
Twin Cities Metro Independent Business Alliance
Utah Food Industry Association
Utah Retail Merchants Association
Utah Veterinary Medical Association
Vermont Retail Association
Virginia Retail Merchants Association
Virginia Veterinary Medical Association
Washington Retail Association
Washington State Veterinary Medical Association
West Virginia Retailers Association
West Virginia Veterinary Medical Association
Wisconsin Association of College Stores
Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
Wyoming Retail Association
Wyoming Veterinary Medical Association
COMPANIES
Abbell Associates, Chicago, IL
Acadia Realty Trust, White Plains, NY
Amazon.com, Seattle, WA
AutoZone, Memphis, TN
Balliet's, LLC, Oklahoma City, OK
Barnes and Noble, New York, NY
Beall's, Inc., Bradenton, FL
Bed, Bath, & Beyond, Union, NJ
Belpre Motor Sales, Belpre, OH
Ben Bridge Jewelers, Seattle, WA
Best Buy Co., Inc., Richfield, MN
Blake Hunt Ventures, Inc., Danville, CA
BrandsMart U.S.A., Hollywood, FL
Bucksbaum Retail Properties, Inc., Danville, CA
Build-A-Bear Workshop®, Saint Louis, MO
Camelot Retail Consulting Group, Wichita, KS
Cascade Designs
CBL & Associates Properties, Inc., Chattanooga, TN
Cencor Realty Services, Dallas, TX
The Hocker Group, Louisville, KY
David Hocker & Associates, Owensboro, KY
DDR Corp., Beachwood, OH
Dick's Sporting Goods, Coraopolis, PA
DLC Management Corp., Tarrytown, NY
Donahue Schriber Realty Group, Costa Mesa, CA
EDENS, Columbia, SC
Evergreen Devco, Inc., Glendale, CA
ExOfficio, Seattle, WA
Fairfield Corp., Battle Creek, MI
Federal Realty Investment Trust, Rockville, MD
FedTax, Norwalk, CT
Foot Locker, Inc., New York, NY
Forest City Enterprises, Inc., Cleveland, OH
Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA
Garrison Pacific Properties, San Rafael, CA
General Growth Properties, Chicago, IL
Ginn Solutions
Givens Books and Little Dickens, Lynchburg, VA
Glimcher Realty Trust, Columbus, OH
Hart Realty Advisers, Inc., Simsbury, CT
Hutensky Capital Partners, Hartford, CT
Hy-Vee Inc., Des Moines, IA
Inland Real Estate Corporation, Oak Brook, II
JC Penney, Plano, TX
Jo-Ann Stores, Inc., Hudson, OH
Bellevue Square Managers, Inc., Bellevue, WA
Kimco Realty Corporation, New Hyde Park, NY
L. Michael Foley and Associates, LLC, La Jolla, CA
Larson Binkley, Inc., Kansas City, MO
Lewis Electronics, Cleveland, OH
Limited Brands, Columbus, OH
Lowes Companies, Inc., Mooresville, NC
Macy's, Inc, Cincinnati, OH
Malcolm Riley and Associates, Los Angeles, CA
Marketing Developments, Inc. MI
Marshall Music Co., Lansing, MI
Meijer, Walker, MI
Michaels Electrical Supply Corp., Lynbrook, NY
Monte Cristo Bookshop, New London, CT
Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust, Philadelphia, PA
Petco, Inc., San Diego, CA
Point of View Farm, Inc., Bengali, NY
Regency Centers, Jacksonville, FL
REI (Recreational Equipment, Inc.), Kent, WA
Reininga Corporation, Healdsburg, CA
RMResources, LLC, Ann Arbor, MI
Rosen's of Maine, Bucksport, ME
Sears Holdings Corporation, Hoffman Estates, IL
Simon Property Group, Indianapolis, IN
Stafford Properties, Inc., Atlanta, GA
Staples, Inc., Framingham, MA
Steiner + Associates LLC, Columbus, OH
Stirling Properties, Covington, LA
Tanger Factory Outlet Centers, Inc., Greensboro, NC
Target Corporation, Minneapolis, MN
Taubman Centers, Bloomfield Hills, MI
The Container Store, Dallas, TX
The CortiGilchrist Partnership, LLC, San Diego, CA
The Greeby Companies, Inc., Chicago, IL
The Home Depot, Atlanta, GA
The Howard Group, Albany, NY
The King's English Bookshop, Salt Lake City, UT
The Macerich Company, Santa Monica, CA
The Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., Dallas, TX
The Pratt Company, Mill Valley, CA
The Rappaport Companies, McLean, VA
The SEAYCO Group, Bentonville, AK
The Sembler Company, St. Petersburg, FL
The Weitzman Group, Dallas, TX
Tractor Supply Company, Brentwood, TN
VPI Commercial Realty, LLC, Knoxville, TN
Wal-Mart Stores, Bentonville, AR
WDP Partners, LLC, Phoenix, AZ
Weingarten Realty Investors, Houston TX
Wendy's Company, Dublin, OH
Western Development Corporation, Washington, DC
Westfield, LLC, Los Angeles, CA
Williams Ski and Patio, Highland Park, IL
Wolfe Properties, LLC, St. Louis, MO
Woolrich, Inc., Woolrich, PA
Zumiez, Inc., Lynwood, WA.

NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION®
March 19, 2013.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: On behalf of the National Retail Federation, I respectfully urge you to vote in favor of the Enzi amendment in support of S. 336, the Marketplace Fairness Act, to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014.

As the world's largest retail trade association and the voice of retail worldwide, NRF's global membership includes retailers of all sizes, formats and channels of distribution as well as chain restaurants and industry partners from the United States and more than 45 countries abroad. In the U.S., NRF represents an industry that includes more than 3.6 million establishments and which directly and indirectly accounts for 42 million jobs—one in four U.S. jobs. The total U.S. GDP impact of retail is $2.5 trillion annually, and retail is a daily barometer of the health of the nation's economy.

As the retail industry evolves and digital commerce becomes a more prominent portion of total retail sales, it is critical that the tax laws not discriminate between similar businesses based on how their products are distributed. This collection disparity has tilted the competitive landscape against local stores creating a crisis for brick-and-mortar retailers around the country and in your state. The Marketplace Fairness Act addresses the crisis by removing the constitutional limitation on states' authority to collect sales and use taxes from remote sellers. This legislation will level the playing field, while protecting small businesses from complicated laws in other states with a healthy small business exemption.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is a commonsense piece of legislation necessary to modernize our federal and state understanding of sales tax laws so that they can keep current with real world change in the marketplace. Leveling the playing field for large and small retailers alike will create a business climate where retailers have a better opportunity to grow and create jobs in a truly competitive marketplace. Please support the local retailers in your state by voting for the Enzi amendment in support of S. 336, the Marketplace Fairness Act, to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014.

Sincerely,

DAVID FRENCH,
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

[From, Marketplacefairnesscoalition]

ERICK ERICKSON IS WRONG, HERE'S WHY:

This morning Erick Erickson published a very misleading post that claims that legislation introduced by Senator Enzi (R–WY) will raise taxes and tax online downloads.

The truth is:

The Marketplace Fairness Act will not raise anyone's taxes; in fact it could help lower taxes by making state tax codes more efficient and restoring state and local control.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not tax the Internet or Internet businesses.

The Marketplace Fairness Act has nothing to do with iTunes—digital goods are not covered by The Marketplace Fairness Act.

At the end of the day, the Marketplace Fairness Act gets the federal government out of the way of state policymaking and restores free market principles by leveling the playing field between local, brick-and-mortar sellers and their out-of-state competition.

By the way, it is probably a coincidence that he expresses his sincere concern for eBay sellers. Certainly eBay couldn't be behind Erickson's piece. The good news is that the Marketplace Fairness Act protects small online businesses by exempting the first $1 million in online sales—not total retail sales

but specifically online sales—so the exemption actually applies to businesses with far more than $1 million in annual sales.

One MORE thing Erickson misses is that the tax is already due. As an avid online shopper himself, if he isn't calculating and remitting the use taxes he potentially owes, he could be audited and face fines and penalties. Truth is that every online shopper faces that threat under the current system and that is why a significant majority of online shoppers want the tax collected at the point of purchase.

At the end of the day we shouldn't be surprised that Erickson is taking the side of faceless Internet sellers who are desperately trying to protect their competitive advantage—as much as 10% in some places.

To quote Ronald Reagan, ''facts are stubborn things.'' Erickson is entitled to his own opinion, but not his own facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me first thank Senator ENZI and Senator DURBIN for bringing forward this amendment. I agree with Senator ALEXANDER for his comment as it relates to this bill. Let me talk about one of the objectives we want to see in taxes. We talk about simplifying, we talk about fairness. We also talk about what is known as the tax gap. That is the gap between the taxes that we have imposed that we should collect and what we really collect. When it comes to sales and use tax, it has been estimated that because of the place in which an individual buys the product there is a $23 billion gap. That is $23 billion of taxes that are owed are not collected.

This is an urgent problem. In my own State of Maryland it is $300 million a year. There are people who are paying higher taxes than they should because Maryland has to impose higher rates to make up for that $300 million. We all talk about a system where we can spread the base and lower the rates. The first way you do it is by collecting the taxes that everyone should pay.

This is a good-governance issue, this is a fairness issue, this is an issue that is not that terribly complicated. We are not talking about any new tax responsibilities. We are not talking about any new taxes. We are talking about getting our local governments, as Senator ALEXANDER has said, the ability to collect the taxes that they impose in a fair manner. This is a matter of fairness. This is a matter of doing what is right.

Let me give one example that was brought to my attention by a retailer in Maryland, a person who works in an electronics shop in our State, where someone came into that shop recently and was shopping for a TV monitor, a new TV set. They did all the comparative shopping, brought the expert in from that store, answered all their questions and decided on what television set he was going to buy. He then went on his phone and ordered it from an Internet supplier. The price was identical at the two locations—identical. But the person bought it on the Internet because they did not have to pay the State sales tax. They had to pay the State use tax, but they never paid the State use tax. That is something we have to end. That is wrong. That is basic fairness.

The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee points out, how do we collect these taxes? Let me point out we already collect taxes in our State from sales that are made outside of our State. We do it when there is that nexus that the Supreme Court has acknowledged, and as has been pointed out, the retailer you buy it from adds the State sales tax by putting in their sales the ZIP Code in which we live and they calculate the sales tax and they remit the sales tax. That is currently being done. This is not an additional burden.

Then I heard how complex it is to figure out what taxes are owed. Let me point out two points about that. First, the bill provides that the States adopt the streamlined sales and use tax agreement so we have a uniformity as far as how this is applied. But let me tell you, I do not even know that is totally necessary because there are computer programs today that figure this out for the retailer. The retailer knows the products they are selling and they know how the retail sales taxes throughout the Nation apply to the products they sell. It is a simple program. This is not a burden to the retailer.

Senator DURBIN already pointed out if you live in New Hampshire or you live in Montana or you live in a State that may not have a sales tax, your citizens are not going to pay a sales tax. It does not increase anyone's sales tax. All we are saying is that when our citizens buy products that are subject to our sales and use tax that they cannot get a competitive advantage by going on the Internet rather than using a retail establishment. What is wrong with that? We are not talking about imposing any taxes on anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me last point out, in an effort to make sure that no small businesses are disadvantaged, there is a small business sales exemption of up to $1 million, so we are not talking about very small sales. We are talking about a great deal of revenue.

I thank Senator ENZI for his leadership, and Senator DURBIN. This is long overdue. We should pass this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington?

The Senator from New Hampshire?

MS. AYOTTE. I thought I was next. May I check that?

Mrs. MURRAY. I believe they are yielding time off the Republican side.

MS. AYOTTE. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment I heard that is going to be filed, the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. I think we have need to rename this legislative proposal for what it is, the Internet Tax Collection Act. I come from a State, New Hampshire, that does not have a sales tax nor do we have an income tax. One of our famous Governors said low taxes are the result of low spending, and that is how we do it.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor today about somehow this Marketplace Fairness Act is about States rights. This act, which really should be named the Internet Tax Collection Act, infringes on the rights of retailers in New Hampshire and businesses that have thrived and grown over something great called the Internet. It forces them to become tax collectors for the rest of the Nation. In fact, they would be forced to become tax collectors for nearly 10,000 tax jurisdictions across this country should this proposal go forward.

I have heard a lot of talk about leveling the so-called playing field. There is nothing level about this playing field. These are cash-strapped States looking for more money and asking Washington to impose burdens on other States that have chosen to have a low tax burden, like States such as mine which doesn't have a sales tax. In fact, this is another attempt to turn our businesses into tax collectors. I think it is wrong.

It is the opposite of States rights. There has been some discussion of conservative support for this. There is absolutely nothing conservative about this proposal because, again, what this is about is officials in cash-strapped States across the country looking for new ways to plug their budget holes. They are attempting to make New Hampshire businesses, and other businesses across this country, use the Internet to collect their taxes. This is not just about the State of Tennessee handling its own taxes, it is making New Hampshire, which has no sales tax, collect for the rest of the Nation, and it is wrong.

The exemption for small businesses is a red herring. This so-called exemption doesn't even match up with what the SBA defines as a small business retailer. We know what will happen with the small business exemption. When the States don't get the revenue they want, they will be right back here again looking for us to repeal the small business exemption, saying: It is not fair that this category of businesses has been exempt. They will be looking for more and more, and here we are in Washington letting them trample on the States that made the decision not to have a sales tax. This bill should not go forward.

I want to share some stories from New Hampshire. My constituents have written to me about this. A company in Franconia, which is in the northern part of New Hampshire, calls this a job killer. From Pittsfield, an online coin and stamp dealer says: If policymakers

decide to impose new sales tax collection burdens on small businesses and force them to collect and remit 9,600 tax jurisdictions nationwide, the legal compliance and administrative cost alone would undoubtedly make it harder and, in many cases, impossible to enjoy the opportunities and benefits of the Internet marketplace.

This is from a business in Amherst:

> Our company is a poster child for small family-run Internet businesses. We have over 80,000 customers nationwide. The burden of collecting and distributing sales tax for this would be prohibitively expensive.

Finally, another constituent from Boscawen believes this would open the door for States to begin taxing across their borders for many other different taxes. Another company from Rindge says:

> This bill is absolutely terrifying. I think I may not be able to survive. I may not be significant to many in Washington, but my little machine shop is the center of my family's livelihood.

When I hear my colleagues come to the floor and call this a States rights issue, what about States such as New Hampshire? Why are we going to make this vibrant part of our marketplace, the Internet, a tax collection haven for other States? So businesses in New Hampshire and other States are going to collect taxes for Indiana, and this is all because cash-strapped States are coming here and asking Congress to do this.

By the way, for those who believe this is some kind of conservative bill, this is not my idea of conservative. The Americans for Tax Reform are against this, the Heritage Foundation is against this, the Campaign for Liberty is against this, the National Taxpayer Union is against this, Cato is against this, and the Heartland is against this.

This is not about small government. This is about forcing businesses in States like mine, with no sales tax, to become the tax collectors for the Nation. It is wrong.

This is not about small businesses. I urge my colleagues to vote against the online tax collection act because that is what this really is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act. This act will level the playing field for small business retailers in Minnesota and across the country.

I want to thank Senator ENZI for his years of work on this. He had a retail shoe store. I thank Senator DURBIN, Senator HEITKAMP, and Senator ALEXANDER for introducing this legislation. This legislation will simply allow States to help their brick-and-mortar retailers, including the mom-and-pop shops on Main Street, stay competitive in a marketplace where online sales have become a fact of life. The amendment we offered to the budget resolution today lays the groundwork for passing that legislation. It is a commonsense measure which brings our sales tax into the 21st century.

In Minnesota, the retail industry includes nearly a half million workers, which is about one in five jobs in our State. Those retailers need to compete on price and service every single day. The current sales tax system makes it impossible for them to compete.

Senator CARDIN spoke about something that is very common around this country. I have heard the same exact story myself. It is where someone walks into an electronics store and wants to buy a big flat-screen TV, and they get the guy who knows everything to come over and point out what is the best for their needs. The salesman is a very skilled guy. He was hired because he knows what he is doing. He sells the TV, except he doesn't sell it, not for his store. Instead, the customer gets on their smart phone and buys it online. They buy the same exact model at the same exact price, but because he or she doesn't have to pay the sales tax—they are supposed to, by the way, but they don't—they buy it online. They end up saving $100 and the brick-and-mortar store, which pays for employees, sewer, schools, and everything which makes a society work, loses the sale and cannot compete. It is just not fair. It is just not fair.

This is a commonsense amendment. Small businesses have an exemption. The exemption is written in the amendment. People cannot say, well, just because they have an exemption, we are going to get rid of the exemption in some way. It is an exemption that is a part of the amendment we are proposing.

I am proud to be on this bill. I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The Marketplace Fairness Act is common sense, it is bipartisan, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is a member of the Budget Committee and has worked hard to get us to where we are. I appreciate his input to get us to this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have similar stories to those that have been described on the Senate floor today. Indeed, a former Member of this body, who is now the Governor of our State, Governor Chafee, wrote to me about a bookstore owner in Middletown, RI. The bookstore owner talked about patrons who would browse for books in his store, only to leave without actually making a purchase. He said they would make a list of the books they wanted to buy and then went to get them more cheaply on the Internet.

I have been approached by a Rhode Islander who works in a shoe store. He said he has seen people come in and have his employees bring them boxes of shoes to try on so they can find the exact size and model shoe they want only to then walk out the door without a purchase. They have seen it happen enough that they think what happens is the potential customer is instead going to an Internet site so they can buy the shoe more cheaply.

Now, there are true efficiencies and true benefits to shopping over the Internet. It is very valuable, and it is very sensible. Those are real factors. That is part of progress, and we have no quarrel with that. However, we should not be using discrepancies in taxes to favor shoe companies, one over the other, because one sells over the Internet and the other sells out of a brick-and-mortar store where people can actually come in and try on the shoes.

As a result of this loophole, big businesses who do business over the Internet have $23 billion to fiddle around with that doesn't go to support the kind of civic structure of our society—as Senator FRANKEN talked about.

The complexities are not that great. There is an existing Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement that simplifies this immensely. The tax payments will very shortly be built into the basic business software. The concern about small businesses is misplaced because we completely exempt any business with less than $1 million in annual sales. They have no obligation to comply with this whatsoever.

The National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the Retail Industry Leaders Association, the National Retail Federation, the International Council of Shopping Centers, and amazon.com, to their credit, as well as AFSCME, support this.

I hope we can use the vote on this amendment to show that this is a piece of legislation that we are willing to move forward on. Then, of course, we will have to go through the legislative process of authorization in order to actually pass it into law. The budget amendment will not pass it into law, but I think it will send an important signal that will bring everybody to the table and finally get us to closure on this important piece of legislation.

I will close by thanking Senator ENZI, whom I see on the floor, for his work and his leadership and dedication in trying to get this right over 14 years. Before it was as easy as it is now to comply with this, he was working on this. Every year it gets easier. Every year the software is able to catch up more. Every year more States join the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement. He and Senator DURBIN have

done a service to this country with their leadership on this issue.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Marketplace Fairness Act is about leveling the playing field for brick-and-mortar businesses. We have a bipartisan and bicameral bill to do just that. So I am pleased to join Senators DURBIN, ENZI, and many of my colleagues in offering this budget amendment today to add a deficit neutral reserve fund to ensure marketplace fairness by allowing States to enforce their State and local sales tax laws.

This is a big issue in Rhode Island, where businesses have a hard time competing against out-of-State retailers because of outdated rules that require shops on Main Street to collect revenue, but their out-of-State online competition does not.

When Internet commerce was still in its early stages online companies were basically exempted from collecting State and local sales tax for sales to States where they do not have a physical presence despite the fact there was an obligation to collect sales tax on those purchases.

This puts Main Street businesses at a competitive disadvantage, hurts the ability of Rhode Island to keep jobs in the State, and has strained State budgets all across the United States.

In 2012, Rhode Island lost out on estimated $70 million in uncollected revenue. Revenue that was owed but because of an outdated Supreme Court decision went uncollected. It is past time that we fix this loophole.

I have talked to a lot of local business owners about this in Rhode Island and many of them say the same thing: Since when is requiring all customers to pay the same sales tax rate a tax increase?

This is a bipartisan proposal. It seeks to keep jobs in our communities, and bring much-needed revenue to strained State budgets all across the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and continued efforts to close this long-outstanding loophole.

I thank them and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes off the resolution time to my colleague, Senator WYDEN of Oregon, who is an outstanding member of the Budget Committee. He has been waiting to come and speak. I want to thank him as well for his valuable input throughout the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from the Northwest. We worked it out so I could talk a little bit about Medicare and taxes as well.

Before Senator ENZI leaves, I just want to tell him he is someone who gives public service a good name. We have spent a lot of time working together on a variety of issues, such as tax reform, and particularly this idea of transition rules. I just want to tell the Senator how much I appreciate the way he approaches problem solving. I would say to colleagues that what I have not been able to figure out for the 10 years this debate has gone on is how we are going to make this work for America's innovators and small businesses. Let me give just a couple examples and be very brief.

What concerns me most about the bill as it is written today is State revenue collectors, under this legislation, in effect, will be outsourcing their jobs to America's small businesses, America's innovators. If the bill passes in its present form, those small businesses, our innovators, are going to spend their time trying to figure out how to collect all these taxes across the land rather than creating jobs. I don't think that is anything any of us want to do, Democrats or Republicans. That is point No. 1.

Second, I wish to talk about the international implications of this bill. Senator MURRAY and I and others, including Senator BAUCUS, are very close to the border. What concerns me, especially after the legal analysis I received from the Congressional Research Service, is I think the way this bill is going to work, people are going to end up calling it the shop Canada bill or maybe the shop Mexico bill or, what is even more ominous, the shop China bill. I wish to describe exactly why that is the case using the legal analysis from the Congressional Research Service.

The proposal, of course, requires American businesses to collect sales taxes on behalf of 45 State revenue collectors, but it imposes no such burden on foreign retailers that sell into the United States. So an Oregon business would have to collect taxes for New York, but Chinese firms wouldn't have to collect taxes for any State. Washington State businesses would have to collect taxes for Idaho, but Canadian firms are under no such obligation. I ask my colleagues: What is fair about sacking these American small businesses, these entrepreneurs, which are adding so much value to the new economy, to make it even more difficult for our small businesses to compete with Canadian sellers and European sellers and Chinese sellers? This bill as written is going to be a huge boon, for example, for the idea of setting up online businesses in Canada.

Small businesses all across the country, especially those that are near the border, in my view, would have every financial incentive to incorporate there. For the life of me, I don't see how that could be good for the American economy or fair to American firms that, for a variety of reasons, are not capable of moving.

Senator ALEXANDER was spot on in terms of talking about how we should look to States rights—I am certainly interested in that—but let's not do it so that in a globalized economy, we make it even tougher for American innovators to compete.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a legal memorandum that was prepared for me by the Congressional Research Service that describes in great detail the unfairness the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act would create for American firms in a global economy.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
July 23, 2012.

To: Senator Ron Wyden; Attention: Jayme White

From: Steven Maguire, Specialist in Public Finance, 7–7841; Jeanne Grimmett, Legislative Attorney, 7–5046; Erika Lunder, Legislative Attorney, 7–4538

Subject: Analysis of Possible Modifications to the Marketplace Fairness Act, S. 1832.

This memorandum responds to your questions about the ''Marketplace Fairness Act,'' (S. 1832). The Marketplace Fairness Act (MFA) would modify current law to allow state tax authorities to compel out-of-state vendors to collect sales and use taxes. Your office asked CRS to: (1) analyze the impact of expanding the MFA to require foreign sellers to collect and remit sales tax; (2) identify legislative proposals to achieve this and assess if these are consistent with international trade rules; and (3) suggest other taxes that could be collected and remitted if MFA were to become law.

Generally, extending state sales and use tax collection authority beyond international borders could be complicated both administratively and legally. Under current law, states may only impose sales and use tax collection responsibilities on out-of-state sellers of goods and services to in-state persons if the seller has a ''physical presence'' in that state. This nexus standard is required by the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution. When no physical presence exists, then the state sales and use taxes would apply to these transactions, though remittance of the tax would fall to the in-state buyer to the extent prescribed by state law. So, when the seller does not have a physical presence in the taxing state, the buyer is typically responsible for remitting the tax to the state.

For example, consider a consumer in Virginia who purchases a camera over the Internet or by phone from a retailer based in New York state. The camera retailer does not have an outlet or a physical presence (substantial nexus) in Virginia. The New York retailer is not required to collect New York sales taxes because the transaction does not occur at the retail outlet and the customer is not a resident of New York state. And, the retailer is not required to collect the Virginia sales tax because the retailer has no physical presence in Virginia. The Virginia consumer, however, is required to remit the use tax to the state.

Under its authority to regulate commerce, Congress has the power to authorize state action that would otherwise be an unconstitutional burden on interstate or foreign commerce, so long as it is consistent with other provisions in the Constitution. The Marketplace Fairness Act (MFA), if enacted, would be an example of Congress exercising that power. Under the MFA, Congress would authorize states to shift the burden for sales and use tax collection from the in-state consumer to the out-of-state seller as long as the state had either adopted the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (SSUTA) or if the state implemented ''minimum simplification requirements.'' If either criteria are met, then the state could impose sales

and use tax collection liability on any remote vendor if the sale was sourced to that state under the sourcing rules in the SSUTA or the act. Neither set of sourcing rules are restricted to physical presence. So, for the states meeting either criteria, the bill would essentially change the nexus standard under the Commerce Clause by removing the requirement that the seller have a physical presence in the taxing state. While the bill would expand the authority of these states to impose sales and use tax collection obligations on remote vendors, it does not provide the states with additional enforcement mechanisms or authority. As discussed below, states could have difficulty in enforcing the law with respect to foreign vendors with little U.S. presence. CRS was not able to find any legislative proposals that would provide such a mechanism. Since no specific piece of legislation has been proposed, the following discussion of possible trade agreement implications is only a general one.

Removing the ''physical presence'' requirement does not mean that all remote vendors would be subject to the state collection responsibilities. First and foremost, nexus is also required by the due process guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment. Unlike the Commerce Clause's nexus requirement, Congress may not change the standard required by the Fourteenth Amendment. Thus, even if MFA were enacted into law, states could still not impose sales and use tax collection responsibilities on entities that did not have sufficient contact with the state required for due process. Furthermore, it is possible that other domestic laws could also limit the ability of states to impose the collection obligations. For example, state law might contain exceptions or other provisions that limit or remove the liability in some cases.

With respect to international law, in general, the United States, or a subdivision thereof, could tax a sale by a non-U.S. merchant to a person in the United States without running afoul of what has been considered to be a consensus view of international law regarding a nation's jurisdiction to prescribe tax laws. As set out in the Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law:

A State may exercise jurisdiction to tax a transaction that occurs, originates or terminates in its territory or that has a substantial relation to the state, without regard to the nationality, domicile, residence, or presence of the parties to such a transaction.

The Restatement further explains that taxes on transactions that occur, originate or terminate in a state ''include sales, value-added, excise and severance taxes, as well as export taxes and customs duties.'' It further notes that ''states impose sales and excise taxes or customs duties on transactions in or touching the state, regardless of the relationship between the participants and the state,'' but that ''[a]n excise or tariff . . . may be imposed on a person participating in a transaction by reason of that person's relationship to the taxing site even though the transaction occurs outside the state's territory.'' This latter principle would appear to have relevance for Internet or mail order transactions involving non-U.S. vendors, where the sales transaction itself may legally be sited outside the United States but the purchaser is located within this country. Further, under international law, if a state has jurisdiction for prescribing a rule of law, it also has jurisdiction to enforce that rule, be it through judicial or nonjudicial means.

At the same time, regardless of its status under international law, a requirement that places the burden of collecting the tax on a non-U.S. vendor with no ties to the United States or a particular U.S. state other than the sales themselves would seemingly pose practical problems with regard to its implementation. It appears difficult to envision a workable mechanism by which the United States could compel such a vendor in a foreign country to collect a U.S. tax. In this regard, punitive trade measures, such as prohibiting the importation of products from foreign companies that fail to collect the tax, would appear to raise issues under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994). For example, GATT Article XI:1 generally prohibits the imposition of quantitative restrictions on imports from other WTO Member countries and a U.S. measure violating this provision would need to be justified under one of the general exceptions set out at GATT Article XX. It may be that, for practical purposes, implementation of a tax collection requirement imposed on non-U.S. vendors that in fact have no nexus to the U.S. state imposing the tax may call for some sort of reciprocal agreement between the United States and countries in which such vendors are legally constituted. Whether such an agreement is feasible, however, is far from clear and beyond the scope of this memo.

Finally, some have noted that U.S. based retailers may respond to the expanded state tax collection authority by shifting operations outside the U.S. to avoid the collection burden. The costs of moving operations and increased shipping costs, however, would seem greater than any benefit conferred by avoiding the collection burden.

With regards to your second question, national measures involving the imposition and collection of taxes on Internet and catalog sales of products would implicate international trade obligations involving trade in goods and possibly trade in services. Regarding a tax itself, Article III:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994) prohibits a WTO Member from imposing a sales, excise, or other tax on an imported product in excess of the tax imposed on the like domestic product. In addition, tariffs on products imported into the United States from non-U.S. vendors would be subject to GATT Article II, which prohibits the United States from exceeding the negotiated or ''bound'' rates for particular products contained in the tariff schedule that the United States has submitted to the World Trade Organization (WTO) under Article II. Also, as noted above, quantitative restrictions on the importation of products from WTO Member countries are generally prohibited under GATT Article XI: 1. GATT Articles III and XI are generally incorporated into U.S. free trade agreements (FTAs) such as the NAFTA. In addition, FTA parties are subject to the tariff rate and tariff reduction commitments made in the FTA regarding goods originating in the territories of the parties.

WTO obligations in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) apply to ''measures by Members affecting trade in services'' and thus, were a U.S. tax collection requirement placed on non-U.S. vendors to qualify as such, the GATS would come into play. For GATS purposes, the measure may be at the federal, state, or local level. According to the WTO Appellate Body, the phrase ''affecting trade in services'' is intended to give the GATS ''a broad reach'' and ''the term 'affecting' . . . indicates a broad scope of application.'' Here, the Appellate Body upheld a WTO panel interpretation of the phrase ''measures by Members affecting trade in services'' finding that ''no measures are excluded a priori from the scope of the GATS as defined by its provisions.''

''Trade in services'' would be involved if foreign vendor were considered to be a service provider—likely a provider of retail services—and the Internet or catalog sale fell within one of the modes of providing a service covered by the GATS. Internet or catalog sales may constitute either cross-border provision of a service or the consumption of a service abroad, i.e., the provision of a retailing service from the territory of the vendor into the territory of the U.S. consumer, or the consumption of a retailing service in the territory of the vendor by a U.S. consumer. If the measure were in fact covered by the GATS, the United States would be subject, inter alia, to the GATS most-favored-nation (MFN) obligation, meaning that it would need to accord to the services and service suppliers of any other WTO Member treatment no less favorable than it accords to the like services and service suppliers of any other country.

In addition, the United States has made a sectoral commitment under the GATS with respect to retailing services where these two modes of service supply are concerned, thus implicating additional GATS obligations. Thus, to the extent that catalog or Internet sales constitute a retailing service, and the service is provided cross-border or consumed abroad, the United States would be subject to GATS obligations involving market access and national treatment of services and service providers of other WTO Members in the retailing sector. Market access commitments generally involve prohibitions on various types of quantitative restrictions, such as limitations on the total value of service transactions in the sector in the form of a numerical quota. The GATS national treatment obligation requires that, regarding all U.S. measures affecting the supply of services, the United States must accord to services and service suppliers of any other WTO Member treatment no less favorable than that it accords to its own like services and service suppliers. U.S. free trade agreements also contain obligations involving trade in services, including MFN obligations and national treatment obligations that are not premised on specific sectoral commitments.

While U.S. trade agreements do not appear to expressly address a situation where a foreign service provider of one agreement party is required by another agreement party to collect sales, excise or similar taxes on sales made by the former in the territory of the latter, the obligations described above would be relevant if a case can be made that the requirement is covered by the GATS or the services chapter of an FTA. Further, were a quantitative restriction placed on retail sales services by a foreign service provider to U.S. consumers as a punitive measure for non-collection of sales taxes, GATS market access commitments may well be implicated. As is the case with the GATT, a measure that violates a GATS obligation may be justified under a GATS general exception if all the requirements of the exception are met.

Regarding your third question, the proposed MFA is narrowly focused on sales and use taxes and would not allow for states to use this new authority for the collection of any other taxes:

No obligation imposed by virtue of the authority granted by this Act shall be considered in determining whether a seller or any other person has a nexus with any State for any tax purpose other than sales and use taxes.

The MFA also expressly provides that:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as—

(1) subjecting a seller or any other person to franchise, income, occupation, or any other type of taxes, other than sales and use taxes,

(2) affecting the application of such taxes, or

(3) enlarging or reducing State authority to impose such taxes.

If you have any questions, please call Steven Maguire on 7–7841, Jeanne Grimmett on 7–5046, or Erika Lunder on 7–4538.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will just wrap up with this. As colleagues look at this—and we are going to have plenty of debate—let's think through the implications of what the administrative water torture is going to be all about for small businesses and why it doesn't make more sense for State tax collectors to do their job, No. 1; and No. 2, let us not make it harder for American small business to compete in tough global markets. It is plenty tough as it is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator COCHRAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is encouraging that for the first time in 4 years the Senate is considering a budget resolution. The absence of a resolution during this time has contributed to a breakdown in the legislative process. As a result, we have operated the Federal Government without a blueprint for revenues or spending.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution being considered by the Senate does not reflect a workable effort to get our country back on a sustainable path.

But rather than setting us on a new path toward a more affordable, efficient, and effective Federal Government, the Budget Committee has laid out a plan for higher taxes and more spending. It does not even pretend to balance the budget. Support of this budget would represent support for a bigger Federal Government and a weaker economy.

I have heard from many of the hardworking citizens in my State who are ready for better economic times and more opportunities to improve their lives. Our priority should be to help strengthen the economy and get government spending under control. The Obama administration has embraced a course which locks us into higher and higher deficits for the foreseeable future.

I am hopeful we can amend this resolution to produce a serious proposal that will lead to a more efficient, more effective Federal Government that better serves hard-working Americans rather than increasing the government's burden upon them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 3 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Minnesota, and then she will take her 30 minutes as the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee following that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURRAY for her great leadership. I also wish to thank Senator ENZI and Senator DURBIN on the Marketplace Fairness Act. This is a bill and an amendment that needs to pass. It is incredibly important to small businesses, big businesses, and to people across this country who work for retailers.

When I travel around my State, I hear from small, locally owned retailers about the competitive disadvantage they face against online retailers, small businesses such as Creative Kidstuff that sells educational and developmental books for kids and Thrifty White Pharmacy, a full-service, employee-owned drugstore.

Right now, States are currently unable to require out-of-State or online-only retailers to collect sales tax and it puts local mom-and-pop stores at a disadvantage. Not only that, but this tax loophole is draining billions of dollars in lost revenues from State and local governments—$23 billion last year alone across the country.

In effect, this tax loophole subsidizes some taxpayers at the expense of others and some businesses over others. That is why we call this the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I have been committed to a competitive agenda for this country since I got to the Senate, and part of that agenda includes not only encouraging competition and innovation, but it is also about having an even playing field for our businesses. Minnesota alone lost about $394 million in 2011 from out-of-State sales that are legally due but not collected. This lost revenue translates into over 7 percent of Minnesota's general sales tax liability in 2011. That is what we are talking about. This is real money.

One of the longstanding principles of tax fairness is that similarly situated taxpayers should be taxed similarly. A bookstore on Grand Avenue in St. Paul has to charge a sales tax, while an online retailer selling that same book hundreds of miles away does not. A consumer buying a T-shirt in downtown Duluth is taxed differently than his friend who is buying that same T-shirt on the Internet. Someone buying a TV at Best Buy—hometown company—in Richfield, MN, is taxed differently than if he buys the same TV online.

Our current situation encourages tax avoidance, undermines our tax system, and ultimately creates a competitive disadvantage for brick-and-mortar retailers at a time when we want them to succeed.

I am so excited that there is a bipartisan group of Senators supporting this bill. Our momentum is growing. We can see it today on the floor.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of some of the supporters from my State that includes major stores such as Target and Best Buy to the Uffda Shop in Red Wing, MN. I have shopped there and I suggest my colleagues do the same. It also includes Mary's Morsels & Catering and Sleepy Eye Floral & Design, to give my colleagues just a sense of the hundreds of companies that support this in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stand With MainStreet.com.]

Minnesota imposes a sales tax that brick-and-mortar retailers (and their websites) collect at the time of purchase and remit to the state. Today some online-only retailers (including Amazon.com) are exploiting a loophole that allows them to not collect Minnesota sales tax on these same purchases, placing the burden on consumers to self-report and pay that tax directly. However, few do. This gives online sellers a competitive advantage by not collecting the tax and creating the perception that online-only purchases are ''tax free.'' The Minnesota Legislature is considering a proposal to require large online-only retailers to collect sales tax at the time of purchase like brick-and-mortar retailers are already required to do and to bring fairness to the marketplace. Competition among businesses, whether they operate on the Internet or in Minnesota communities, is important. The proposal being considered by the Legislature establishes fairness for a 21st century marketplace and makes sure that all sellers have the same tax collection obligations.

E-FAIRNESS SUPPORTERS

STATEWIDE BUSINESSES;

Target; Walmart Home Depot; JCPenny; Best Buy; Creative Kidstuff; Barnes & Noble; Sears; Thrifty White Pharmacy; Walgreens.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Hennen's Furniture; Happy Sleeper Furniture; Quality Appliance & TV Center; Roberts Fine Jewelry; Eichorn's Furniture; Brownie Furniture; Jenia's Appliance & TV; Woodwards Books; Puffes Fine Jewelry; Ferrin's Furniture; Red Wing Appliance; Wanshura Jewelers; Johnson-Mertz Appliance; Garon Bros Jewelers; Security Jewelers; First Photo; Bookstore at Fitgers; Ski Hut; Explorations; J Skylark Co.

Toys for Keeps; Logan's Furniture; Appliance Village Co. Master Jeweler; Waconia Farm Supply; Factory Direct Furniture; Linsk Flowers; Drury's Furniture; Grand Jete; Schroeder's Appliance Center Kern's Appliances; Bethany Book & Gift; Cycle City; Bob & Frans Factory Direct; Cattale's Books & Gifts; Uff da Shop; Rick's Home Furnishings; Yetzer's Home Furnishing; Vacuum Cleaner Outlet & Services; Valley Bookseller; Bakkum Enterprises, LLC; Mary's Morsels & Catering LLC.

Spicer Bike & Sports; Uncle Hugo's Science Fiction; Bookstore/Uncle Edgar's Mystery Bookstore; T & M Athletics; Artistic Floral; Dieknnan's Jewelry; Rhoda's Closet Inc. Hillary's; Pete's Surplus; Christian Book Store; Glenwood Floral & Greenhouses; Kraning Jewelry Inc.; Jenny & Co; The Framing Place and Gallery; Yarn Harbor; Gem Classics Inc.; Teske's Jewerly Inc.; Adventure Cycle and Ski; Bissen's Tavern; J B Off Sale Liquor.

Casey's Bar Inc.; Country Rose Floral; Collins Feed & Seed Center; Liquor Mart; A Johnson and Sons Florist; Kalli's Place; That Special Touch Flower Shop; Strom Clothing Co.; Thomas Liquors; Dar's Pub Inc.; Judy's House of Gifts; Suzanne's Jewelry; Big Guys Bar; Beltone Hearing Care Center; Woodwards Books, Yarns, Fabrics; Anderson Memorials Inc.; Eastside Express; Northwedge Greenhouse; Tradewind Products Art II (Framing & Art Supplies).

Fleur de lis; Replay MMG; Sleepy Eye Floral and Design; Chapel of Love; Grand Performance; Uncle Louie's Café; OFF Sale Liquor; Artistic Treasures; Phillson Award Etc. LLC; Double J Cafe; Antle's Long Guns & Accessories; Village Liquor; Dan's Dugout; Bremer's Bar Inc.; Shooters Pub LLC; Bill's

Repair; Town and Country Café; Stavrakis Jewelers; Wothe Bait; Life in Lavender.

Lake City Radio Shack; A&W Consulting; Bloomington Jewelry & Trophy Co.; Brinky's Liquor; C&J Store; Country Floral; Crosstown Market; Deb's Snow Sled Inn; Hwy. 25 Liquor; La La Homemade Ice Cream; Mike's Drive-In Liquor, Inc.; Moments On Main; On Sale Liquor; Oriental Orchid; Preston Liquor Store LLC; RMR Inc, Roger's Grove City Liquor; Slim's Wood Shop; Stogies Discount Tobacco; Trailhead Cycling & Fitness.

Nelson OFF Sale Card Shop; Colonial Laundry, Tara's Sewing Shop; Witoka Tavern; Doug's Bar; Bud Rose Flowers; The Attic Gallery; Cattales Books & Gifts (new & used book store); The Gumdrop Tree; Pioneer Cycle; Buskala's Jewelry; Straight River Sports & Fitness; Van Guilders; Bayside Floral; Waldeland Jewelry & Gift; Soderbergs Floral and Gift.

BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Midwest Bookseller Association; Midwest Hardware Association; Minnesota Retailers Association; Minnesota Chamber of Commerce; Hibbing Area Chamber of Commerce; Saint Paul Area Chamber of Commerce. Dakota County Regional Chamber of Commerce; Richfield Chamber of Commerce; Minnesota Business Partnership; American Booksellers Association; Alexandria Lakes Area Chamber; Litchfield Chamber of Commerce; Woodbury Chamber of Commerce; Chisholm Area Chamber of Commerce; TwinWest Chamber of Commerce.

OTHER

Dakota County Board of Commissioners; Sleepy Eye Herald Dispatch.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks by saying this is an opportunity to help our State and local governments, but it is a big opportunity to help the employees and workers of this country who work every day, showing those TVs, making sense of things, explaining how things work, going to work every day, putting those flowers in the vases. They deserve an equal playing field. This amendment does it.

I am now going to begin my 30 minutes of Joint Economic Committee time. I am the vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee, which is a joint committee with the House and I am the Senate chair.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, that Senator TESTER be permitted to speak for up to 8 minutes, that Senator SANDERS be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes, that I then again be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes, and that Senator FRANKEN be permitted to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to first thank Senator MURRAY again for her leadership on the Budget Committee. Day in and day out, month in and month out, she has been working on this budget and she has achieved, along with the committee, a smart, balanced proposal for meeting our country's fiscal challenges.

This is not the first time I have come to the Senate floor to talk about the critical need for a balanced approach and to bring down our debt in a balanced way, but this is the first time in a long time I have actually felt optimistic that we are going to get a budget through the Senate and optimistic that there are a lot of stirrings of bipartisanship and compromise. While our budget, as has been pointed out and I will point out, is very different than the House budget, I think there are still grains of compromise there. We have seen this willingness in the Senate, with our Republican colleagues, to talk about bringing the debt down, whether it is the Gang of 6 or the Gang of 8 or whether it is the work of Simpson-Bowles or the work done with the Rivlin-Domenici group. These are all reasonable proposals. We don't agree with everything in them, but they are all reasonable proposals and they contain some balance.

The other reason I am optimistic is that we have a great opportunity here. I was reminded of this last week when former Republican Senator Judd Gregg testified before our Joint Economic Committee. He actually paraphrased the Foreign Minister of Australia saying, ''The United States is one debt deal away from leading the entire world out of economic doldrums.''

I couldn't agree more. Look at the economic news we have had in just the last month. We know there is so much work to do, that there are too many people unemployed, and there is too much investment that is not being made. But we also know that we saw the best month for unemployment numbers than we have seen in 4 years. We are seeing a turnaround in the construction market. We are seeing a turnaround in the housing market. I can tell my colleagues that in my State, we have unemployment that is at about 5.6 percent. So we are seeing progress, but we have more to do. The last thing we need to do now is to go backward. We need to go forward, and that is what Senator MURRAY's budget does in a very balanced way.

As I have said many times before, we are talking about balance. I believe the Senate budget achieves the right equilibrium. It includes an equal mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue from closing loopholes and ending wasteful spending in the Tax Code. Our proposal builds on the $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction we have already received—I don't think every citizen knows that—$2.4 trillion. Let's remember 70 percent of that was spending cuts and the other 30 percent was revenue. That is a balance. It is not exactly the balance we wanted on our side of the aisle, but if we were to adopt the House budget right now, we would be at, if we include the past revenues, 10-to-1 spending cuts to revenue. That is not the balance we are seeing in the other proposals that have been made by these bipartisan groups.

How does our budget do this? The additional debt reduction to the $2.4 trillion we have done to get to over $4 trillion in debt reduction—first of all, $975 billion in targeted cuts and $975 billion in revenue. Again, this will help us to surpass the bipartisan goal of $4 trillion and put our debt-to-GDP ratio at about 70 percent.

Some of the most important points in the Senate budget include the fact that it replaces sequestration—which is just a hammer—with smart, targeted cuts while also making critical investments in areas such as education, workforce training, and infrastructure.

When I get out in our State with our unemployment rate at 5.6 percent, I hear time and time again that there are jobs unfilled, that we need to train workers, that we need our high school kids to be going into trades again, to be going into technology, math, and science. This budget accounts for that. It produces savings in Medicare and Medicaid by eliminating waste and fraud, promoting efficiency, and emphasizing cost alignment. We know a little bit about this in Minnesota, with the Mayo Clinic and the way we deliver health care in a high-quality, low-cost way.

One study out of Dartmouth showed that if they simply used in the rest of the hospitals across the country the cost-effective ways of the Mayo Clinic, we could save $50 billion—$50 billion in 5 years with chronically ill patients. That gives a sense of what we are talking about when we talk about high-quality, low-cost care.

Our budget also recognizes there is a massive amount of spending that takes place through the Tax Code to the tune of over $1 trillion per year in tax expenditures.

I come from a State with a thriving renewable energy sector, and 2 years ago we agreed to let the ethanol tax credit expire at the end of 2011, which saved billions of dollars. In fact, that was $60 billion in 10 years—$60 billion. I do not understand why the oil industry cannot follow ethanol's lead. I am proud of the work they are doing. I have been out to Lewiston. I have seen the drilling in North Dakota. It has helped to increase our own domestic oil production and decrease our dependency on foreign oil. But I do not believe the oil companies still need $40 billion in 10 years. That is a lot of money we could bring in to reduce the debt.

We can make other commonsense changes. One I would propose is with the home mortgage deduction, very near and dear to everyone's heart. Cap it at $500,000 in value of a home. If you buy a million-dollar home, great. Then you get it for up to $500,000 in value of the home. That brings in tens of billions of dollars in debt reduction.

All told, the proposal that is coming out of Senator MURRAY's budget reduces the deficit by approximately $2 trillion. If enacted, our debt will continue on a downward path, where our debt-to-GDP ratio will be, as I mentioned, about 70 percent. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that a debt-to-GDP ratio in that range would also result in a 1-percent increase in the size of the economy in that year.

We cannot discount the impact that a growing economy can have on deficit

reduction. CBO expects GDP growth to be above 3 percent in 3 of the next 4 years. As the economy grows, we will see more revenue, and we will see lower deficits.

Former CBO Director Alice Rivlin, who just testified last week at a Joint Economic Committee hearing on the very topic of debts and deficits, said this:

> The really important thing is to keep the debt from growing faster than the economy.

I could not agree more. Deficit reduction must be paired with economic growth. This is where we need to be, and I am optimistic that ultimately—while we have many differences that we are going to hear a lot about today—ultimately, we are going to come together on something that works for America.

Unlike the proposal in the House, I will tell you the Senate budget preserves and protects Medicare, ensuring that it is there for our seniors today and strong for our children and grandchildren tomorrow.

I firmly believe we can make some reforms to our Social Security safety net, and that those reforms—that money—can go right back into Social Security to keep it solvent. On the Medicare front, there are many things we can do without reducing the benefits for our current seniors, for the people who deserve that help.

Look at what we could do. The VA negotiates prescription drug prices and gets much less expensive drug prices for high-quality drugs. Right now, we do not do that with Medicare. By negotiating prescription drug prices under Medicare Part D, you could produce $240 billion in savings over 10 years right there. Why not leverage the power of America's seniors? They have a lot of power.

We all agree we need to reduce our debt. But our ultimate goal is not simply a balanced budget; it is a budget that is balanced.

Let's look at what goes on with the Ryan budget. Well, the Ryan budget gives millionaires a huge tax cut, drastically lowering their income tax rate from 39.6 percent to 25 percent.

Last year, the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve, estimated that a similar plan introduced would have given millionaires an additional $285,000 in tax breaks, while hitting the average middle-class family with a $1,300 tax hike.

He also claims his tax cuts for the wealthy, which would cost about $4.5 trillion—and I say that because I believe they would be paid for by the middle class—will not add to the deficit. But Ryan refuses to name one specific loophole or expenditure that his budget would eliminate to pay for the tax cuts.

Some experts project that such extreme cuts, as we would see in his budget, would cost jobs. I believe that is true. That is why, as we are seeing this improvement in stabilization of our economy, we need to do things in a balanced way over the long term. We need to send the clear message that we are reducing this debt and get to our goal of $4 trillion in debt reduction in 10 years. But we simply cannot do it by doing it on the backs of the middle class who are still struggling in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget proposal. It is time to get it done. I truly see this as a time of opportunities not only in the next 2 days to get the budget done, but also in the next few months as we negotiate with our colleagues across the aisle to get a budget for America.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I now yield 8 minutes to Senator TESTER of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota. I thank her very much for her comments.

I rise to join my colleagues who understand the need to strengthen our economy while taking responsible steps to reduce our deficit.

Four short years ago we were coming out of the worst economic recession, depression, since the dirty thirties. Today, this country needs a budget that tells Americans we are serious about growing our economy and creating jobs. Strengthening our economy will increase economic opportunities for all Americans and allow small businesses to expand and hire more workers. But a stronger economy will also help us reduce our deficit without cutting the investments that lay the groundwork for a better future for our kids and grandkids: investments in education, in infrastructure, in our health, investments in our veterans.

That is why the budget we are debating today is the responsible path forward for this Nation. It sets forth our priorities. It reduces our deficit without cutting the legs out from underneath our economy. It also tells Americans that we are not going to sacrifice those critical investments to strengthen our economy and enable our economy to grow.

Montanans know what it is like to live within their means. We do not spend what we do not have. And our State government is required to have a balanced budget. That is why Montana is one of the few States that survived the recession without dropping into the red. I am going to get into that in another area shortly.

We cannot tear the Federal Government apart to make up for the decisions that put us here in the first place. Ten years ago, we put two wars on the credit card at the same time we drastically cut taxes. Those choices quickly squandered the budget surplus we had in the 1990s.

Today the Republican plan approved by the House, known as the Ryan budget, uses tricks and gimmicks and smoke and mirrors to balance the budget. It sacrifices the welfare of our seniors, our students, and our veterans to get us back to the good old days.

It ends Medicare as we know it. It hands seniors a voucher that down the road will grow at half the rate of anticipated medical costs. Under their plan, for a procedure that a senior can afford today, tomorrow they will get a voucher for a part of what that procedure will cost, and they will be told: You make up the rest. And if you don't, too bad.

The Ryan plan also freezes Pell grants for students at a time when education costs continue to grow too fast for middle-class families to afford. Pell grants, education—a major driver in our economy.

It also makes it harder for low-income and unemployed veterans to get the health care they need. The Ryan plan is what I speak of. It cuts funding for women's health care and reduces coverage for preventative health services, such as cancer screenings—affecting 47 million women across this country. It does this while protecting tax loopholes for large corporations and failing to invest in roads and bridges. And the senior Senator from Minnesota knows all about bridges that collapse. She had one collapse in Minnesota. Those investments are necessary.

If you balance the budget by taking the country apart, what is the point of balancing the budget?

Now, there is no doubt we must reduce the deficit, and the Democratic plan responsibly cuts our deficit by putting us on a responsible long-term path that gets our fiscal house in order while investing in initiatives that grow our economy. It reduces the deficit by nearly $2 trillion over the next 10 years. Now, that is not chump change, and that is on top of the work we have already done over the last few years to reduce the deficit by $1.6 trillion. It does this while protecting seniors, women's health, middle-class families, and students.

Here is the kicker: Only the Democratic plan reforms the Tax Code and puts those savings toward deficit reduction. The Republican plan specifically forbids new revenue from tax reform to go to lower the deficit. For a party that claims balancing the budget is its holy grail, it is puzzling that Republicans want to use tax revenue to pay for more tax cuts. This is just one of many radical proposals and budget gimmicks they are proposing.

If you are for a balanced budget, then you must be for balanced deficit reduction. Every bipartisan commission that has looked at the problem agrees: to responsibly balance the books, you need to save money through a comprehensive plan that cuts spending, reforms entitlements, and fixes our Tax Code—and uses that savings to pay down the debt.

The time for commissions and working groups is past. We should have learned those lessons. We are here now to do the work to get our long-term deal to fix the budget. We will have to

compromise, and that is the way it should be, because working together is what built this country. But only one plan is closer to where we need to be at the end of this debate. The Democratic plan cuts spending, keeps in place reforms to our health care system, and mandates the tax reform we need.

Tax reform will not be easy, but there are a few things that should not be hard to agree on either. I think tax loopholes for big oil and gas companies and corporations that ship jobs overseas should be wiped off the books.

We have two paths we can follow. One path drags this economy into a ditch by dismantling Medicare and cutting investments in infrastructure and our future. The other path takes a balanced approach to put this country on the road to long lasting economic growth and stability.

We have been lurching from one crisis to another for far too long. It has hurt job growth because businesses are holding back. They do not know where the debate in Washington is headed.

Offering them more certainty and strengthening this economy is something we need to do. We need to do it in a responsible way. We need to come together around a plan that strengthens our economy in the short term while taking real steps to reduce our deficit in the long term.

Senator MURRAY's plan is a better choice. It meets the needs of the American people. It shows them we are willing to lead. That is what we were sent here to do.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TESTER. Perfect. Let me also take 2 minutes to comment on an amendment that some of my colleagues spoke of that will be filed to this resolution.

It is an amendment that would not only impose new burdens on small businesses but would also fundamentally alter the rights of States by allowing them to tax entities located outside their borders.

Now, I heard a few Senators earlier today advocating for the elimination of the current standard that only allows States to tax entities with a physical presence in that State.

Montana is one of those States that does not pay a sales tax. We do not want a sales tax. It has been on the ballot a number of times. It has been voted down by the people every time. But under the provisions that some in this Chamber are pushing, small businesses in Montana would be forced to do the bidding of the departments of revenue in other States by collecting and remitting their sales taxes.

Montana's budget is currently operating at a surplus—without a sales tax. The idea that other States would balance their budgets on the backs of Montana's hard-working businesses is not only wrong, it is flat insulting.

This is an unfunded mandate on Montana's small businesses, and it is a slippery slope of what businesses will do to take their collections out of State.

Where is it going to go from here? Agricultural products grown and raised in Montana and marketed in other States? This is an aberration of States rights—rights which so many in this Chamber say they support. I would urge my colleagues to vote against any measures that would gut these States rights.

With that, I thank the Senator from Minnesota and yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, what is our agreement at this point?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee has 30 minutes on our side, and I do not know on the Republican side. I think we are about halfway or more into it.

Mr. SESSIONS. You are into it?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 12 minutes remaining in the period of time allotted for Joint Economic Committee remarks.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. If the Senator would like to speak for a minute or so, if he has something he would like to say.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I appreciated Senator TESTER's remarks and his belief that Montanans believe they should live within their means, and he supports a plan to reduce the deficit. But I just want to share with my colleagues that the budget that is before us today is not balanced. It does not reduce the deficit. It taxes a lot more, but its spending increases at the same level, and there is no net change in the unsustainable debt course we are on.

He said it reduces the deficit by $2 trillion. I want you to know that is what the Budget Committee claims for that budget, but it is not accurate. It does not reduce the deficit $2 trillion. It does not. It keeps us on the same path.

It is not a balanced deficit reduction plan, because it doesn't reduce the deficit. It increases taxes and increases spending, if you call that balance. It is not the right kind of plan. I wish we could get together on fundamentals of numbers in that budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I think we have made our case here with the $975 billion in spending cuts that are contained in the budget, and the fact that to date we have made $2.4 trillion in debt reduction, and of that 70 percent or $1.5 trillion has been spending cuts. What we are simply trying to do with this budget is keep this balanced approach to not set an economy—which was literally on its heels a few years ago—back in the same place. We want to do deficit reduction. We want to give our businesses the kind of consistency and incentive to invest, but not do it in a way which Chairman Bernanke has said would cause a sharp contraction by doing too much too soon at once on the backs of the middle class and seniors. I am very hopeful in the coming months I will be able to find some kind of compromise and agreement with our colleagues.

The American people are tired of the gridlock. They want to see people are willing to work together. I truly believe courage is not just standing alone but standing next to someone you don't always agree with for the betterment of this country. Senator SESSIONS and I have worked very well together on Judiciary matters, and I wish to continue to do this on the budget.

Turning to another matter, I spoke about marketplace fairness, and I support that amendment to this bill. I also want to talk about the medical device tax repeal. As I mentioned before, one of my major focuses in the Senate has been on an innovation agenda, the idea we should manufacture items in this country, invent things, and export to the world. This is how we are going to get out of the current situation we are in. I believe we can do it.

We need to do it by promoting innovation all across this country. My State has a long history of innovation, bringing the world everything from the pacemaker to the Post-it note. We are home to one of the world's leading medical device companies, Medtronic, started by Earl Bakken in his garage. It is not just the large medical device companies and their employees who keep this industry running, the small- and medium-sized companies and their entrepreneurs are incredibly vital as well.

In Minnesota we have over 400 medical device companies employing more than 35,000 people across the State. This thriving technology, the medical technology sector, has been one of the keys to our success and one of the bright spots in America's economy. When you look at the potential for exports, as you see a growing middle class in China and in India, people are finally going to the hospital. They are beginning to receive good health care. We have a great potential here for more jobs in America as long as we do this correctly.

The United States is currently the largest net exporter of medical devices in the world, yielding a trade surplus of roughly $5.4 billion a year. Medical device companies are also responsible for creating millions of high-paying, highly skilled American jobs, exactly the kinds of jobs we want in this country. These are the kinds of jobs where every parent sends their kid to high school and says, is he or she going to learn something which will create a job? I am looking at our pages right now, and I can tell you medical device jobs are one of those kinds of jobs.

In order to ensure our country remains a world leader in medical device innovation, we need to address the 2.3-percent excise tax on medical devices. As you know, this came out through the Affordable Care Act. At the time I opposed that tax. We negotiated and were able to get it halved from $40 billion to $20 billion in 10 years. It still isn't right because it creates too much of a burden.

Medical device manufacturers are not the ones which are going to get multiple new customers, millions of new customers out of the increase in coverage in the health care bill. Pharmaceuticals might. They negotiated something. Think about it. A lot of medical devices are used by people who are older. They tend to have health care coverage with Medicare and other things. This is the issue here is this is not at the right rate, this is not the right tax, and it should be repealed. The tax is a burden on medical device businesses but, most importantly, it is a disincentive for jobs. It stifles innovation, and it makes it more difficult for the next generation of lifesaving devices to make it to the market. I have been fighting to reduce it, repeal it, and to delay it since the first day it was introduced. At the end of last year, I rallied a record number of Democratic Senators behind the effort. While we couldn't get an agreement included in the fiscal cliff negotiations, we had great traction. I think there were 18 or 19 Democratic Senators in strong support.

I see Senator COATS from Indiana, as part of the strong support we had on the Republican side for repealing this tax.

This is why Senator HATCH and I have filed an amendment to the budget resolution to repeal this tax and help give these businesses and their employees the certainty and stability they need to keep researching, developing, and inventing the next medical breakthrough. Our amendment now has the support of 28 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. I am hoping we can continue to work in a bipartisan way.

I yield 2 minutes to my colleague Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota to speak about this important issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I rise today to speak about the promise of biomedical innovation in our country, as did Senator KLOBUCHAR. I talk a lot about the importance of biomedical innovation because in my home State of Minnesota there are 400 medical device companies, and there are more than 30,000 employees who support our economy while creating high-quality jobs. They do it while saving and improving patients' lives.

The industry is being punished for its innovation and growth. The medical device tax is cutting into the proceeds which go toward research and development and workforce training. By taxing companies on the first dollar of sales, they are especially hurting the very small companies, the startup companies, which may not be in profit yet. This is why I am happy to join with Senator KLOBUCHAR, with Senator HATCH, in filing this amendment to the budget resolution to allow for the repeal of the medical device tax. This amendment is an important first step toward fully repealing the tax and providing much-needed relief for our innovators and doing it in a fiscally responsible way.

Along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, I fought this tax from the beginning. The health care law will insure 30 million new Americans while also improving the health care of every American citizen. While I am proud to be a champion of that law, I believe the medical device tax is not the way to pay for it.

On this point, I disagree with the Obama administration, as I did from the beginning. Senator KLOBUCHAR also disagreed from the beginning. We fought against the tax and ultimately we were successful in getting it cut in half from what it was when it came out of the Finance Committee.

As a member of the HELP Committee, I will continue to improve our regulatory process. I am very proud I had a part in helping create the Medical Device Innovation Consortium, a private-public partnership in this industry which is a first of its kind. Part of this, I believe, is the full repeal of the Medical Device Act. As a first step, I ask my colleagues join those of us who are cosponsors of this critical amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I thank Senator FRANKEN for his strong words in support of this amendment. I thank him for being a cosponsor of this amendment.

May I ask how much remains on the Joint Economic time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I want to thank the Senators who joined me today as we work to advance a smart, balanced approach for meeting our country's fiscal challenges. The time is ripe for common ground on a budget plan to move the economy forward. While I don't know if we will have that bipartisan plan in the next few days, I think we will get a budget through this Chamber which will pave the way for the kinds of bipartisan negotiations we need to have. We need to keep this country moving, and moving in the direction we need.

When I go out there and talk to small companies throughout my State, they want us to get something done. They want to have consistency so we are not playing green light, red light with the Tax Code; that they know exactly where they stand. I think they all acknowledge everyone is going to have to sacrifice a little here. I think they acknowledge we are going to have to do something which makes a difference and not just speak about it anymore. We have not only the opportunity but the responsibility to find common ground on a deficit reduction plan which will help build a stronger, more resilient framework for economic renewal so families and businesses have the certainty they need.

I think we know neither party is going to get everything it wishes, but this doesn't mean we can put our heads in the sand and pretend this isn't happening. I truly appreciate my Republican colleagues. When we meet behind closed doors and speak about this, they have a willingness to compromise. I think this is what will happen in the future. However, our job in the next 2 days is to get a fair budget through a balanced budget.

This is what Senator MURRAY's budget is. I have been part of this, and I look forward to working with her and our colleagues in the future to show the American people we can stand tall and do what is right.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise today as the senior Senate Republican of the Joint Economic Committee to discuss one of the most fundamental issues this body confronts on a year-to-year basis, or at least should confront on a year-to-year basis, which is passing a budget through which we could operate the rest of the year and measure how we spend hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

Unfortunately, we haven't had one of these budgets for 4 years. I am pleased we finally have arrived at this particular point. I will speak about that in more detail.

A few years back when I was serving as Ambassador to Germany, I made calls on the various ministers. They would be equivalent to cabinet secretaries in our country. I would always try to get a little background information on them before I went to see if we had anything in common, or an ice breaker to start the conversation.

I was calling on one of the ministers and noticed, reading his background first, his birth date was the same as mine. It was a milestone birthday. We were both born in 1943. At the time, the date of my seeing him was just a couple of months after we both celebrated our 60th birthday.

To break the ice, I said to him: Mr. Minister, we have something in common.

He said: What is that?

I said: We both were born on the same day. Therefore, we both reached a very important milestone in life.

He looked at me seriously and said: And how are you doing with all of this?

I said: Well, I am doing fine. I don't feel any different, and I don't think I think any different. It is almost as if the number is meaningless.

He looked at me seriously and said: You are in serious major denial. This is a big deal. This is a major milestone.

Well, ever since he said that, I have been wondering, gosh, is that little pain in the right shoulder the beginning of more problems and so forth?

It reminded me of the situation we faced here when others have said the debt problem we have is not a major problem or that we don't have a spending problem. It reminded me of the minister who said: You have to be in major denial.

Year after year, we are spending a lot more money than we take in, and there is no end in sight to that. Mandatory spending alone on programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security is projected to double in a few years' time. It is estimated each new child born today will inherit $50,000 or more of debt, which they will need to pay off as they grow, go through their education years, and become part of our economy. They are going to be saddled with this ever-growing debt.

My three latest grandchildren, Grace, Charlie, and Avery, all young, just a few years old, are inheriting a very significant amount of debt which will saddle and stifle their opportunities to participate in the American dream and enjoy many of the same opportunities many of my generation have had.

Interest rates were held down by the Fed at historically low levels. We might also be facing our day of reckoning. I had the opportunity to speak with the Fed Chairman some time back. He indicated we are running out of tools here at the Fed to address these problems. The people up the street who handle the fiscal issues, not the monetary issues, need to stand up and address the problem.

I think we all know we can only keep interest rates low for so long. It is important to understand a 1-percent point increase in interest rates would add over $1 trillion to the United States debt in a 10-year period of time. These historically low rates are not going to stay historically low forever. They are going to rise as investors lose confidence in America's ability to pay off their debts in the future if we keep plunging into the level of debt and deficit spending which has been taking place here over the last several years. Eventually, we are going to reach that tipping point, and when we reach that tipping point, investors and consumers lose confidence. When that happens, interest rates rise. When interest rates rise, it impacts our economy in a very significant, negative way. All we have to do is look across the Atlantic, in Europe, to see what is happening there to get a glimpse of the crisis that can come with not dealing with the ever-increasing debt and not taking the necessary steps over a period of some time to put our country on a fiscal path to health.

I think most of us here know that we have to make some tough choices and that it will require political will in order for us to address this. We have been avoiding this for years, and we are going to face a debt-induced catastrophe if we don't address it and address it soon.

So when you are faced with this kind of fiscal mess, what do you do? Well, what families and businesses all across America have had to do when they have faced these types of situations—sit down, create a budget, and put themselves back on a path to balance and prosperity in order to avoid the inevitable: a collapse of the family budget or the business budget. Our communities and our States have had to do this. We see this happening everywhere except in Washington. It is this body and this administration that have refused to step forward, No. 1, to pass a budget on which to guide our spending and, No. 2, to make the decisions necessary to turn this economy around and begin to put us on a better path toward a balanced budget.

Why a budget? Well, it helps us identify priorities. Sitting on the Appropriations Committee, where agency heads and Secretaries come before us and present their requests for the future fiscal year in which we are making decisions, I ask each one of them: Do you have a plan B?

They say: What do you mean by a plan B?

I say: if we continue down this path that is going to ever shrink discretionary spending—whether it is for cancer or paving roads or education or any other worthy project, there is going to be less money if we don't address this spending problem, particularly if we don't address mandatory spending.

I ask them: Have you looked at doing what every family has had to do and what every business has had to do during these 4 years of tepid growth, which just seems to linger and linger and linger? We still have 23 million people out of work. Have you looked at ways in which you can make your spending and the parts of the budget you oversee more efficient and more effective? Are there things you can cut? Are there programs you can eliminate that no longer are effective or perhaps shouldn't have been there in the first place? Are there things you would like to do but without the resources are not able to do at this time?

You know, if a family is faced with lower revenue—dad's salary has been cut or mom has lost that second income or for whatever reason—and they are having a hard time making payments—education for the children, mortgage payments, and so forth—the family has to say: You know, we are going to have to look at how we spend money, and we are going to have to cut back. Maybe we won't be able to go to Disney World this year as we had planned. Maybe we will need to buy a tent and go to the State park or do something less expensive. And if they have kids with a credit card: We are going to have to put limits on that or you are going to have to scale back.

These are decisions every family has had to make. These are decisions every business owner is faced with and has to deal with, and they are doing that. But this is a decision that hasn't been made here.

Well, it has been 4 years—1,400-some days; I think 1,422 days and counting—since this body, the Senate, has passed a budget which would allow us to determine what our priorities are or at least give us a guidepost as to how we are going to spend money. Four years since this body has presented to the American people, who elected us to come here and represent them, a budget and give them the transparency of how we are spending their money.

Finally, after 1,422 days, after 4 years, we have a budget before us. While I am pleased that is the case and I am pleased we are here debating that, it is disappointing when we learn what that budget offers.

One would think, after 4 years—and particularly after the 4 years we have been through and the 23 million people unemployed or underemployed and the rate of growth of this economy half of what it normally is—that the budget being presented to us would take some steps toward addressing our spending issues and would not incorporate $1 trillion or more of increased taxes, which will simply go to more spending. How could we possibly support a budget—being $16.7 trillion in debt—that plunges us further into debt—a staggering increase in debt—and also doesn't reduce spending? That is at least a step but nothing nearly appropriate to what we are facing.

So this budget grows government. Let's not make any excuses. It grows government by increasing spending, and it grows government by a massive increase in taxes just after we have had one a few months ago, not counting the massive increase in taxes that is going to occur beginning in 2014 with the implementation of ObamaCare. When we add that up and look at the cost of that, we face a dire circumstance. So one would think a budget being offered to us would not increase debt by 42 percent but would address the real problem.

I know there has been a dispute about how much of the budget revenue is increased taxes. Some say $1.5 trillion. Those who have presented the budget simply say: Oh, no, it is only $1 trillion. Well, whether it is $1.5 trillion or only—only—$1 trillion, it is $1 trillion in new taxes on the American people after they just got hit with more than $½ trillion 2 months ago and are going to get hit again with another $1 trillion when ObamaCare fully kicks in. I mean, it just defies credibility, and I think the investment community and consumers and taxpayers all across America look at this and say: What in the world are you doing?

What are the consequences of this? Well, the Heritage Foundation indicates that the Senate Democrats' budget would cost over 8 million jobs nationwide and 225,000 jobs in my own

State over the next 10 years. They estimate that the budget would reduce economic output by $1.4 trillion and reduce private domestic investment by $820 billion. We certainly see the trend here, and the trend is a negative consequence not a positive consequence.

So I think these statistics emphasize the fact that the entire mindset behind this budget seems to be how we can find more revenue to fund more government spending rather than how do we grow the economy. Our goal ought to be to grow the economy, not grow an already bloated government with more taxes to pay for more government spending.

This budget never balances the budget. We will never reach the point our States have had to reach in balancing their budgets. The majority of our States have had to pull themselves out of a hole, and they have done so because many are constitutionally mandated by their own State constitutions to balance that budget. Families have had to balance their budgets, and businesses have had to balance their budgets. Only the Federal Government doesn't seem to balance its budget and this plan doesn't even attempt to get us there.

I have been coming to the Senate floor day after day after day this year basically talking about the need for Republicans and Democrats and the President to come together with a bold, credible, and enforceable long-term plan to reduce our debt and put our country back on a path toward growth and prosperity. We need to recognize that it will take more than a quick fix. It is going to take more than this soap opera drama of kicking the can down the road, extending the decisions we have to make for yet another few months behind this, behind that, or whatever. It is going to take the will to roll up our sleeves, stop wasting our time and instead get to work on a plan that will deliver real results for the American people.

To solve this dire situation and reduce dangerously high debt, I believe we need a plan that includes three major things:

We need to reform the way we spend. We need to go through each program at every agency and department and determine how we can do more with less. My colleague from Oklahoma, TOM COBURN, already has taken steps to triage our Federal Government's spending by identifying programs that are ineffective, unnecessary, and overly duplicative.

We need comprehensive tax reform. The Joint Economic Committee has heard witnesses from the left, from the right, from the middle, nonpartisan, Republican, Democratic, Independents, and there is a consensus: If we don't have comprehensive tax reform together with a sensible, credible, long-term, enforceable deficit-reduction plan, we will not pull ourselves out of this mess we are in.

The growth element of what we need comes through tax reform. Senator WYDEN and I, in a bipartisan way, have worked for years—he worked years before that with former Senator Judd Gregg—on putting together a plan. We are not saying it is the be-all, end-all, but it forms the basis for a simplification of the Tax Code. It is revenue neutral, it addresses our lack of competitiveness around the world in terms of our corporate entities and businesses, it fixes rates at reasonable levels, and it ought to be the basis for at least the discussion and moving forward.

If we don't combine our spending discipline with comprehensive tax reform, we are not going to have the element that will produce the growth and revenue that will bring us closer to balance.

Finally—I talk about this all the time—let's have the courage to address what we know is driving us into more and more deficit and will prevent us, if we don't adjust it, from ever having a rational plan to get us out of this situation, and that is mandatory spending.

Let me quote from the President's own bipartisan commission. They said:

> By 2025, revenue will be able to finance only interest payments, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Every other Federal Government activity—from national defense and homeland security to transportation and energy—will have to be paid for with borrowed money.

That is because our revenues will only pay for these few programs, which are eating up all of our expenditures. So from cancer research to education, from paving roads to air traffic control to meat inspectors, national defense and homeland security, and everything the government does that is an essential function for the Federal Government—all will paid for with borrowed money.

Let me go back to their statement.

> Debt held by the public will outstrip the entire American economy, growing to as much as 185 percent of GDP by 2035. Interest on the debt could rise to nearly $1 trillion by 2020.

That is just 7 years away. Returning to the quote:

> These mandatory payments—which buy absolutely no goods or services—will squeeze out funding for all other priorities.

So not only will the uncontrollable growth of mandatory spending squeeze out funding for all other programs or priorities in our country, but it will also jeopardize the safety net we have put in place for retirees who have worked hard and put money aside to become eligible when they retire for Social Security and Medicare and for those who find themselves in a situation where Medicaid is a necessary safety net.

We have always taken pride in being a country that is compassionate. We have been a place where, if you work hard, you can earn a good living, you can raise a family, and in later phases of life you will be able to rely on the safety net of health and retirement programs you have invested in. But if we don't act on mandatory spending, if we don't act on Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, we will all but ensure the demise of these much needed programs for future generations. Failing to act and leaving our children and grandchildren with this enormous debt burden is immoral.

We all know—or we ought to know by now—our current path is unsustainable. Academics, economists, and business leaders from all sides of the political spectrum repeat the same thing: Unless we make the tough choices we have been avoiding for years, we are going to face a debt-induced catastrophe and it is only a matter of time and the clock is running down.

Congress and the President must summon the courage and the political will to do the right thing and take the tough medicine now that will heal this economy. What we have been doing for the last 2 years that I have been here is basically looking at a chronic illness and saying: Take two Advil; maybe you will feel better in the morning. That doesn't work. We need the bold, the credible, and the enforceable plan that will put us on the path to prosperity, and it must include spending discipline, comprehensive tax reform, and mandatory spending reform.

I am going to be offering up to five amendments to this budget. I don't want to spend a great deal of time on this now. I will, for the record, mention the five I am going to offer.

The first is a mandatory spending budget point of order. This would be a point of order against any legislation that increases the net level of mandatory spending at any time our gross Federal debt exceeds 100 percent of the economy or our GDP.

Numerous studies have said that when we reach 90 percent, we are at a tipping point, and it becomes historically proven that it has a serious negative impact on our economy. I have raised this to 100 percent to allow a little room. This point of order will be in place and, if passed, can only be overridden with 67 votes. This should force Congress to think before we act.

Secondly, I am offering an amendment that is called debt transparency legislation. One of my colleagues and a Member of the House of Representatives, LUKE MESSER, has passed similar legislation in the House with very significant bipartisan support.

It simply requires the Congressional Budget Office to report annually an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit for any year that the President's budget is projected to be in deficit. The American people deserve to know this number, and this amendment would achieve that.

I am also offering an amendment to repeal the 3.8-percent tax on investment income. If we want to stifle the economy more, if we want to prevent more growth and slow down this economy, throw in yet another tax on the very people who are providing the capital and the investment.

We just talked about the medical device tax, which I have supported, working along with Democratic cosponsor Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota and many others who have joined us. It is an absolutely irresponsible tax, simply a way for the administration to pay for the costly health care law that taxes the very industry that is providing us revenues, high-paying jobs, and helping our trade balance exported quality products. This is crippling, and it is forcing some of these companies to look overseas because of this egregious surtax on top of all the other taxes they pay. So I support the amendment of Senator HATCH and Senator KLOBUCHAR to repeal that medical device tax.

I am also offering an amendment designed to fix our broken and convoluted Tax Code. I see Senator WYDEN has come to the floor. Senator WYDEN and Senator Gregg started a heroic project several years ago to put together a comprehensive tax reform package. The work and the hours spent in pulling this together is amazing. When Senator Gregg left the Senate, he called me and he said: This is something I think you ought to take a look at. Perhaps you can take my place and work with Senator WYDEN so it can be a bipartisan effort going forward. We have discussed this with our colleagues. It should serve as the basis for tax reform.

As I said earlier in my remarks, we cannot address this problem without spending discipline and comprehensive tax reform combined. All the witnesses who have come before us in the Joint Economic Committee have asserted this and enforced this; that it is the necessary element to provide the growth to accompany the spending discipline and, added to that, the mandatory entitlement reform.

Finally, an EPA amendment—which working with my colleague Senator MANCHIN, a Democrat, again, a bipartisan effort—to deal particularly with an EPA rule. I will not go into the details of that.

But these will be some of the amendments I will be offering in conjunction with my colleagues to hopefully make this budget a better piece of legislation.

To conclude, it has been 4 years since the Senate has passed a budget. The plan before us, in my opinion, has not been worth the wait. It will not help generate more jobs for the more than 23 million Americans who are either unemployed or underemployed. It will not improve this slow economy. It will not save Medicare and Social Security from going broke. It will not produce a path to bipartisan comprehensive tax reform. It will not ever balance the budget. It will not help hard-working Americans get back to work and get ahead in this life. We can do better than this.

After 4 years of inaction, the American people deserve better than this plan. The American people elected a divided government. It was not a mandate for either party. It is a challenge, a challenge all of us need to accept.

So let us act now. Let us summon the courage to stand and work together on a truly balanced plan—not one that calls for ever more spending and ever higher taxes but one that puts in place real reforms.

The first step is passing a credible budget. Sadly, in my opinion, this budget doesn't match the need. Hopefully, we can make the adjustments for this to put us on that path to prosperity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are having this debate in hopes of ultimately reaching a fair and bipartisan budget deal. We all know that is not going to be easy, so the least we can do is get our facts straight. It is kind of disappointing to see that rather than engaging in a productive conversation, some of our Republican colleagues prefer to launch some pretty inaccurate attacks. I would like to take just a moment to correct some of those inaccuracies so we can focus on the urgent task at hand.

Some Republicans continue to claim the Senate budget includes a $1.5 trillion tax hike. I talked about this last night, but I wish to make it clear again. This is not true. Here are the facts:

Of the $975 billion in new revenue from those who can afford it the most, $480 billion is matched with responsible spending cuts to fully replace sequestration, $100 billion goes toward targeted, high-priority infrastructure repairs and job training to help boost our economy and put Americans back to work. The rest goes to reduce the deficit. But, unfortunately, rather than seriously considering the credible path we have presented in our budget plan, some Republicans have decided to play some games with these numbers and are not telling the truth.

Instead of subtracting the sequestration replacement portion and the investment package from that $975 billion in total revenue, they are trying to say we should add it all together. They are taking one side of the ledger, combining that with the other side of the ledger, and coming to a conclusion that makes absolutely no sense. It doesn't make sense. You don't have to take my word for it. Fact checkers and reporters have called this claim false. They have called it a step too far. The Washington Post fact checker even gave it two Pinnochios.

Republicans have also made the argument that this budget actually only includes $300 billion in deficit reduction. That distorts the facts. It is not true, and it is inconsistent actually with what Republicans have claimed in the past.

Our budget includes 1.85 in deficit reduction, evenly divided between responsible spending cuts and new revenue. That revenue comes from closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending from a Tax Code that has been skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. But some Republicans say that because part of what we are doing is replacing sequestration with smarter deficit reduction, that this somehow diminishes the savings.

I actually find this kind of interesting because I served on the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction when Republicans and Democrats discussed ways to replace sequestration, which was, of course, well after sequestration had been signed into law. We didn't reach an agreement because Republicans refused to include revenue. But we did agree then that deficit reduction to replace sequestration was deficit reduction. In fact, my colleague Senator TOOMEY put forward a plan to replace sequestration—to replace sequestration that he said would have "reduced our deficit by $1.2 trillion."

I find it odd that some Republicans were willing to count replacing sequestration as deficit reduction when they were putting forth plans to do it, but they will not treat the Senate budget the same way, especially since bipartisan groups, including Simpson-Bowles and Domenici-Rivlin and the Committee for Responsible Federal Budget, all used the same starting point that the Senate budget does. Like us, these groups knew sequestration was not deficit reduction. It was there to trigger deficit reduction that would come from replacing it. That was the whole point.

In fact, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities noted that the Senate budget uses the appropriate starting point:

> "Bowles and Simpson received no criticism when they did the same thing for their new budget plan of a few weeks ago."

I didn't hear any Republicans complaining then. This just goes to show that, sadly, some of our Republican colleagues appear more interested in politicized attacks than serious consideration of our plan. The American people deserve better. They deserve better. They want an honest conversation. That is what we are trying to have with the credible approach we put forward.

Finally, I wish to strongly dispute the criticism I have heard that Democrats somehow don't take reducing our deficit and debt seriously. Despite what you may have heard, Democrats care deeply, as we both know, about restoring our Nation's fiscal health. We think it would be absolutely wrong to pile up unsustainable debt and hand it to our children. That is exactly why the Senate budget presents a serious, credible, and sustainable approach to getting our debt and deficits under control.

Experts on both sides of the aisle have generally come together around a

few principles for a responsible deficit reduction plan. The Senate budget builds on the work of the last 2 years to meet each of those benchmarks.

In 2010, the Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission recommended finding roughly $4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years. This has now become the benchmark of other serious bipartisan proposals. The Senate budget builds on the $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction that has already been done in the last 2 years since Simpson-Bowles, with an additional $1.85 trillion in new deficit reduction, for a total of $4.25 trillion in deficit reduction since the Simpson-Bowles report.

What the Senate budget does is it takes us the rest of the way to that $4 trillion goal and actually beyond it. Following the recommendations of Simpson-Bowles and the Senate Gang of 6 plan, the Senate budget importantly reduces the deficit to below 3 percent of GDP by 2015 and keeps it well below that level for the rest of our 10-year window in a responsible way. It pushes our debt as a percentage of the economy down, moving it in the right direction, as we have been told is an important goal.

So our budget reaches these benchmarks the way the American people have consistently said they want it done and the way economists and experts across our political spectrum have recommended—with an equal mix of responsible spending cuts across the Federal budget and new revenue raised by closing loopholes and cutting wasteful breaks that, by the way, primarily benefit the rich.

This budget responsibly cuts spending by $975 billion. As a member of the Budget Committee, the Presiding Officer knows we made some pretty tough choices to get there.

We think every program, including the ones that we know are important, needs to be wringing out the waste and trimming fat and reducing costs so our taxpayers get that benefit. So $500 billion of our deficit reduction comes from responsible savings on the domestic spending side, including, by the way, and I remind all, $275 billion in health care savings that we do in a way that does not harm seniors or families.

There are no sacred cows. We have put everything on the table. But we do it in a responsible way to preserve and protect and strengthen programs such as Medicare and Medicaid that the American people support as well. Our budget saves $240 billion by carefully and responsibly reducing defense spending while giving the Pentagon enough time to plan and align the reductions to time with the drawdown of our troops from overseas. The remainder of the savings, $242 billion, comes from savings on interest payments due to lower debt.

Taking the balanced approach the American people have consistently called for, our Senate budget matches those responsible spending cuts with $975 billion in new revenue, which is again raised by closing loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code while locking in tax cuts for the middle class and low-income working families so we protect them from paying anymore.

There is bipartisan support for reducing the deficit by making the Tax Code more fair and efficient. During the fiscal cliff negotiations, Speaker BOEHNER proposed that we reduce the deficit by $800 billion by closing what he called special-interest loopholes and deductions. So the Senate budget takes him up on that. Every bipartisan group that has tackled this issue in a serious way recommended a lot more revenue than the $600 billion raised from the wealthiest Americans in the yearend deal.

If our budget passes, the total deficit reduction since the Simpson-Bowles report will consist of 64 percent spending cuts, 14 percent tax rate increases on the rich, and 22 percent new revenue from closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code. That is a responsible approach. It is a balanced and fair approach. It is the one endorsed by bipartisan groups and experts and it is one that is supported by the vast majority of the American people.

I want to say this again. Here are the facts. Our budget does not include a $1.5 trillion tax hike. It does raise $975 billion, again from closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in our Tax Code. It reduces the deficit by $1.85 trillion when analyzed the same way Republicans have analyzed their own proposals. And Democrats do care deeply about our country. We do want to reduce our debt and deficit, which is exactly why we have put forward a responsible proposal to put our debt and deficit on a downward sustainable path. As we continue this debate over the next day I urge my Republican colleagues to stick to the facts. Let's end the misinformation. Let's work together on the job the American people want us to focus on and get a comprehensive budget deal and get our country back on track.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes off the resolution to Senator WYDEN.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I will not insist on an answer but I wish to raise something.

Mrs. MURRAY. If the Senator would withhold, because we have two Senators waiting to talk. I will be happy to answer that. Can we let two of them go on our time?

Mr. SESSIONS. You have the time. That will be fine. Thank you.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 10 minutes to Senator WYDEN and 35 minutes to Senator LEVIN.

Mr. LEVIN. If I can ask Senator WYDEN to yield, that 35 minutes will be allocated by me among a number of Senators on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, when we began the budget debate in Senator MURRAY's committee last week, I said that Senator MURRAY's challenge gave new meaning to the idea of playing a tough hand. Many thought her task was essentially ''Mission Impossible.''

The fact is, for all of us who know Senator MURRAY well, she has spent her whole life coming up with solutions to those matters that people said were ''Mission Impossible.'' She spent her whole life coming up with accomplishments that actually solve problems. I commend Senator MURRAY for all of her work on this matter. I think it is very clear that when we get the kind of bicameral, bipartisan agreement that addresses the major concerns we are debating here on the floor, it is going to be in no small measure because Senator MURRAY continued to reach out to all sides. I want her to know how much I appreciate that.

I think we all understand these are complicated issues. At the same time, the challenge of coming up with a bipartisan agreement here is not rocket science in terms of identifying what the issues are. There are two issues here. One of them is taxes and the other is Medicare. The two of them in fact are inextricably linked in many respects, because I have heard some on the other side of the aisle say I will look at ways to reform taxes if colleagues on the Democratic side will look at ways to protect Medicare and at the same time hold down its costs. We have heard other Senators say the reverse. So these issues are inextricably linked.

One of the reasons I support this budget this evening is that I think this budget provides significant space for Democrats and Republicans, as this process goes forward, to produce bipartisan solutions on those two issues, the tax question and the Medicare issue, in the days ahead.

Let me take a few minutes. Senator COATS talked about our bipartisan efforts. I have had a chance for the last 5 years to work with two very thoughtful, conservative Republicans—Senator COATS and our former colleague Senator Gregg. Senator BEGICH and I have been part of a bipartisan team that is, in effect, seeking to modernize some of the principles that a very big group of Democrats and Ronald Reagan agreed to in the 1980s, which is to clean out some of these outlandish special-interest tax breaks.

I see my good friend Senator LEVIN tonight. He is going to outline just some of those outlandish tax breaks. We ought to clean them out and use a portion of those dollars to hold down the rates and keep progressivity. In the 2 years after Democrats and Republicans did that in the 1980s, the country created millions of new jobs. No one can say that every one of them was due to that tax reform effort, but it certainly helped.

We had Senator ENZI on the floor earlier this evening. I have been working with him on something that I think has been missed in the tax reform debate, and that is Senator ENZI has said

when are people going to start talking about the transition rules you would need to actually implement the tax reform plan because today in a global economy—and Senator MURRAY and I come from a part of the world that is so trade sensitive—here we have Senator ENZI talking about something very practical that ought to be very attractive to the most progressive Member of the Senate and the most conservative Member of the Senate. Under the Murray proposal these are the kinds of ideas we should be looking at in the days ahead.

Let me now turn, if I might, to the Medicare issue. Again, we all understand it is right at the heart of this when Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN and all those who are going to be in a bipartisan conference are negotiating. I continue to believe it is critically important to protect the Medicare guarantee, something I have battled for since the days when I was codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers, and we can do it in a way that will hold down costs. This is another area where Senator MURRAY has given us a chance to look at some of the solutions that could win support on both sides of the aisle. I will touch on them briefly.

For years now we have had advocates on all sides of the political spectrum talk about the value of merging Part A, which is the hospital portion of Medicare, with Part B, the doctors and outpatients part of the program. Here is a chance to save billions of dollars while also helping vulnerable seniors hold down some of their out-of-pocket expenses. It is there for the doing under the Murray budget. I think we can forge bipartisan support for it.

Let me move on now to the question of chronic care. This is where more than 70 percent of Medicare costs go, for those who are suffering from heart and stroke and cancer and diabetes. The accountable care organizations, which are an important part of the Affordable Care Act, are clearly going to help with respect to how we look to treat this population. But it is not going to lift all the boats. There are a lot of very effective plans and group practices around the country that are going to give us the opportunity to put in place integrated, effective plans to help the most sick among us. We ought to pursue it. The Murray budget will give us that opportunity.

I will close simply by saying there are some very good ideas for promoting Medicare quality and holding costs down, which cost very little, such as the approach Senator GRASSLEY has given me the chance to partner with him on, that would open for the first time the Medicare database so that we would get a sense of what Medicare was paying various doctors and providers for various services.

I know colleagues are waiting to speak. I will wrap up by saying that on the biggest challenges of our time, which I think come down to two issues, taxes and Medicare, the Murray budget gives us a chance to come together in a bipartisan way. We are not going to get it all done, obviously, this week. But we are going to have a chance to do it and I think in both of these areas, taxes and Medicare, there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who can pick up on this budget and find a way to help Senator MURRAY and others who are going to participate in these discussions get us to the solutions we need that will strengthen our economy and protect our people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first I commend Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee for the plan they have presented to us. It represents an enormous step forward on an issue of huge significance to American taxpayers. It is a step toward balanced deficit reduction.

An important part of balanced deficit reduction is reducing the deficit without severely damaging important protections for and investments in American families. One way to do that is by ending unjustified tax loopholes and ending the damage they have inflicted on our budget. Senator MURRAY's summary of the Foundation For Growth, the budget plan before us, refers to ''the sheer magnitude of the revenue lost to off-shore tax abuse, wasteful and inefficient loopholes, and other business tax breaks.''

Many Senators have focused on this issue over the months and the years. A number of them will, I expect, be joining me on the floor over the next few minutes. For many years as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations I have focused on the maze of offshore schemes and complex gimmicks that are concocted to allow a privileged few to avoid paying the taxes that are rightfully owing.

Our subcommittee has, on a bipartisan basis, filled volume after volume with damning detail on how these schemes work and the damage they cause. As Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee have pointed out in their blueprint, we are at a moment in history when we can remove this blight. The pressures on the Federal budget and the threat to economic growth and prosperity that they represent require action. We must close these loopholes. The relentless arithmetic of our budget situation compels it; fairness and justice demand it.

We come to the floor today in support of the revenue provisions in the budget resolution before us. We are going to outline the ways for ending these tax avoidance schemes, the preposterous contortions that too many corporations and wealthy individuals employ to avoid paying taxes. We will illustrate the huge loss in Federal revenues, the resulting rise in deficits from these contortions, and will show how that loss has contributed to a shift in the tax burden from corporations and the wealthy to middle-class families and small businesses. This is a shift that has occurred largely without the notice or the approval of the American public. We are going to demonstrate how closing these loopholes is integral to any balanced deficit reduction agreement that is built on the common good.

The case for additional revenue and for closing tax loopholes as a source of that revenue is overwhelming. Serious deficit reduction requires more revenue, as everybody from the Simpson-Bowles Commission to the Domenici-Rivlin task force to the Concord Coalition to Fix the Debt, has recognized. They have rightly concluded that without additional revenue, the deficit reduction numbers simply do not add up. Republicans have insisted that the discussion of revenue as part of our deficit-reduction approach is finished.

The other day Speaker BOEHNER claimed, ''The talk about raising revenue is over.'' He is mistaken. Our effort is picking up steam. These Republican protests cannot erase the fact that Federal revenue remains significantly below its historic average as a percentage of the gross domestic product of our economy, and that revenue is, and under current trends will continue to be, below the levels we have needed in the recent past to balance the budget.

In particular, the loss of corporate tax revenues is an ongoing cause of deficits. At a time when corporations enjoy record profits, the highest in half a century, revenue from corporate income taxes has fallen off as a percentage of our taxes collected.

In 2006, corporate tax revenue made up about 15 percent of all Federal revenue. In 2012, it had fallen to 10 percent. Somebody has to pick up the slack. In this case it has been average American families. Why is corporate revenue a shrinking share of our Treasury even though the U.S. corporate tax rate, at 35 percent, is one of the highest in the developed world? It is because the top tax rate doesn't tell the story. While our tax rate at the upper limit is 35 percent on corporations, the average U.S. corporate taxpayer's actual tax rate was just 12 percent in 2011, which is the lowest in generations.

A recent study by two think tanks found that 30 of our largest corporations with combined profits of more $160 billion paid no income tax, zero, from 2008 to 2010.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, has outlined in great detail the black magic that these corporations employ to make their tax bills disappear. One major culprit is offshore tax avoidance. This is hardly a new problem, but it is receiving attention like never before—perhaps because it is simply too big to ignore any longer.

This recent edition of The Economist—just a few weeks ago—pointed out in its lead story and on its cover that tax haven abuse is now a $20 trillion problem for the global economy.

That is $20 trillion, not billion. They also have a special report on this offshore finance. The headline here—and it is an eye-popper, I hope—is that ''The Missing $20 Trillion—How To Stop Companies And People Dodging Tax.''

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has been digging into these abuses for years. Last year a subcommittee report outlined how three U.S. companies—Apple, Google, and Microsoft—had used offshore gimmicks to avoid taxes on almost $80 billion in profits. Much of this tax avoidance stems from manipulation of intellectual property and other intangibles. Companies develop valuable knowledge within the United States, often using tax credits, grants, and other Federal support. They then transfer that valuable property under various legal schemes to offshore subsidiaries at bargain basement prices, thereby shifting the profit that this valuable property generates overseas where it is shielded from taxes.

Other offshore schemes involve pretzel-like twisting of tax laws. For example, the subcommittee found that Hewlett-Packard employed such a gimmick to bring home money that was held offshore—bring it back to the United States—without paying the required taxes. Here is what the law requires: When profits are brought back to the United States, the profits are taxed. The IRS allows an exemption for very short-term loans from offshore subsidiaries to their domestic parent. Hewlett-Packard exploited that exemption by concocting a rotating series of alternating loans from a pair of offshore subsidiaries to make billions of dollars in what should have been taxable repatriated income appear to be short-term loans exempt from taxation. This is a gimmick that is so blatant that even some of Hewlett-Packard's accountants questioned it.

Our subcommittee found that Hewlett-Packard used this offshore cash—used it here—shielded it in taxes to help run its U.S. operations during the 2010 fiscal year. To quote from the subcommittee's description:

> There does not appear to be a gap of a single day during that period where the loaned funds of either BCC or CHCC—

The two offshore subsidiaries in question—

> were not present in the United States. Moreover, a similar pattern of continuous lending appeared to be occurring for most of the period between 2008 and 2011.

Now they are talking about short-term loans—which I believe is 30 days or less—but they are supposed to be exempt from taxes when they are lent from an offshore subsidiary back to the parent here in the United States. This has been going on for years without a gap by using a gimmick that they found in the Tax Code, which is egregious. It is time to act.

Senator WHITEHOUSE and I introduced a Cut Unjustified Tax Loopholes Act not too long ago. Our bill would help address some of these tax schemes, and others as well. It is a powerful weapon in our deficit-reduction arsenal if we will use it.

Today a coalition of more than two dozen national public interest groups, as well as dozens of State and local organizations, released a letter urging the Senate to adopt our Cut Loopholes Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR, We write to ask you to join as a cosponsor of the Cut Unjustified Tax Loopholes Act (S. 268), introduced by Senators Carl Levin (D-MI) and Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI). This bill would close a myriad of corporate tax loopholes that serve no public purpose and would raise at least $190 billion over ten years. We urge the Senate leadership to include the provisions of this bill in any budget deal struck this year. The legislation tackles offshore tax loopholes that allow and even encourage many large U.S. companies to shift U.S. jobs and profits to offshore subsidiaries. Corporations that benefit from all of the advantages of doing business here are able to use creative tax planning to avoid paying taxes on income legitimately earned in the United States.

As federal revenues from corporations hover at multi-generational lows, cracking down on offshore tax abuses should be at the top of the Congressional ''to do'' list. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has estimated the cost to taxpayers of tax-avoidance schemes involving tax havens at $100 billion annually. New estimates put the amount of lost revenue as high as $150 billion: $90 billion from corporate tax avoidance and $40-$70 billion from individual tax evasion. Tax haven abuse is widespread: at least 83 of America's top 100 publicly traded companies have subsidiaries in offshore tax havens, according to the GAO. Some of these subsidiaries are nothing more than P.O. boxes. In fact, 18,857 corporate 'headquarters' are registered at one modest five-story building in the Cayman Islands.

This is also a jobs problem. At a time when far too many Americans are facing unemployment, our tax code is rewarding U.S. corporations for moving and operating abroad rather than in the U.S. It allows corporations to immediately deduct some of their expenses for moving and operating those overseas facilities even though the companies can defer U.S. taxes on the offshore profits indefinitely. The CUT Loopholes Act would promote investments in American jobs by removing some of these incentives.

The non-partisan Congressional Research Service recently found that U.S. multinational corporations reported ''profits'' in offshore tax havens that far-exceeded the entire economies of those tax havens. For example, in 2008, U.S. multinational corporations' reported profits in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands exceeded 645% and 545% of those tax havens' GDPs, respectively. After surveying the multinational corporate profits reportedly from tax havens, that report found ''these numbers clearly indicate that the profits in these countries do not appear to derive from economic activities related to productive inputs or markets, but rather reflect income easily transferred to low-tax jurisdictions.''

Here is an example of how these loopholes work. A recent investigation by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations found that Microsoft avoided $4.5 billion in federal income taxes over three years by using sophisticated accounting maneuvers to artificially shift its income to tax-friendly Puerto Rico. The company sold certain intellectual property rights to its Puerto Rican subsidiary. Now the parent company pays that subsidiary 47% of the revenue generated from its American sales despite the fact that its products were developed and sold in the U.S.

Businesses should compete based on the quality of the products and services they offer, not on the cleverness of their tax attorneys in exploiting loopholes like these. Tax haven abuse by large multinational corporations puts small businesses — and even large domestic businesses — at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace. Along with individual filers, they must shoulder the extra tax burden through higher taxes, a reduction to public services, or a larger share of the federal. A 2012 U.S. PIRG report found that the average extra tax burden shifted to just one ordinary taxpayer due to tax haven abuse adds up to $426 per year. If small businesses were to make up for the revenue lost just from the corporate abuse of tax havens, each small business in America would have to pay $2,116. It is time for Congress and President Obama to correct this imbalance and make sure multinational corporations are contributing their share.

Offshore tax loopholes create winners and losers. The winners are multinational corporations, usually in financial services, high tech, and pharmaceutical industries. The losers are those businesses who stay here in the U.S. and those who can't afford to hire expensive tax planners and lobbyists. Those on the losing end of these loopholes include retailers, small businesses, and ordinary taxpayers, who are forced to pick up the tab for tax haven abuse.

Due to the substantial loss of revenue, governments at all levels, here and around the world, cut programs and jobs that are critical to economic recovery and growth. We are finally seeing international bodies such as the European Union, the G–20 and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and government leaders from U.K. to India taking action. The United States should be leading these efforts, not following and certainly not ignoring the fact that these stateless corporations are not going to act until we eliminate these loopholes for good. Additionally, by closing these corporate tax loopholes we send a message around the globe that corporate tax avoidance is unacceptable whether it be in the developing or developed world.

As Congress looks for ways to reduce the federal deficit and debates tax reform proposals, members should start with the elimination of these loopholes, which could raise as much as $1.5 trillion in revenue over the next ten years. Policies that would close a number of the most egregious of these offshore tax loopholes are included in the Cut Unjustified Tax Loopholes Act (S. 268). The Levin-Whitehouse bill would end incentives that encourage the offshoring of jobs and profits.

Diverse constituencies, including small business, labor, faith, and public interest groups support closing these loopholes. We urge you to stand with taxpayers by joining as a co-sponsor of the Cut Unjustified Tax Loopholes Act and urging your leadership to close these loopholes as part of any budget agreement made in the next year.

Sincerely,

Action Aid USA

Alliance for a Just Society

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)
American Sustainable Business Council
American Friends Service Committee
Business for Shared Prosperity
Center of Concern
Center for Effective Government
Citizens for Tax Justice
EG Justice
Financial Accountability and Corporate Transparency Coalition
Foreign Policy In Focus
Foundry United Methodist Church
Friends of the Earth US
Global Financial Integrity
Jubilee USA Network
Main Street Alliance
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns
New Rules for Global Finance
Presbyterian Church (USA)
Public Citizen
Service Employees Union International (SEIU)
Tax Justice Network USA
TransAfrica
U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG)

STATE/LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Arizona PIRG—AZ
Jubilee San Diego—CA
California PIRG—CA
Nicaragua Center for Community Action (NICCA)—CA
Resurrection Lutheran Church—CA
Colorado PIRG—CO
Connecticut PIRG—CT
Pax Christi Catholic University of America—DC
Foundry United Methodist Church—DC
Florida PIRG—FL
Georgia PIRG—GA
Georgia Rural Urban Summit—GA
Georgia Fair Share—GA
9 to 5 Atlanta—GA
MoveOn Atlanta—GA
Atlanta Jobs with Justice—GA
Provincial Council of the Clerics of St. Viator (Viatorians)—IL
Illinois Maternal and Child Health Coalition—IL
AIDS Foundation of Chicago—IL
Autism Society of Illinois—IL
Union Church of Hinsdale—IL
American Bottom Conservancy Illinois—IL
Citizens Against Ruining the Environment—IL
Eco-Justice Collaborative—IL
Holy Cross International Justice Office—IN
Sisters of the Holy Cross Congregation Justice Committee Notre Dame, Indiana—IN
Des Moines Chapter—Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)—IA
Iowa Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church—IA
Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement—IA
Iowa Move to Amend—IA
Green Dubuque—IA
Iowa Progressive Action Coalition—IA
Iowa Citizen Action Network—IA
Iowa Mainstreet Alliance—IA
Iowa PIRG—IA
Iowa Policy Project—IA
Maryland PIRG—MD
Maryland United for Peace and Justice—MD
Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti—MA
Jubilee Justice Task Force of the United Church of Christ—MA
Jubilee Massachusetts—MA
Massachusetts PIRG—MA
Immaculate Heart of Mary Justice, Peace and Sustainability Office—MI
Holy Innocents Episcopal Church—MI
PIRG in Michigan—MI
Missouri PIRG—MO
Missourians for Tax Justice sub-committee of the MO Association for Social Welfare—MO
Economic Justice Task Force—MO
Progress Now Nevada—NV
New Hampshire PIRG—NH
New Jersey PIRG—NJ
NJ Working Families Alliance—NJ
NJ State Industrial Union Council—NJ
NJ Save Our Schools March—NJ
NJ Main Street Alliance—NJ
NJ Citizen Action—NJ
New Mexico PIRG—NM
North Carolina PIRG—NC
Jubilee Oregon—OR
Oregon PIRG (OSPIRG)—OR
Pennsylvania PIRG—PA
Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart—PA
Small Business Chamber of Commerce—SC
Texas PIRG—TX
Vermont PIRG—VT
Jubilee Northwest—WA
Fuse Washington—WA
Washington PIRG—WA
Hill Connections—WI
Madison Teachers Inc—WI
Wisconsin Alliance for Retired Americans—WI
Citizen Action—WI
Wisconsin Community Action Program—WI
Wisconsin Education Association Council—WI
Wisconsin PIRG—WI.

Mr. LEVIN. I see there are a number of my colleagues who have joined me here in this effort so I will close with the following comment. Some of the people argue that they will consider closing tax loopholes but only if the resulting revenue is used to lower tax rates rather than reducing the deficit. This position is unwise for two reasons. First, the budget deficit is a significant problem for our country, and we should address it. Senator MURRAY's budget wisely takes the view that we need to act to reduce the deficit.

Second, the people who elected us overwhelmingly believe that reforms to end these tax schemes, which I have outlined, should contribute to deficit reduction. A recent poll shows that more than 80 percent of Americans believe that revenue we recover from closing tax loopholes should be dedicated to reducing the deficit, not to cutting rates.

Let's follow the path this budget resolution before us outlines: spending cuts, yes, but prudent, carefully considered cuts that preserve our most important priorities; Savings from reform of entitlement programs, yes, but reforms to keep the faith with seniors today and in the future. And, yes, revenue, revenue that ends the privileges of an influential few who have for far too long enjoyed unjustified tax breaks that boost corporate profits and the bank accounts of the wealthy few at the expense of ordinary Americans.

Earlier today Senators WHITEHOUSE, MCCAIN, and I—a bipartisan group—filed an amendment to the budget resolution suggesting the need to close tax loopholes. Our amendment makes reference to ending offshore tax abuses by large corporations. Our amendment provides that at least some of the revenue generated must be used for deficit reduction. This bipartisan amendment makes a strong statement on the momentum that is building for balanced, commonsense deficit reduction.

There is a group of Senators who have come to the floor with me so we can end these tax schemes and gimmicks. I thank Senator MCCAIN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I thank my other colleagues who are here today for the work they put into a very vitally important issue.

Mr. President, I believe Senator WHITEHOUSE is ready to proceed. Senator WHITEHOUSE is my principal cosponsor on this amendment, along with Senator MCCAIN.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator has 24 minutes remaining in his name.

Mr. LEVIN. Is 9 minutes sufficient?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. It is more than sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEVIN for his leadership on this issue. I am proud to be part of his Levin-Whitehouse group in putting this together. If we boil down the discussions that we are having back and forth about the budget, they come to a very simple question; that is, can we use the money that is in tax avoidance, in tax loopholes toward solving our sequester problem, our deficit problem, and our debt problem?

The way this has been described so far is that there are spending cuts. That is one part of the equation. The other part of the equation is tax increases. That has been the way this has been framed. That overlooks the third big piece of the problem, which is money that goes out the backdoor of the Tax Code without ever coming into the U.S. Government in revenues. I want to let people who are watching know—because they probably won't believe it—what a colossal number that is.

We get $1.09 trillion in revenue out of the individual Tax Code. We get $181 billion in revenue out of the corporate Tax Code. We give away $1.02 trillion out the backdoor of the Tax Code for individual deductions and loopholes. We give away $157 billion out the backdoor of the Tax Code in corporate deductions and loopholes. The IRS estimates that there is $385 billion which never even gets into the formula because of what Chairman LEVIN was talking about: companies and individuals who hide their revenue and income offshore so it never even gets into the tax package. If we add it up, there is actually more money lost through tax avoidance than there is collected in tax revenue in this country.

When people talk about only the tax revenue and only spending cuts, they are trying to hide a very big ball. That is the basic difference between the Democratic proposal and the Republican proposal. We want to take $975

billion, which is only 7 percent of all the money that goes out the backdoor of the Tax Code, and use it toward ending the sequester and balancing the budget. That is our proposal. The Ryan Republican proposal is to take 41 percent of that money that goes out the backdoor of the Tax Code and use every nickel of it to lower the high-end rates for corporations and for wealthy Americans who pay the highest end rates. They don't put a dime from this toward either the sequester or deficit reduction. We cannot have that be the rule.

If we take this number, which is an annual number—the minimum is right here, $1.02 trillion plus $157 billion. We do our budget over a 10-year span. These are annual numbers. That means in a 10-budget horizon, we have at least $11.5 trillion going out the backdoor of the Tax Code. If we allow for moderate growth in the economy, it is not $11.5 trillion, it is $14 trillion. If we throw in the nearly $400 billion in offshoring, we are up to nearly $18 trillion—$18 trillion that goes out the back door of the Tax Code.

By the way, although there are important middle-class deductions in the middle of this, such as the home mortgage deduction, there is an awful lot of nonsense and mischief in the tax expenditures that go out the back door of the Tax Code. If we want to know why hedge fund billionaires pay a lower tax rate than their chauffeurs and the hospital orderly rolling his cart down Rhode Island hospital hallways in the middle of the night, we can look at the mischief in the Tax Code for the carried interest exception. If we want to know why corporate jets, private jets get favored treatment, look at the accelerated depreciation schedules in the corporate Tax Code. There is a lot of mischief and monkeyshines that have been built into the Tax Code by lobbyists for the wealthy and lobbyists for powerful corporations over the years.

All we want to do—and what this fight is all about—is take $975 billion out of those trillions and trillions of dollars that go out the back of the Tax Code and use it to get rid of the sequester and to balance the budget. That is what we want to do. And what the Republicans want to do is take 41 percent of that and use every dollar—every dollar—to lower tax rates for the richest people. They don't spend a nickel in all of that toward reducing the deficit or toward ending the sequester.

This Tax Code spending—all the earmarks the lobbyists built into the Tax Code over decades—is the Republican treasure trove. That is their Ali Baba's cave. That is where all the goodies are, and they don't want to spend a nickel of it either getting rid of the sequester or helping with deficit reduction. They want all of the treasure in Ali Baba's cave of special tax deals to stay with the big corporations and with the wealthy in the form of lower tax rates. That is the entire debate between our sides right now.

I think Chairman LEVIN, by putting forward this plan to take this offshore hidden revenue and bring it into the discussion and use it to help solve our sequester, use it to help support our economy, use it to help reduce our deficit, is a very strong idea, so I am very pleased to support him. I appreciate his leadership. I am delighted Senator JOHN MCCAIN has joined us on this to make this a bipartisan initiative. They show great leadership together, and I am delighted to join them.

With that, with my great appreciation to Chairman LEVIN, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. First let me thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. He has been a leader in this effort for a long time. His support here is critical and will really make a difference.

How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to add my thanks to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the leader in this effort to close some of these abusive and unnecessary and wasteful loopholes. I also thank Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator MCCAIN for their leadership in this effort, which is about fundamental fairness.

Most importantly, let me thank Senator MURRAY for the hard work, the courage, the strength it has taken to put together a budget that is intensely complex, dealing with issues that are hugely challenging, and craft a solution that presents a vision for the future of America that is very distinct and different, as well as very preferable to the one presented by the House budget. The House insists on a cuts-only approach and absolutely refuses to consider new revenue. The solution crafted by Senator MURRAY and her committee has opted for balance and compromise—two words that unfortunately are too often missing from our deliberative process.

Our budget achieves $1.85 trillion in new deficit reduction, with an even mix of $975 billion of new revenue and $975 billion in responsible spending cuts. That is a real achievement.

We are here today to talk about cutting loopholes, tax breaks, giveaways to people who don't need them and corporations that don't deserve them. Their existence undermines the fundamental fairness of our Tax Code.

The fact that more money goes to tax avoidance than to tax revenue is a fundamental, searing indictment of our Tax Code, and it is the reason there is resistance to people paying their fair share. Again and again and again, what I hear from citizens, from taxpayers, from residents of the State of Connecticut is, I would be willing to pay my fair share as long as others are required to do the same.

Fairness is at the core of our Tax Code. It is the reason why voluntary compliance is so important and why it happens—because people rely on its fundamental fairness.

The offshoring of profits and ending those offshore tax abuses that have been described so eloquently by Senator LEVIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE is absolutely necessary to a sense of fairness in our Tax Code. As important as the additional money is the sense of equity it would bring to our Tax Code.

Likewise, fair and effective tax enforcement is critical. I know as an enforcer of civil laws for 20 years as attorney general it is important to a sense of fairness in our society, and effective enforcement requires resources. It requires tightening rules relating to tax shelter promoters; stiffening penalties for the aiders and abettors—the ones who enable violations of our tax laws and tax evasion; and modernizing Federal tax lien registration. We are fond of saying in this body that the devil is in the details. Here, the devil is in nonenforcement of those detailed regulations and rules that require compliance.

Similarly, ending excessive corporate tax deductions or stock options and closing some of the loopholes that apply to derivatives are fundamental to fairness and to preserving a sense that everybody is bearing a fair share of the burden. Those rules that presently permit evasion and abuse must be ended. The consequences are huge because they apply to the vision of the future that each of these rules and budgets contemplate.

The wasteful tax loopholes mean losses in revenue, and those, in turn, mean we must cut programs as a consequence. In my home State of Connecticut alone—just to show some of the consequences of the House or Ryan budget—47,000 seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year, and that means $828 for each of them, on average, more in the cost of drugs in 2014 alone and more than $13,000 over the next decade.

The House budget would cut $8.73 billion in funding Connecticut receives for nursing care and other health care services for seniors and the disabled, putting at risk tens of thousands of Connecticut seniors who rely on Medicaid for their long-term health care needs.

I have sponsored the Bring the Jobs Home Act, which many others have cosponsored, which would close that loophole for corporations that send jobs and ship employment overseas. We need to bring those jobs back.

The House budget would double down on job-killing cuts to infrastructure and research and economic development programs. The Economic Policy Institute has found that these cuts would cost Connecticut over 24,000 jobs in 2014 alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Our economic recovery is fragile. Job-killing cuts must be stopped.

I thank Senator LEVIN for his leadership on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for his tremendous work in this area.

I yield the remainder of my time, which I believe is 6 or 7 minutes, to Senator SHAHEEN. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEVIN for the work he has done to look at the tax loopholes that should be closed and to bring attention to really the fairness we should have in our Tax Code.

I am here to join my colleagues in talking about the importance of passing a budget that will address our debt and deficits and protect middle-class families while investing in our future job growth. I applaud Senator MURRAY for her leadership and the work of the Budget Committee in bringing this document before us.

We have made significant progress in the last few years to get the American economy growing, and we have taken real action to reduce our deficits, but there is more we can do on both fronts, and the budget before us addresses both of these urgent priorities in a responsible way.

No one is questioning the need to address our debt and deficits. The question is, Can we do this in a responsible way? Can we come together in a way that protects our economic recovery?

Unfortunately, because of continued political stalemate, we have seen the across-the-board spending cuts known as sequestration go into effect. Now we need to come together to support a plan to address these harmful automatic cuts because they are hurting small businesses. They are having an impact on our economic recovery. They are forcing furloughs of public employees—in New Hampshire, people such as our Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers and our air traffic controllers. They are creating economic uncertainty that is putting our economic recovery in jeopardy.

I have had the chance to travel around New Hampshire in the last month or so and talk to companies that are concerned about the impact of these automatic cuts. One of those companies I visited is called Cirtronics, which is a manufacturing company in Milford, NH. The company employs about 150 people, and it manufactures a diverse array of products, from circuit boards, to medical equipment, to defense and homeland security products. Cirtronics doesn't have any direct government contracts, but many of its clients do. As a result, the company is facing a lot of uncertainty under sequestration. According to its CEO, Geraldine Ferlins, this uncertainty is getting in the way of the company's growth. She said:

> How do you plan without knowing how you will be affected? You hear about how CEOs are hesitant to hire. This is why.

Another company in Salem, NH, called Micro-Precision Technologies is a small, family-owned business with about 20 employees that makes semiconductors used in the military, aerospace, medical, and communications industries. About 80 percent of Micro-Precision's business is with the Department of Defense. Sequestration has meant that their orders are down about half for the month of January. They had been planning to hire two new people, but unfortunately they cannot do that because they are so uncertain about what is going to happen.

That is why we need a better approach to addressing our budget situation. We need a plan that looks at all areas of our spending—at our domestic, at our defense, at our mandatory programs—as well as at revenues through tax reform. That is exactly the approach that was taken by the Budget Committee in passing out the budget resolution that is before us this week. That is why I supported it. It replaces the harmful cuts under sequestration with a balanced mix of responsible spending cuts as well as additional revenues. So instead of across-the-board cuts, the budget makes targeted cuts to several areas. It cuts health care spending without harming beneficiaries; it reduces defense spending cuts, as we wind down our operations in Afghanistan; and it results in reduced interest payments on our debt.

The budget also provides a balanced approach by ending, as Senator LEVIN pointed out, the unfair tax breaks for the wealthiest and for big corporations. I certainly applaud Senator LEVIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I was really glad to hear that Senator MCCAIN has joined them in addressing these unfair tax breaks.

The budget does all this, and yet it still invests in our economy in a way that allows it to grow. It provides much needed funding for our aging transportation infrastructure. It creates an infrastructure bank that is a bipartisan idea that allows us to get a greater bang for the taxpayer buck. There is no doubt that we have to do more to fix our debt and deficits, but we need to do it in a smart, responsible way. That is what this budget does.

I certainly hope we will be able to come together this week to replace the harmful cuts under sequestration with a comprehensive and responsible plan for addressing our debt and deficit. That is why I intend to vote for this budget—because it does exactly that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator MURRAY, has questioned the $1.5 trillion in tax increases that we have contended in this legislation. I think it is there because there are two separate reserve funds that would allow taxes to be increased by $500 billion without legislation and would go through without a supermajority, to be passed on a simple vote.

But our colleagues say that is not there, so I would offer into the RECORD, Mr. President, a number of documents that support our view that it is $1.5 trillion. Others can agree, disagree about it, as it is presently written. I would offer that for the RECORD and our explanation and why we think that is accurate. I ask unanimous consent to have that material printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXPLANATION OF THE $1.5 TRILLION TAX HIKE IN THE SENATE DEMOCRATS' FY2014 BUDGET

When the Budget Committee minority staff began analyzing Senate Democrats' FY 2014 budget last week, they discovered that the plan called for not $975 billion in tax increases—the amount that the majority claimed—but instead $1.5 trillion in tax hikes.

How is this possible? The answer lies in an arcane budget tool known as a ''deficit neutral reserve fund'' (DNRF). Because it is not possible to legislate on a budget resolution, DNRFs were created to facilitate the passage of subsequent legislation. They do this by removing future barriers in the form of budget points of order.

To understand how DNRFs work, consider an example: A Senator wants to introduce a piece of legislation to increase funding for border security. Even if that bill's spending is completely offset with new tax revenue, the legislation could still be subject to a budget point of order. (Importantly, if the new spending is offset with spending reductions elsewhere, the bill would not be subject to that point of order.) So if the Senator knows during consideration of a budget resolution that he will be introducing border security legislation at a later time, he can offer a DNRF to preclude the possibility of that point of order being raised when his bill is brought up.

Returning to the Senate Democrats' FY 2014 budget, the majority asserts that their plan ''includes budget reconciliation instructions . . . that [instruct] the Senate Finance Committee to report legislation that will reduce the deficit by $975 billion through changes to the tax code alone.'' The budget also calls for an extension of the certain refundable tax credits that were originally included in the 2009 stimulus law (the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act). After accounting for the extension of these tax credits, the summary tables included with the budget reflect a revenue level that is $923 billion higher than the Congressional Budget Office current law baseline.

In a separate place in their policy document, Chairman Murray proposes to ''[replace] sequestration using the following equal mix of responsible spending cuts and . . . $480 billion in new revenue . . .'' Finally, the majority also proposes a $100 billion ''jobs and infrastructure'' package that ''is fully paid for by eliminating loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the tax code . . .'' [see Table 1]

It was initially assumed that this additional $580 billion was simply a detailed breakdown of a portion of the $975 billion in tax increases called for through reconciliation, but then Budget Committee analysts found two separate deficit neutral reserve funds (Sec. 301 and Sec. 308) that exactly

match those respective amounts. Recall that the sole purpose of a DNRF is to pave the way for legislation that increases both taxes and spending. If the Murray budget intended for the $580 billion to be a subset of the $975 billion, they would have had no need to include these two DNRFs. In other words, it must be assumed that the $580 billion is in addition to the tax hikes called for in the reconciliation instructions.

In total, therefore, the Senate Democrat budget clearly calls for $1.503 trillion (the $923 billion from the tax increases through reconciliation adjusted for the extension of the refundable tax credits plus $580 billion) in tax increases. The budget's authors have protested this calculation, but if they wish to clear up the confusion, surely they would agree to amend their resolution to remove these two DNRFs and remove any possibility that the funds will be used for additional future tax increases.

Table 1—Proposed Tax Increases in the Democrats' Budget

Proposed tax increases	10-year total	Cite in budget document* and how implemented
''Includes $100 billion . . . paid for by eliminating loopholes''	$100 billion	Top of page 8 ''Infrastructure'' Reserve Fund (deficit neutral: higher taxes for higher spending).
''This budget replaces sequestration using . . . $480 billion in new revenue raised by closing loopholes''.	$480 billion	Middle of page 21 ''Replace Sequester'' Reserve Fund (deficit neutral: higher taxes for higher spending).
$975B reconciliation instruction to Finance Cmte, less the extension of stimulus refundable tax credits.	$923 billion	Middle of page 66 Reconciliation Instruction
TOTAL TAXES IN BUDGET	$1.503 trillion.	

* ''Restoring the Promise of American Opportunity'', Chairman Patty Murray, March 13, 2013.

APPENDIX A—DETAILED CITATIONS IN CHAIRMAN MURRAY'S BUDGET DOCUMENT, ''RESTORING THE PROMISE OF AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY

On page 66 is an explanation of the $975 billion reconciliation instruction:

The Senate Budget calls for deficit reduction of $975 billion to be achieved by eliminating loopholes and cutting unfair and inefficient spending in the tax code for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. It recognizes that the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over tax legislation, could generate this additional revenue through a variety of different methods.

On page 55 is an explanation of the permanent extension of the 2009 refundable tax credits:

[T]he Senate Budget builds on the middle class tax relief that was legislated in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (ATRA) and supports the permanent extension of the American Opportunity Tax Credit... as well as the temporary enhancements to the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit, all of which are scheduled to expire after 2017.

On page 8 is an explanation of the new revenue used to pay for the new infrastructure spending:

Includes a $100 billion targeted jobs and infrastructure package that would start creating new jobs quickly, begin repairing the worst of our crumbling roads and bridges, and help train our workers to fill 21st century jobs. This jobs investment package is fully paid for by eliminating loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the tax code that benefits the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations.

On page 21 is an explanation of the new revenue used to pay for the sequester replacement:

This budget replaces sequestration using the following equal mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue from the wealthiest Americans, which builds on the precedent set in the bipartisan year-end deal... $480 billion in new revenue raised by closing loopholes and ending wasteful deductions that benefit the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations...

APPENDIX B—QUOTE FROM KEITH HENNESSEY (STANFORD UNIVERSITY), INCLUDED IN THE WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE ''MITCH MCCONNELL'S CLAIM THAT THE DEMOCRATS PLAN A $1.5 TRILLION TAX HIKE''

Keith Hennessey, another former GOP budget expert who now teaches at Stanford University... was especially suspicious of the fact that reserve funds do not have limits—as is sometimes the case in budget resolutions—and said it was perfectly acceptable to argue that the budget ''also allows for another $580 billion in tax increases to offset additional spending increases she [Murray] assumes and promotes aggressively.'' He added: ''If anything I'd argue that even the $1.5 trillion number understates the tax increases allowed by the Murray budget resolution. She's requiring $975 billion in tax increases to reduce future deficits, and allowing for unlimited amounts more to pay for new spending. I find that terrifying.''

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to say this to my chairman: I am willing to concede the point if the chair would agree to amend the two reserve funds so that they cannot be used to advance tax increases, and I would cease making that argument and accept the fact that you have already almost $1 trillion in new taxes.

So I would ask through the chair, is the Senator willing to amend those two reserve fund languages so they cannot be used to add another $500 billion in new taxes?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me just respond again. As the Washington Post said in giving this concoction two Pinocchios, the reserve funds the Senator refers to lie within there in order to provide the $975 billion in revenues. So essentially what he is doing is double-counting. So I would just say to the Senator through the Chair that there is no need to have any kind of agreement here. That is what our budget does. It is clear. It is what every expert has said.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the chair, and I assume, then, that she refuses to clarify the ambiguity, the certain option to increase taxes by another $500 billion. That could be eliminated simply by making the suggestion I just announced. She is rejecting that. So I think it is legitimate to assume that the intent of this reserve fund is to raise taxes another $500 billion.

Secondly, with regard to the situation we have been discussing concerning the sequester, I know the Senator said just a few moments ago that the sequester is not deficit reduction. We can disagree about that, but that was her opinion, apparently. I think it is inaccurate.

But my question to the Senator is, does your budget as now presented on the floor eliminate the spending limits that are in current law under the Budget Control Act and specifically the sequester portion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I have stated many times out here on the floor—and our budget is very clear—we replace sequestration with a balanced mix of spending cuts and revenues, exactly as we have stated. There is no reason to misconstrue this. That is exactly what our budget does.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, I wouldn't misconstrue it. So it does eliminate the sequester.

So then the next question would be, did you score the allowed increase in spending of $1.2 trillion in your budget as increased spending?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is a matter of semantics. We replace the sequestration, very clearly, because it is very damaging to our country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, your staff indicated that you could not double-count that money, and if you eliminated the $1.2 trillion in sequester limit and allowed $1.2 trillion more to be spent, you would not save $1.85 trillion but approximately $700 billion on that decision alone. Do you agree with your staff in their analysis?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I assume we are taking this off the Republican time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me be very clear: We have put out a budget that is credible. It is clear, and it is a good, solid approach. I know we are playing with numbers here in terms of baselines. There is no need to do that. We are doing what every single budget has done—Simpson-Bowles and everyone else—replacing the sequestration. We are clear that we have $975 billion in spending cuts, $975 billion in revenue. We, within the context of that, replace the sequester cuts. We take the $2.4 trillion that has already been done since Simpson-Bowles—since Simpson-Bowles and we add another $1.85 trillion in deficit reduction.

Mr. SESSIONS. One more question, then. Do you still stand by the promotional material that went with the budget—and in the budget document itself—that you have reduced the deficit over current law by $1.85 trillion or isn't it a fact that eliminating the sequester reduces that to approximately $700 billion in savings?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, over the baseline, which we are very clear in what we are using—we are not hiding the ball, as he is trying to do when he is mixing numbers here—we reduce the budget by an additional $1.85 trillion, absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would just say that the Associated Press disagrees. It is plainly inaccurate. Plainly, I asked that question, over current law, did they count the sequester increase in spending? And the staff admitted in our Budget Committee mark up that it did not—that increased spending—and therefore we reduce the deficit savings from $1.85 trillion to about $700 billion. There is another $700 billion in gimmicks, so there is no reduction in the deficit in this budget.

The AP reported:

> . . . because Democrats want to restore $1.2 trillion in automatic spending cuts . . .—cuts imposed by [the] failure to strike a . . . budget pact—Murray's blueprint increases spending slightly when compared with current policies.

The Hill says:

> The Murray budget does not contain net spending cuts with the sequester turned off.

So I will say this is a serious issue. We need to understand that the sequester is law. It is not just a policy, it is in law. It is taking effect right now. The deficit reduction proposed by this bill is not $1.8 trillion but, in fact, zero.

I thank the Chair and would now recognize Senator BARRASSO for 10 minutes, I believe, and Senator ALEXANDER for 10 minutes. I thank them for their patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, within the last 20 minutes, I have heard on the floor comments about the sequester. A previous speaker on the Democratic side of the aisle said the sequester was hurting small business and said the sequester was causing economic uncertainty. Another Senator on the other side of the aisle made reference to the Washington Post.

Well, I would draw the attention of this body to the Washington Post of this morning, a front page story in the Washington Post of today, Thursday, March 21: ''Health-care uncertainty weighs down small firms''—not the sequester, uncertainty about the health care law. ''Requirements under 2010 law sow confusion, fear among businesses.'' That is the problem that is driving the fear and the anxiety and the lack of new business starts and the failure to expand business.

In this article, there is a small business owner of an air-conditioning firm in Richmond. He says:

> In speaking to them, I am convinced—

He is talking about other customers, he is talking about other businesses—

> I am convinced that the primary reason we aren't seeing a robust economic recovery is the uncertainty and costs associated with this health-care law.

''Looming health-care changes hold back small businesses.''

Another quote from the article:

> It's already hard out there right now. . . . This may be—

''This'': the health care law—

> the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Not the sequester, not made-up confusion by the Democrats, it is the health care law that is hurting our economy. Even the Federal Reserve, in their Beige Book, said so this past month.

So I rise today to speak on the fiscal year 2014 budget and the choice we face over whether we are going to grow the economy or just grow government bureaucracy.

When I travel home to Wyoming, as I did last weekend and will again this weekend, I hear from hard-working American taxpayers that they do not believe Washington is spending their tax dollars wisely. They think Washington has become far too inefficient, ineffective, and unaccountable. It is not just the people in Wyoming I am hearing it from. According to Gallup, Americans across the country estimate that the Federal Government wastes 51 cents of every dollar it spends. More than half of all taxpayer dollars are wasted is what the American people believe. So when people look at the Federal budget—and the debate that we are having today in the Senate—it is no wonder they are concerned. They want to know how this budget is going to affect them and their quality of life.

Looking at the Democratic budget, I think the American people have every reason to be skeptical and every reason to be concerned. This budget is just more of the same—more taxes, more spending, and more debt—and it never reaches balance, not this year, not 10 years from now, not ever.

This budget does far too little to heal our ailing economy and far too much to expand Washington bureaucracy. The budget the Democrats have put forward would increase taxes by $1 trillion. That is on top of the trillion dollars in tax increases in the President's health care law. It is also on top of the tax hikes the President demanded in the January deal to avoid the fiscal cliff. In contrast, the Republican plan from the House Budget Committee will not increase taxes at all.

The Democrats' budget will also rack up $7.3 trillion in new debt over the next decade. Since President Obama took office 4 years ago, he has added more than $6 trillion to our national debt. For 4 years, he has run budget deficits of over $1 trillion each and every one of those 4 years. Now Senate Democrats want to throw good money after bad and add another $7 trillion on top of that. The President has simply wasted too much of the American taxpayers' money. The American people have been stuck with an enormous bill as well as an anemic economy and economic growth that has been very slow.

The American people think more than half of all Washington spending is wasted, and the Democrats cannot find a single dollar that they think should be saved. Democrats actually want to increase Washington's spending by another $645 billion.

This budget would spend $46.4 trillion over the next 10 years. Apparently, President Obama thinks the only things which need to be cut from our budget are White House tours.

Well, Republicans and the American people know there is a lot more we could be cutting. Taxpayers are demanding Washington finally get serious about our budget and stop the political games and political gimmicks. It is time for Washington to do what families across the country have always needed to do, live within their means. Democrats still don't seem to get it. They continue to insist the rules don't apply to Washington, and they should not be held accountable for their spending choices.

Like their other failed policies of the past few years, the Democrats' plan is very much a statement of their priorities. It does nothing to stop the overregulation which is destroying jobs and strangling our economy. It protects failing government programs from reform. It does nothing to preserve and protect Medicare and Social Security for future generations. It spends more money so Washington Democrats don't need to make a single tough choice. They have made their priorities clear, but they are the wrong priorities for America.

Republicans have offered a plan which starts to rein in Washington's spending and getting it back in line with revenue. This is what we should be doing. With a debt of more than $16 trillion, it is why, and it is way beyond the time to balance the budget.

We need to finally start to ease the burden of that debt on future generations. We need to reduce our obligations to countries such as China. We need budget reforms which help to grow our economy and create jobs, or we can go in the opposite direction the Democratic way. The Democratic budget never balances. It never even comes close to balanced.

The smallest deficit it ever achieves would be more than $400 billion in 2016, and then the deficit begins to climb again. It continues Washington's unrestrained borrowing and spending and continues the damage 4 years of failed Democratic priorities have done to our economy. According to one independent analysis, the Democrats' budget would cost America 853,000 jobs. Total economic output would be $1.4 trillion less because of this budget. Private investment would be $82 billion less per year.

As bad as this budget is, at least we finally have a Democratic budget to debate. This is the first time in 4 years the Democrats have even bothered to offer a budget in the Senate.

President Obama has not even submitted a budget. Where is the President's budget? It was due on February 4. Now the White House says they will

finally produce a budget maybe sometime in April. This is more than 2 months late.

What we have to work with is an unserious budget plan written by Senate Democrats. It is inadequate to the challenges we face as a country. It is out of touch with what the American people want, and it is a slap in the face to the hard-working taxpayers who will need to pay for it.

If President Obama truly believes we can take a balanced approach to our budget, he should publicly oppose this wildly unbalanced budget which harms America. We need a serious budget, one which grows the economy, not government bureaucracy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes about 11 million low-income children in America, children which all of us would like to help. These are children that I wish would have a chance to get a little help getting to the starting line towards realizing the American dream. I am talking about the children we help through the Federal education program called title I of the elementary and secondary education act.

It is the largest of our Federal programs aiding elementary and secondary schools. It provides $14.5 billion a year to local school districts. The express purpose of it is to help low-income children in schools across our country.

The problem is that the money is not going to help those children as it was intended. It is being diverted for other purposes.

As part of our discussion today and tomorrow on the budget, I will be offering an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator PAUL, Senator RUBIO, Senator TOOMEY, and Senator MCCONNELL, which will redirect the 14.5 billion Federal dollars we spend on behalf of 11 million children living in poverty.

This is the way we would do it: We would simply pin $1,300 in funds to each of those children, and let this money follow the child to the school they attend, any accredited school, public or private.

In a contentious Washington world this is a problem which seems to have a broad amount of agreement from the left and the right. As I said, this $14.5 billion, which is appropriated expressly to help these 11 million children, isn't getting to them. It is ending up in other places. It is distributed by a complicated Federal formula which is generally based on the percentage or number of low-income children in a particular school district and the average per-pupil expenditure in the State.

What happens is the money largely follows the teachers' salaries. The children in wealthier districts are usually taught by teachers who earn higher salaries. The children in poor districts are usually taught by the teachers who earn lower salaries. A lot of the title I money ends up in the schools with more of the wealthier children instead of the schools with the poorer children.

Marguerite Roza, in a report by the Center for American Progress—which I think can be fairly described as a progressive think tank, explained:

The difference in actual school expenditures are often substantial because teachers' salaries are based on their experience and credits or degrees earned, and because high-poverty schools have many more less experienced, lower paid teachers and much more turnover than low-poverty schools.

She offers Baltimore as an example:

> When teachers at one school in a high-poverty neighborhood were paid an average of $37,618, at another school in the same district the average teacher's salary was $57,000.

Assuming the same average number of teachers per school, say 20, the difference in dollars for the two schools is $387,640. That is a lot of money per school.

Under the Federal formula, this is considered ''comparable'' or fair, which means the poor school is essentially stuck with newer, less expert teachers. This is a system designed for the bureaucracy and the adults, not the students.

A different report by the Fordham Foundation, which I would call a center-right foundation, came to a similar conclusion. It summed up its findings by saying:

> All of these problems have a common root: today, money does not follow children to the schools they attend according to their needs. Instead, money flows on the basis of factors which have little to do with the needs of students, the resources required to educate them successfully, or the educational preferences of their parents.

We have scholars from the Center for American Progress and Fordham Foundation coming to the same conclusion, largely because the title I money is distributed based on teachers' salaries and because very often the wealthier school districts pay teachers more. We have significantly more title I money in a school with wealthier children than with poor children, even though the purpose of the $14.5 billion is to help those low-income children move from the back of the line to the front of the line.

This is a lot of money. This is $1,300 per child. If you have a school full of children who bring $1,300 with them pinned on their jackets, they have a lot of money to help those children. I think most of us believe that if we are trying to help children get to the starting line, children who might not have had as much help as other children, might not have had a book read to them by their parents, might not have eaten lunch that day, and who have other challenges associated with living in poverty, then we want to make sure we are spending every single dollar designated toward them for them.

Why isn't the right solution simply to say let's take these $1,300 per student and let it follow the student to the school they attend? This means almost all the money would go to public schools. We have 100,000 public schools in the country, but children are usually assigned to public schools. Sometimes they may choose a public school. This is a matter of State law. This wouldn't interfere with that at all. If the parent chooses instead for their child to go to a nonprofit or attend a private school, as long as that school is accredited, the $1,300 would follow the child to that school.

Some may say that sounds a little different than the way we do it now. It is a little different, but the main difference is the money follows the child. It is not different that we spend public money in private schools. We already do that with title I money by providing services to children who go to private schools under a formula in the Federal law. We have long experience, dating back to World War II, with public money following college students to community colleges, to universities, and even after World War II to high schools. The GI bill followed the veteran to the school they wanted to go to, whether it was the University of Tennessee, Notre Dame, Yeshiva, or any other school, as long as it was an accredited school.

Of course, in our system of education I think we would all agree that we have had the greatest success with higher education, for a variety of reasons. I believe one of the reasons for this success is we have provided generous amounts of Federal dollars that follow the student to the accredited college of their choice, public or private. We call those Pell grants. We call those federal loans. More than half of the college students in the country today go there with some government money that follows them to the academic institution of their choice.

By allowing title I money to do this, we could say the $1,300 scholarship is almost a Pell grant for kids. We could say we will attach it right to the child. It follows the child to the school. It is the most logical way to do that.

Some of my colleagues would like to fix this comparability problem by imposing a whole series of mandates on State and local school districts even though the Federal Government only supplies about 10 percent of all the money spent on local elementary and secondary schools. This would produce a minor revolution in the country, and it would be a gross overextension of Federal power to say that just because we provide 10 percent of the money, and we don't give it effectively, we are going to make it our job to tell Tennessee, Georgia, New Mexico, or any other State how to spend it.

The simple and logical way to solve the comparability problem that the left and the right agree on is to let the $14.5 billion follow each of the 11 million children living in poverty to the school they attend. Then we could make sure that taxpayer dollars are

being used in the most effective way to help these children have the single best opportunity they may have to get a leg up on reaching the American dream, which is through a good education in the best possible school.

I look forward to introducing an amendment to do this. As the ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, I look forward to working with Senator PAUL, Senator RUBIO, Senator TOOMEY, Senator MCCONNELL, and, hopefully, a number of my Democratic colleagues to solve the misallocation of title I money.

Let's do the simple and logical thing: Let the funds follow low-income children to the school they attend.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to raise my voice in this important dialogue about the budget currently pending before this body.

I am thrilled as, first, we are actually having this debate. It has been 4 long years since we passed a budget. I am deeply disappointed the President's budget is not part of this discussion. He missed his first Monday in February requirement, and it must not fit into his schedule to produce one until the second week of April.

Budgets are economic documents, but they are also much more than that. Budgets reflect moral choices we make as a nation. They shape the kind of society we will build for the future. Budgets are about setting priorities.

Republicans realize we have a moral obligation to spend the American people's hard-earned dollars wisely. When those tax dollars are paid into the government, we have an obligation to be careful with them. We should spend them only in areas that we need to cover a constitutionally authorized function of government and not $1 more. That is why we support reforms to fix programs that Washington should be funding, to eliminate programs that it shouldn't be funding and to balance the budget in the process.

We all know the Federal Government wastes hundreds of billions of dollars each year, and the President should work with Congress to identify and remove wasteful areas within the budget. My office has been focused on a very simple message that seems to make sense to every American: Cut this, not that.

The Federal Government wastes hundreds of billions of dollars every year, and instead of targeting waste, it is unfortunate the President is using fear-mongering tactics to scare Americans into believing cuts have to come first from important priorities—priorities such as first responders, law enforcement, national security, and educators.

The President and his allies in Congress want to increase spending and raise taxes. Republicans, meanwhile, want to prioritize spending and keep taxes low. The President is intentionally making cuts to government spending as painful as possible to force more tax increases. Cut this, not that.

This is a debate about priorities. Republicans have identified trillions of dollars in savings that would come from eliminating waste and reforming programs rather than cutting important essential services. The President is choosing to cut the most visible items in order to build opposition to any further spending reductions.

The debate should not be about whether we should cut, but, instead, how we should cut in order to preserve our ability to afford our true national priorities.

Here are some examples of the massive waste: $1 million spent taste testing food that would be served on Mars; $4.5 billion in improper food stamp payments used to purchase junk food, fast food, gourmet coffee, guns, and even alcohol; $1.5 billion for free and subsidized cell phones billed to the American taxpayer; $230 million spent on first-class and business-class travel.

I say to my colleagues and to the President of the United States, cut food testing on Mars, not teachers; cut free cell phones, not border security; cut premium first-class travel, not air traffic controllers; cut improper food stamp payments, not first responders.

The President's second inaugural address was an advertisement for the biggest, most expensive government our country has ever seen. It was a pitch for new government solutions, more government programs, and the promises of a government-made utopia. Of course, no mention was made about the future cost of the President's vision for the country, no mention was made about how we would pay for it, and no mention was made of the damage that will occur from our increasing debt and deficits.

Americans and Members of this body hear this message and get pulled into a debate over the proper size of government or whether a certain policy represents good government or bad government. We argue for a smaller or more limited government or for one that is more efficient or more affordable. Unfortunately, this is often where we fail to articulate a positive vision of what America looks like under the type of government we are striving to create. It is time to reframe this debate. It is time for us to focus on the kinds of principles that will lead us to the kind of country and the kind of society we want for our future and for ourselves.

Here is the principle I ask Americans and my colleagues in the Senate to consider: The opposite of bad government is not necessarily good government—at least not just good government. It isn't even necessarily limited government. The opposite of bad government is a strong civil society. A free and strong civil society is built on the innate desire of Americans to contribute freely to the betterment of the community. It is not the product of bureaucratic, centralized decisionmakers handing down rules and regulations for the rest of us to follow. A civil society is the result of the relationships that connect, bind, and strengthen us. It is derived from the condition in each of us to do our part to help those around us.

Civil society is where free individuals thrive and communities flourish. The interconnection of local communities has always been at the heart of our Nation. I am convinced our future success will be found in a return to that connectedness that has driven the American dream from the very beginning of our Nation.

We see the bonds of civil society when a parent instills values in a child, when a doctor heals a patient, when a teacher stays late to help a student learn to read, when a neighbor stops to help a neighbor, when a pastor inspires faith in a troubled soul. These are the keys to restoring our faith in the institutions of civil society and away from dependence on an administrative state full of so-called experts. ''We, the people'' does not mean a collective adherence to the agenda of the ruling class in Washington. It instead means that as Americans we share certain basic values and principles that when viewed as a whole help form and secure a more perfect union.

Americans' belief in civil society is grounded in bedrock principles of freedom, self-reliance, and self-governance. It is manifested in the form of historic American institutions, including the family, schools, churches, private groups, and civic organizations. These institutions of civil society teach the morals, values, and behaviors that instill faith, confidence, and trust between individuals, communities, and even government. The Constitution of this great Nation provides the framework that ennobles the vision of the individual while, at the same time, enabling the value of the institutions to create an environment where people are secure and prosperous and free.

It is important to remember that government cannot create a civil society, but it can kill it. Over the past 80 years, the Federal Government has expanded well beyond its constitutional limits. History demonstrates that as the power of the Federal Government increases, the ability to self-govern diminishes to a corresponding degree. As self-governance decreases, so too does the influence of the institutions of civil society. Soon, the ability to instill faith, competence, and trust among individuals and communities is replaced by the false promises of big government.

America is extraordinary, not because of who we are but because of what we do. Despite the current crushing weight of our bloated Federal bureaucracy, we can still see the strength of our Nation's fabric through the intertwining actions of the genuine heroes all around us. They are often described as the daily deeds that everyday citizens perform every day, but

they are powerful reminders of the strength of the American spirit and the values we share.

We have a moral obligation to future generations to make the peoples' priorities our priorities. The budget debate isn't just about dollars, it is about sense. It is about common sense. Rather than having a budget battle between Democratic and Republican priorities, we should be having a dialog about American priorities.

Republicans recognize that keeping dollars, decisions, priorities and, at the end of the day, power in the hands of the people is what has long made America the greatest civilization the world has ever known. Now is the time to return to that model. I encourage my colleagues to keep that very model in mind as we embark on this critical debate. Working together we can, we must, and we will restore the greatness and prosperity of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the recognition, and I ask unanimous consent—I was going to ask that Senator SHAHEEN be allowed to follow me. She is on the floor now and so she will.

I am pleased to stand and talk about amendment No. 138, sponsored by Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire and myself. It is a solution to a problem we have in this country and we have in this body. The problem is we have not been able to appropriate; we have not been able to budget. Our debts and deficits have grown, and it has turned into a situation where we do not function as well as we should over the most important responsibility of government; that is, spending money.

For one second I wish to talk about my side. Then I will defer to a lady who has been there and done that, because the State of New Hampshire is a biennial budgeting State.

We have a process problem. We budget every year, we spend money every year, but we never do oversight, we never look for cost-benefit savings, and we never look at analysis. This biennial budgeting amendment does the following things:

No. 1, it amends the Budget Act to require the Congress to do a 2-year budget, not a 1-year budget; No. 2, and followed by that, it requires them to do 2-year appropriations bills, not 1-year appropriations.

The appropriations bills and the budget are passed in the first year of a Congress, which means the odd-number year. In the even-number year, it is dedicated to oversight, efficiency, and cost-benefit analysis, something we do far too little of in this body and far too little of in this country.

Wouldn't it be nice to have elections every even-numbered year where Members of Congress were running for office based on the savings they are going to find, the efficiency they will create, and the accountability they will have in appropriations, rather than talking about how much more bacon they are going to bring home or how much more money they will spend.

This legislation creates a new majority point of order against any amendment that is not confined and coordinated with the 2-year budget process and the 2-year appropriations process.

I have been in Washington 15 years, and we have gotten into the business of when we do appropriations bills, they are omnibus; and when we do budgets, which we haven't done in 3 years, they end up being more of an argument over political philosophy than a practical roadmap for the American people.

The biennial budgeting process, which has been adopted by 20 of the 50 States in this country, is a process that will work and will force us to do what we know our job is—to appropriate, to budget, and then to conduct oversight to make sure the money we are spending is efficient.

One side note before I yield to Senator SHAHEEN. The State of Israel, 3 years ago—4 years ago—was having difficulty with deficits and debt. They went to the World Bank for advice and consultation and they recommended—the World Bank did—that they adopt a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process. In the 3 years since that time, while operating under those principles, they have gone from deficits to surpluses, and they have gone from debt to a lower debt. In other words, it has worked in Israel, it worked in a democracy, it works in 20 of our 50 States, and it can work in the United States of America.

Every President since Ronald Reagan has endorsed the biennial budget. Members of the Cabinet of the President who were nominated and have been confirmed have endorsed a biennial budget. Pete Domenici started this process 15 years ago, and we want to bring it to a conclusion this year. So I urge my colleagues to support and adopt amendment No. 138, creating a biennial budget process and accountability for our appropriations.

I yield the floor now to the Senator from New Hampshire, who has been there and done this in her State, and she is a great partner with me in this bipartisan amendment for success in this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I wish to thank my colleague from Georgia Senator ISAKSON for his eloquent and thoughtful remarks in support of the biennial budgeting amendment. I am proud to join him as a cosponsor of this amendment and a cosponsor of the legislation we introduced last week, in fact.

I am pleased to point out on the floor with us is Senator ANGUS KING, my neighbor from Maine, who is also a sponsor of biennial budget legislation.

I appreciate we have the budget resolution before us. I think it is an important step toward returning to regular order. But the fact is, as my colleague just pointed out, since 1980, we have only had two budget processes that have finished on time, according to schedule. We have had every President since that time, since Ronald Reagan, endorse a biennial budget. As my colleague said, I have been there and done that. As Governor of New Hampshire, as the Governors of 19 other States, we have biennial budgets. It has worked very well—because as this amendment would do, and as the biennial budget process would do, it would give us the chance to spend the first year of the budget cycle working on the budget, looking at programs and preparing for the budget and then the second year in oversight, so we can make sure what we are spending our money on is effective and is doing what we want it to do. It would give us a more transparent process and would, hopefully, allow us to address what has been one of the real challenges we have faced in Congress; that is, getting a budget through on time, according to the process.

As my colleague from Georgia pointed out, as we think about addressing the debt and deficits facing the country, as we think about investments we need to make going forward, thinking about how we can use the process in a way that is more effective, that works better, is something we also ought to be including. We have had a lot of momentum that is built around the biennial budget legislation. In the last Congress, we had 37 bipartisan cosponsors. We had the support of then-budget chair Kent Conrad and ranking member JEFF SESSIONS. So we have some momentum. I think we clearly have an opportunity. I hope we will take advantage of it and that our colleagues will support this effort.

I thank my colleague for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I just to want to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for what she has done in supporting this, and I thank my other colleagues who are supporting it. This is an idea whose time has come. I urge every Member of the Senate tonight to vote for this amendment so we can begin a new process and a new day in this Congress.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the chairman, and I rise to speak briefly in support of the Senate budget resolution and four amendments that I will be offering. I believe these amendments will improve the underlying budget resolution and they deserve broad support.

First, Udall amendment No. 192 addresses the need to increase access to care for rural veterans.

Many of these veterans, including those in New Mexico, travel long distances between their homes and Veterans' Administration medical centers. Many other States have rural veterans who face the same challenges. I am glad to be joined by Senator MORAN from Kansas as a cosponsor of this bipartisan amendment. Expanding access to health care in rural areas helps our veterans get the care they need.

The second Udall amendment, No. 311, would ensure that the 113th Congress can strengthen and reform the National Nuclear Security Administration. During the past decade NNSA has shown repeated failures in managing and planning projects. The result is costly overruns, deferrals, and, in some cases, security lapses. These failures are not only a threat to our national security, they pose threats to the safety of the scientists, engineers, and other workers employed at the National Labs.

I cosponsored an amendment to the 2013 Defense Authorization Act with Senator Kyl to form an advisory panel and to take a look at this to make bipartisan recommendations to improve the governance and structure of the NNSA. It is vital that necessary reforms would be completed.

The third Udall amendment, to lay the foundation, is for future hard rock mining reform in the 113th Congress. I have just filed this amendment so it does not yet have a number. We should correct a longstanding fiscal loophole and establish a royalty on hard rock minerals mined on Federal lands. Since 1872, the Federal Government has literally been giving away our gold, silver, uranium, and other hard rock minerals, handing over these public resources for free. A royalty is long overdue. It could be used for the reclamation of thousands of abandoned hard rock mines across the country, as well as for budget deficit reduction.

Oil and gas and coal all pay Federal royalties when extracted from Federal land. All other developed nations apply royalties to hard rock minerals. This amendment does not prejudge what type of royalty Congress might agree on. The mining industry supports one type of royalty. We have worked with Chairman WYDEN, Ranking Member MURKOWSKI, and Majority Leader REID on the text of this amendment, and I hope it is acceptable to a broad range of the Senate.

Lastly, I have also filed an amendment to allow for full funding of the Impact Aid Program. This program is one of the oldest Federal elementary and secondary education programs, going back 63 years. Impact Aid supports school districts that lose local revenues, such as property taxes, when educating pupils who live on Federal lands, such as military bases and Indian reservations. Impact Aid funding has been flat for many years, but the costs of education have gone up significantly, shortchanging many Indian communities.

I am pleased to be joined on this amendment by Senator BAUCUS of Montana who faces many of the same issues as we do in New Mexico and throughout the West. Finally, let me thank Chairman MURRAY for the work on this budget. She has shown real courage and leadership on this budget and pulled together a very diverse committee.

I think this is a budget bill that is good for the middle class, and it is going to be a fair and sensible budget. The budget is critically important to my State of New Mexico. It replaces the devastating sequester cuts with a balanced approach that will save thousands of jobs in my State. At home in New Mexico, sequestration is not just another political issue, it is a bread-and-butter issue for our family budgets: smaller paychecks, lost contracts, real economic harm.

Not only does the Senate budget resolution put a stop to the sequester, it also helps rebuild our economy with $100 billion for jobs and infrastructure investment. It will help spur job creation and rebuild the outdated infrastructure on which American businesses depend.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendments and support this budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to Ranking Member MURKOWSKI from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would my friend yield for a unanimous consent request?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. I do appreciate the courtesy. Members are waiting all over the Capitol and maybe a few other places.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending motion be set aside and the following amendments to S. Con. Res. 8 be called up:

Murray No. 433, Hatch No. 297, Stabenow No. 432, Grassley No. 156, Mikulski No. 431, Ayotte No. 158, Cruz No. 202, Murray No. 439, Crapo No. 222, and Shaheen No. 438; that the time until 8:10 p.m. be equally divided between the two managers, or their designees, prior to votes in relation to the Sessions motion and the first four amendments listed; that all after the first vote this evening be 10-minute votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote; that no amendments be in order to the motion or any of the amendments prior to the votes in relation to these items; that following votes this evening, the remainder of today's session be for debate only on the concurrent resolution; further, that when the Senate convenes at 9 a.m. on Friday, March 22, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 8 with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two managers or their designees; that at 11 a.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the remaining amendments listed above; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote and all after the first vote in this sequence be 10-minute votes; that upon disposition of the last amendment listed, there be 2 hours equally divided between the two managers or their designees remaining on the concurrent resolution; finally, the next amendment in order be an amendment from the majority side to be followed by a Republican alternative to Shaheen No. 438.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL today. We believe this is an appropriate way to go forward. I appreciate very much the work of the two managers on this legislation. This is noteworthy legislation. Debate at this point has been courteous and strong. There are feelings on both sides, and that is what this body is supposed to be.

So I am grateful to the two managers of this bill, and I again appreciate my friend from Alaska yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take 3 minutes off of our side of the 30 minutes to allow the Senator from Alaska to proceed, and then we will continue on the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I came to the floor, as Senator ISAKSON from Georgia and Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire were speaking about the biennial budget amendment and the effort they have undertaken. I just want to acknowledge their leadership on this issue. I think it is smart, I think it is wise, and I think it is something that we as a Senate should surely consider. I wanted to just make that brief comment.

As the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I know bipartisan progress on energy is possible in this Congress. While it may take our committee some time to develop, consider, and complete legislation within this area, we have a great opportunity to take the first step forward today through the adoption of a number of energy-related amendments that I have offered. I filed three amendments that would help us seize on the historic opportunities within our reach. I hope the Senate would agree to adjust the resolution before us to reflect their beneficial impact.

The first amendment that I have introduced is cosponsored by the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT. It would raise an estimated $3.1 billion—not through taxes but by facilitating new energy production on Federal lands and waters that are currently not open to development.

It is worth noting that the $3.1 billion estimate is probably far too low. Almost certainly that number does not account for the substantial receipts that would result from a good plan to boost Federal production offshore and onshore in Alaska and across the continental United States. But for this amendment, we relied on the Congressional Budget Office estimates for receipts that we already know we can raise. If we were to take action today, we will also generate far greater receipts in the years ahead. CBO doesn't assume that production will begin within its 10-year window, but it has acknowledged that Federal receipts will grow tremendously by several billion dollars a year once it does.

Some Members might question why this amendment is even necessary at all. They know that oil and natural gas production is rising in this country. After watching a few campaign ads, listening to a few speeches, they might think that everything is fine right now. But that is hardly the case. While overall production has in fact risen, the entirety of that increase has been from State and private lands. Production on our Federal lands and waters—the only area that the Federal Government is responsible for managing—has actually fallen.

According to the Congressional Research Service, oil production on Federal lands is down 6 percent since 2009 while natural gas production is down 21 percent. Just as worrisome, the pace of permitting—which is a key indicator for future production—has also slowed.

The Senator from Missouri and I believe it is time to produce more of our prolific resources beneath our Federal lands and waters. We need the jobs, we need to reduce our deficits, we need to keep energy prices down, and we need to break our dependence on foreign oil. New production will help us accomplish all of those crucial goals, and there is no real downside.

My second amendment is focused on increasing oil production on Federal lands in Alaska. Right now, no production is occurring on those lands. That is the case even though we have more than 200 million acres of Federal land and close to 40 billion barrels of conventional oil just waiting to be produced. The cause, of course, is the Federal Government continues to deny, delay, and generally up-end anyone who tries to bring energy to the market. The consequences are now apparent for all to see.

In 1988, Alaska produced more than 2 million barrels of oil per day. Last year, they had fallen all the way down to 526,000 barrels per day, and it is forecasted to drop even further in the years ahead. In Alaska, we are treating this as an emergency, and the Senate should as well. If our production continues to decline, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline system could be shut down. Our Nation could lose a substantial share of its oil supply. Jobs will be lost, energy prices will rise, our dependence on foreign oil will deepen, sapping our economy and progress that we have made.

These consequences and others that would manifest must be avoided—can be avoided—and it is within our power to do that. Alaska doesn't need subsidies or loans or grants or tax credits. What we need is permission to produce. We need the Federal Government to work with us, not against us. We need access to our National Petroleum Reserve. We need access to that tiny dot of land in the nonwilderness portion of the Coastal Plains. We also need to be able to explore new areas where resources have not yet been discovered.

My amendment is simple. It would modify the budget resolution to account for substantial receipts—about $2.5 billion—from increased oil in Alaska. As with the amendment that Senator BLUNT and I have cosponsored, this estimate is probably too low. We anticipate that receipts would grow tremendously once production begins. We always talk about the need for an ''all of the above'' policy. That would allow for it.

I have one final amendment that I would speak to briefly, and this is one that would facilitate the creation of an advanced energy trust fund. This was part of my energy 2020 blueprint that I released earlier this year. It is specifically designed to help create an energy policy that pays for itself. It would open new lands that are not currently available for development and devote a share of the receipts to energy research.

This concept has gotten pretty broad support, notably from the think tanks, and even more notably from the President himself. But I would be remiss if I didn't point out why my plan works and why the President's does not. While I would raise new receipts from new production, the President would divert revenues from production that is already scheduled to occur.

The result of his plan would be either deficit spending or, most likely, tax hikes elsewhere in the budget. Neither of those would be acceptable to us, particularly when we know there is a better path forward.

My amendments offer us an opportunity to create jobs, to make energy more affordable, to reduce our debt, to break our dependence on foreign oil. That is in the best interests of a coherent energy policy that so many of us are working to develop and certainly in the best interests of our Nation's budget. I encourage my colleagues to take a look at these amendments and, should they be brought before us for a vote, to join me in support of them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I think I can yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about amendment No. 156. I am offering this amendment to the majority budget to ensure that tax reform is revenue neutral and the money available to do tax reform is not used for spending, as the underlying resolution proposes. I am pleased to be joined in offering this amendment by a number of my colleagues: Senator ENZI, Leader MCCONNELL, Senator CORNYN, the finance ranking member Senator HATCH, as well as Senators BURR, ROBERTS, PORTMAN, ISAKSON, THUNE, COATS, and RUBIO.

In order to ensure tax reform does not become a tax-raising exercise, this amendment eliminates the nearly $1 trillion in new revenue and the reconciliation instructions called for in the majority's budget. It further creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund for progrowth, revenue-neutral tax reform.

The budget reconciles the Finance Committee to come up with nearly $1 trillion in revenue. I spoke last night how difficult that is to do unless you want to tax middle-income Americans. This reconciliation instruction, in addition to raising a lot of money to spend more, dashes the hopes that the Finance Committee can take a bipartisan approach to tax reform. First, it puts in place an arbitrary deadline that requires the Finance Committee to produce a bill by October 1 of this year. Tax reform will be a long and difficult process. Hopefully it will not take 3 years to produce it, as it did in 1986, the last major tax reform we had, but discussions about tax reform should not be cut short to meet an arbitrary deadline. The Finance Committee needs to be allowed to do its work.

Second, reconciliation is not a suitable way to produce tax reform that simplifies the Tax Code. This is because it prohibits any changes to the Tax Code that score as adding anything to the deficit. This requirement is incompatible with the goal of simplifying the Code, making it easier to administer. Chairman BAUCUS has voiced similar concerns, which is why he has concerns about including a reconciliation instruction in the budget.

While the budget does not call explicitly for tax reform to be a part of the reconciliation process, it has that effect by requiring the Finance Committee to come up with nearly $1 trillion in ''savings . . . by eliminating loopholes and cutting unfair and inefficient spending in the Tax Code.''

If such large amounts of low-hanging fruit exist in the Tax Code, you would have thought that either Chairman BAUCUS or I, during the period of time I was finance chairman, would have gone after some of these along with the billions of dollars of loopholes that we have worked to close already. The truth is that the majority's definition of a loophole is so broad as to be void of any real meaning, and their idea of spending in the Tax Code is popular deductions widely used by middle-class Americans such as tax deductions, mortgage interest, charitable giving, State tax deductions, and in order to

raise the revenue they want to, you have to go to those areas. When you do that, you end up taxing middle-class America.

Also, referring to these tax increases as savings or as eliminating loopholes or spending in the Tax Code does not change the fact that to raise nearly $1 trillion, the middle class will see higher tax bills. The budget of course does not only assume nearly a $1 trillion in tax increases, additional reserve funds in the budget assume another $500 billion in tax hikes to pay for more spending.

The underlying premise in this budget is that the Federal taxes are too low to support much-needed Federal spending. The budget resolution has this completely backwards because until we get spending under control, we will never be able to raise enough revenue that will suffice to satisfy the spending appetite that some in Congress have.

Yesterday I had charts—I have a different one today—that lists the last five times we had a balanced budget. The last five times were the years 1969 and 1998 through the year 2001—5 years in the last 43 years. As you can see, in each of these years, spending as a percent of GDP was significantly lower than 20 percent—significantly lower than 20 percent. This line represents the spending level of these years, right here, the years when we balanced the budget. Over the next 10 years as projected by the Congressional Budget Office, under current law spending will average 22.1 percent of gross national product as CBO estimates it under current law. Actually the budget resolution would be higher than that 22 percent.

Lower on the chart I have another dotted line which represents projected revenue, right here, about 18.9 percent. That is over the next 10 years. As this chart shows, these revenues are more than enough to bring our budget into balance simply if we return to the spending levels of the late 1990s and 2000.

The larger gap where spending was and where spending is projected to be is where our problem is. In between here and here is where the problem is. Congress has exhibited an appetite in the last few years to go hog wild on spending compared to the average of the last 50 years of about 20 percent.

We all know there is clutter in the Tax Code. There has been a proliferation of tax preferences that should be reexamined. However, they should be reexamined in the context of enacting progrowth tax reform, not as a means to finance higher government spending. The goal of tax reform is to simplify the Tax Code and make it more efficient. The ultimate goal is economic growth, but true tax reform should be revenue neutral. It should not act as a way to increase taxes. Revenue raised by eliminating tax preferences should be used to lower marginal tax rates because that is where you get economic growth, you encourage entrepreneurship, and that is how you create jobs.

The assumption in the budget that business and corporate loopholes are available for revenue reduction is particularly puzzling. We currently have the highest tax rate among our major trading partners. The President has even recognized the competitive disadvantage this puts us in. That is why he has called for reducing the corporate tax rate from 35 percent down to 28 percent. That is the President of the United States who wants to do that.

At a recent hearing before the Budget Committee on tax expenditures, the Democrats' only witness, Professor Edward Kleinbard, similarly recognized the need to use revenue from eliminating business tax preferences to lower rates. It was his view that the corporate rate should be reduced to the mid-20s by eliminating corporate tax expenditures.

I want to stress this was the opinion of the majority's witness. Raising revenues by closing so-called loopholes or reducing tax expenditures is a tax increase. Unless it is used to offset true tax reform, it is a tax increase that will support more spending, and that is the purpose of it, according to the budget resolution.

Tax reform, then, should be revenue neutral and my amendment would ensure that any reduction in tax preferences is used to lower tax rates. In other words, tax reform and not finance more spending.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 15 minutes off my time to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first I thank Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee for producing a budget that says loudly and clearly that our No. 1 priority is to fight for a stronger middle class, even as we dramatically reduce budgets and stabilize the debt by the end of the decade. I also applaud Senator MURRAY and the committee for producing a budget resolution that insists on a balanced approach to deficit reduction: both spending cuts and revenue increases—both.

I also applaud my colleague Senator LEVIN for his leadership on using his investigating subcommittee, his Permanent Committee on Investigations, to bring to light over the last few years the number of loopholes and the egregious tax spending that we are doing through loopholes that allows corporations and others to get by without paying their fair share of taxes.

Senator CARL LEVIN has long fought to bring fairness to the Tax Code. His investigations have shown that one of the major things we have to do is to close up some of those egregious loopholes.

My colleague from Iowa was just talking. He pointed out the years we balanced the budget. I note those are the years when we had a Democratic President, President Clinton. We were working off the 1993 deal that was made to both reduce spending and increase revenues. We had growth in the economy. We had low unemployment. We balanced the budget for 5 years in a row.

During that time our revenues averaged about 20 percent of our gross domestic product. Now it is down to less than 18 percent. We also know that demographics, including the tens of millions of baby boomers becoming eligible for Social Security and Medicare, will place vast new demands on our budget. At the same time, we need to make investments in infrastructure, research, and education to prepare our young people and our economy for the competitive global economy that is coming. I remind my colleagues that when President George W. Bush's tax cut was passed in 2001, it was defended on the grounds that it was only going to take a small part of the projected surpluses that we were going to have for the next 10 years. That was what was said.

As we now know, those surpluses didn't materialize. We had the tax cuts, we had two unpaid-for wars that completely wiped out the expected surpluses, and yet we kept those big tax cuts going and that created big deficits. Then the onslaught of the great recession in 2008 pushed our deficits even higher.

To date, only one-eighth of the revenues lost by the Bush tax cuts have been restored. Yet many of the Republicans keep repeating their mantra that we only have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This is demonstrably not the case.

If we go back in time, when I was here, President Reagan pushed through some tax cuts. To his credit, he realized he went too far. He reversed course and supported two income tax increases. In looking back just 12 years ago, President George W. Bush's tax cuts also went too far, again, contributing to the largest deficit in our history.

One would think we would want to reverse course, but Republicans have dogmatically refused to reverse course on increasing revenues. They are sticking to their ideological mantra. They say: Don't touch tax breaks for the wealthy and the largest corporations. Instead, cut the programs that undergird the middle class and meet the needs of the most vulnerable citizens. They demand that we slash funding for infrastructure, innovation, and education and keep tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

There are abundant opportunities for cutting waste, cutting spending, but it needs to happen on both sides. Yes, we need spending cuts. We need to cut spending by closing tax provisions in the Tax Code that hurt our economy. That is where we need to cut some spending—tax spending that goes to the wealthiest and goes to large corporations.

I will cite a few examples. Consider the so-called deferral provision governing taxation of profits earned by companies overseas. Follow this: A U.S. company can deduct the cost of starting a business overseas, such as building a facility. They can deduct the cost of shipping equipment to that plant even if it comes from America. But the Tax Code then allows these companies to delay paying taxes on these profits until its profits are brought back home.

So on one hand, they get tax breaks for building a plant overseas, they get other tax breaks for shipping the jobs overseas, they get tax breaks for shipping equipment that could be used in America overseas—those are immediate. They get the tax breaks right away, but when that plant earns a profit, they are not taxed until and unless they bring those back home. That is totally unfair to U.S. manufacturers who may have a factory in Iowa or New Mexico and pay their full taxes at a full and fair rate. The lost revenue is unfair to Americans who play by the rules, pay their full taxes, and, yes, Americans who rely on essential government services.

Here is another one. U.S. companies can sell their patents to their own subsidiaries with an overseas postal address in a country with low tax rates. The parent company is paid to use the patent, generating profits for the company, but the taxes on those profits are not paid as long as the money is technically in the subsidiary's account even if the money is deposited in a U.S. bank.

Consider another tax outrage, and we all know it by the name of ''carried interest.'' What does that mean? It means that for those individuals who are fortunate enough to make $10 million a year, they pay income taxes at the rate of 39.6 percent. But if a hedge fund manager makes $10 million managing a hedge fund and never invested a penny, they get taxed at 20 percent, not 39.6 percent. Twenty percent is the capital gains rate for most of our income. Well, why is that? Well, there is no rational reason. That was just put into the Tax Code I guess by some great tax lobbyist who was hired by the hedge fund industry.

These gimmicks and tax breaks cost the Treasury untold billions of dollars. They serve no constructive economic purpose. In fact, they give incentives to corporations to make decisions that harm the U.S. economy and American workers. By ending these abuses, we can generate needed revenue while creating a fairer Tax Code, one that does not reward corporations and the wealthy for behaviors that put the rest of us at an unfair disadvantage.

When I hear someone say, well, we are going to have tax reform, but it must be revenue neutral, what I hear is, let's keep all the tax loopholes for the wealthy and these large corporations. I say it is time to end that. We need that revenue for education, reinvesting in the infrastructure of our country, biomedical research, and science research. We need it to make sure that our young people today are able to compete in this global economy in the future.

Compromise, commonsense, and good-faith negotiations are what we need today. We do not need someone saying: No, we cannot raise revenues; all we have to do is cut spending. On our side, under the leadership of Senator MURRAY, we have said we will cut spending, but we will also raise revenues. We will have a balanced approach.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this budget resolution and to say no to all of these amendments that would upset what I think is a very good, solid budget resolution that has been put forward by Senator MURRAY and the committee. Let's put dogma aside. Let's act rationally and reasonably, and let's come together for a balanced and responsible solution to our Nation's budget challenges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise in support of amendment No. 297, which has been brought forward by my colleague, Senator HATCH from Utah. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment that establishes a reserve fund to repeal the onerous medical device tax. In fact, the medical device tax is nearly a $30 billion new excise tax on medical devices. It took effect on January 1 to pay for the President's new health care law, and it affects everything from orthodontics to the most complex lifesaving medical devices—just to name a few: joint replacements, knee braces, pacemakers, visual aids for sight-disabled people. It affects things that help people who are ill, such as lifesaving devices and technologies that people need, and this tax burdens all of them, and it will increase health care costs.

I thank Senator HATCH for his tremendous leadership on this issue. He has been fighting so hard to repeal this onerous tax since it went into effect. I thank Senator HATCH for bringing this important amendment forward because the medical device industry in America is a manufacturing success, and I have seen this in my home State of New Hampshire, where we have nearly 50 medical device companies that employ almost 3,500 Granite Staters. We are very proud of those companies, and we want to keep them in New Hampshire and hopefully grow them. When I campaigned for the Senate, I went to visit many of these companies. They told me about this tax and the impact it will have on their companies.

The medical device technology and medical field in this country is a great success story. In 2008 the industry employed over 420,000 workers, generated more than $24 billion in payroll, and paid 40 percent higher salaries than the national average in terms of a job. These are great-paying jobs. They are high-quality, good-paying, sustainable jobs, and this tax is going to make sure we have fewer of those good jobs that Americans want so much right now. With the Nation's unemployment rate still unacceptably high, we should be doing everything we can to create a good climate for American companies so they can strive and make sure we have more economic growth and make sure people have good-quality and high-paying jobs.

If this tax is left in place, the medical device tax will absolutely stifle hiring. For example, a 2011 study by the Hudson Institute found that the device tax threatens nearly 43,000 jobs nationwide and will cost $3.5 billion in wages. I hear a lot of talk from my colleagues about investing. This is something where this tax is basically going to kill good-paying American jobs. It defies common sense. Over 16 percent of respondents to a survey last year said they would reduce staff and employees in order to lower costs before the implementation of this device tax.

In my home State of New Hampshire, a study found that we could lose potentially hundreds of employees due to the cost of this medical device tax.

I had an opportunity to visit one of those companies, Corflex, which is located in Manchester. They manufacture orthopedic medical products. Corflex has seen steady growth over the years. It is a small thriving business in Manchester, NH. When I met with the CEO at Corflex, he showed me their balance sheets. He showed me the balance sheets before the medical device tax went into effect and after the medical device tax went into effect. What he showed me is that they went from being a profitable company to a company that would sustain a loss. This is a great company that was founded by a person in New Hampshire who was an entrepreneur and just had a dream. This tax would change a profitable company into a company that would experience a loss. He said: If this tax is not repealed, it will ultimately force companies, like us, to cut research and development dollars, pass costs on to consumers, or even consider reducing our workforce.

Last year I visited Smiths Medical Facility in Keene, which employs 500 people in New Hampshire. They are doing great work at Smiths Medical. The vice president of global operations of technology told me that repealing the medical device excise tax is about improving patient care and investing in more innovation and jobs.

The medical device tax has sadly already cost the United States thousands of jobs. We need bipartisan action now to repeal this onerous tax that is killing jobs in this country. I know there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who support the Hatch amendment.

For smaller device companies, like many in New Hampshire, this tax hits them even harder. In fact, Teleflex—a Pennsylvania-based company that has

a manufacturing plant in Jaffrey, NH—does what many larger medical device companies do: they rely on small companies to do their research and development. The vice president of Teleflex said:

> I think the fear is that there is a lot of good that comes out of small medical device companies, and with more costs thrown upon them, it's going to be harder and harder for them to sprout up and make a go of it . . . I think the view in the industry is that this is going to stifle innovation.

Why is this going to stifle innovation? Because this is a tax that is not a tax on profit, it is a tax on revenue. It is a 2.3-percent tax on revenue. What does that do to startups? What does that do to investments? Basically what we are saying is, don't start your new medical device company here with your new idea on how to save American lives because we are going to tax you whether you make a profit or not. That is why this tax is very onerous on startups. It is essentially a tax on innovation.

The device tax also stands to increase health costs, and that is why I don't understand why it was used to fund the President's new health care law—because we are going to see greater costs. In fact, the CMS Actuary, Richard Foster, said he anticipates that the excise tax will generally be passed on to health consumers in the form of higher drug and device prices and higher insurance premiums. It will raise national health costs by a whopping $18.2 billion by the time we reach 2018.

Even though it only went into effect a couple of months ago, we are already hearing about the job losses in this country because of the medical device tax. We heard that Stryker Corporation laid off 5 percent of its global workforce. Covidien, which makes surgical instruments, recently announced the layoff of 200 American workers. And guess where they plan to shift their production. They are shipping it offshore to Mexico and Costa Rica. And that is the other impact of this tax—encouraging new devices to go elsewhere, to plant their new investment in other countries instead of here in the United States of America. That is another horrible impact of this medical device tax. Zimmer said it planned to cut jobs and outsource. The CEO of Cook Medical, the world's largest privately owned medical device company, said it will have about $20 million less to develop and improve patient care and access to technology. We heard so many of these stories about American companies that are being hurt tremendously by this medical device tax.

So what is this about? This is about repealing this onerous tax. This is a tax that taxes innovation, increases health care costs, and also is a tax that kills good-paying American jobs.

Finally, we want the new medical devices to be developed here in this country. We don't want them to be developed in Europe because of an onerous tax. What we are going to see is that Americans are going to have less access to the very new and best products because it is going to become too costly in this country for new companies to develop those products and for startups and, at the end of the day, it will be sad for Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hatch amendment and, again, I thank him for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I think we have confusion on the time limits. I had reserved 10 minutes; I have 17 on the motion. I think there has been some confusion about it. What is the status of the time?

I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 8:10 is divided. Of that remaining time, the Senator from Alabama has 8 minutes. There is still time remaining on the motion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Does that include—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But it cannot be used before 8:10.

Mr. SESSIONS. So that time could be used after 8:10?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. After the votes occur.

Mr. SESSIONS. After the votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes equally divided.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, my colleague Senator HATCH is here. The 8 minutes, as I understand, that exist—he wishes to speak. If he spoke, would that count against my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Senator's time to yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be delayed until 8:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, our Members have been waiting for 2½ hours to get to a vote. I know we have had a lot of time to debate. We will have additional time after the votes as well, as the Senator knows, tonight and tomorrow morning. I would respectfully ask if we could stay on time because a lot of Members have been waiting for the vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, reclaiming the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the vote start at 8:12, and I will be happy, and we will make it all happen. Senator HATCH can have 1 minute.

Mrs. MURRAY. I assume that means the time will be divided equally, which means the Senator from Alabama would only have 1 additional minute.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will do my best.

I yield to Senator HATCH for 30 seconds.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words in support of amendment 156 offered by Senator GRASSLEY and myself.

This amendment would strike the tax reconciliation instructions from the budget and, instead, create a deficit neutral reserve fund for pro-growth, revenue-neutral tax reform.

The American people have had it with our current tax code.

It is too complex.

It is overly burdensome.

And, it is an impediment to economic growth and our global competitiveness.

Members from both parties need to work together to reform our tax code to provide greater fairness and simplicity and to ensure that it encourages growth.

In order to do that, we need to work at finding ways to broaden the tax base in order to lower the marginal tax rates.

That is how we encourage economic growth.

That is how we create jobs.

For the first time in many years, there is bipartisan agreement in both the House and Senate on the need to move forward on tax reform.

Unfortunately, rather than letting those efforts move forward, the budget before us today would hijack those efforts.

Under this budget, the Finance Committee would be instructed to scour the tax code in search of nearly $1 trillion in new revenues in order to pay for new spending.

It is bad enough that this budget would greatly increase our Nation's debt. And, it is bad enough that it doesn't balance at any point.

But, to add massive tax increases on top of that is simply unconscionable.

As I said this afternoon, more than 70 percent of the revenue loss due to tax expenditures comes from the top 10 tax expenditures, most of which predominantly benefit the middle class.

As Senator GRASSLEY stated last night, the top 20 tax expenditures—which also greatly benefit the middle class—account for 90 percent of the revenue loss.

So, as we can see, we simply cannot generate a significant amount of revenue—certainly not in the magnitude imagined under this budget—without negatively impacting the middle class.

I hope my colleagues will reject this attempt to once again raise taxes on the American people.

Toward that end, I hope they will support our amendment.

I will recap quickly. The Grassley-Hatch amendment assures tax reform will travel on a bipartisan path. It corrects the partisan process in the budget with an elimination of reconciliation. That is all it does, and we ought to all support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I thank my colleague, the terrific chair of the Budget Committee, who has worked so hard in putting together the budget.

I wish to speak for a moment on the amendment I will be offering in a few

moments that relates to Medicare and protecting Medicare for future generations by keeping it as an intact insurance plan. There are very different visions, as we all know, and this will be an opportunity tonight to vote on which vision we support.

The House, under the Ryan Republican plan, has eliminated Medicare as we know it and replaced it with a voucher program which only covers part of the costs, increasing costs for seniors of around $6,000 per person. They would have to go back into the private insurance market and try to find insurance that would work for them.

We very clearly say that Medicare is a great American success story. We have created a generation of seniors such as my mom and future generations who will be able to live longer, healthier lives, play with their grandchildren and great-grandchildren because of something they have paid into all of their lives called Medicare.

When we look at the choices, even the people who invented this whole idea passed by the House have said that the proposals ''lack safeguards for beneficiaries and threaten to shift costs to the elderly and disabled and force them to shop for coverage in a confusing insurance market.''

That is what the folks who came up with the Republican idea are saying. Even Chairman RYAN's own description of his plan admits: ''We are stopping the open-ended, defined benefit system.''

In other words, the Republican plan will end Medicare and end its guaranteed benefits—benefits that seniors have paid into throughout their lives, for the security of knowing they have a health insurance plan; they won't have to go out and try to figure out how to find private insurance and then have a voucher to pay for part of it.

To add insult to injury, what is most concerning is the money that is taken away from seniors, the costs that are added, the savings in the Republican budget, don't go to save Medicare, they go to give another round of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. One more time we are seeing seniors, as we have seen middle-class families, as we have seen the vulnerable in our communities, find themselves sacrificing over and over again so the wealthiest among us, the well-connected, can get another special tax deal.

My amendment makes it very clear. If Members vote for my amendment, they are voting for Medicare. If Members vote against it, they are voting for the Republican plan that dismantles Medicare as we know it and takes the money and turns it around and gives it to another tax cut for the wealthy.

The other side of the aisle and those on the other side of the building have called the Ryan Republican plan a balanced plan. It is certainly not balanced for seniors. It is anything but balanced for the middle class. I hope when the opportunity comes we will see a very strong vote in support of my amendment to guarantee Medicare going forward for our seniors.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, it is good to be considering a budget again. It has been 4 years since one has been brought to the floor. It is important that we do so because the Nation has never, ever faced a more systemic debt threat to our country.

Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson both told us before the Budget Committee that this Nation has never faced a more predictable financial crisis. What they meant was that if we don't change course, we are going to have a crisis.

I would say one of the things that would make our economy grow better, create jobs, confidence, and productivity gains would be for this Nation to commit itself in a responsible way over a decade of effort to balance the budget. We can do that with increasing spending every year by 3.4 percent. It does not even require a net reduction in spending each year. It will be hard. It will require us to change some course because we are on a path now to increase spending 5.4 percent a year, and that is the difference in an unsustainable path and a sustainable path.

We have the budget of the majority before us, Senator MURRAY's budget. It is not the kind of budget we should pass. It is the kind of budget—it requires alteration, in my view, and it needs to be placed on a path to balance. I think my Democratic colleagues implicitly agree with that, because they have been talking about balance all week. We started keeping a tally on it.

Look at this chart. We made this chart not too long ago. We determined the word ''balance'' had been mentioned by the Democrats 120 times. We kept on counting and now it is up to 165 times. Maybe that indicates they believe a balanced budget is important. They say, however, that when they say balance they mean we balance deficit-reduction spending cuts with deficit-reduction tax increases, and that totals $1.9 trillion in net deficit reduction. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I hate to say that. It is unbelievable to me that in the Senate we have legislation on the floor that is being counted $1 trillion—really $2 trillion off—and fundamentally, indisputably, that is correct.

At the Budget Committee hearing last week, I asked a staffer for the Democratic majority:

> Can you honestly say that under this budget you can achieve $1.85 trillion in deficit reduction and eliminate the sequester with only $975 billion in new taxes?

The answer: ''No.''

When I pressed him: Well, what does that mean? He said it would be $700 billion. And what he was talking about was $700 billion under current law.

The way the confusion has occurred is our colleagues are switching around in the way they compare spending cuts.

This is the true situation: Under current law—that is the Budget Control Act and the tax increases we had in January—that is current law—we are projecting to continue deficits throughout the entire 10-year period and increase interest charges by dramatic amounts, placing this country in a very serious predicament.

So what do we say about it? Mr. Elmendorf, the Director of CBO, testified a couple of weeks ago before the Budget Committee and I asked him: Under the current law that we are operating under, including the full cuts in the sequester, including the tax increases in January, were we still on an unsustainable course? He said we were.

What I want my colleagues to know with every fiber in my being is: Please know that if you take out the sequester, you increase spending. You do not have $1.9 trillion in deficit reduction. You have only $700 billion. And then if you add other gimmicks in the budget, including not scoring the doc fix, misscoring war costs, and misscoring the stimulus spending, we end up with hardly any deficit reduction at all.

We raise taxes in this budget almost $1 trillion. We have no deficit reduction because we increase spending as much as we increase taxes. So, apparently, my colleagues should know and think about this: A ''balanced'' plan that has been mentioned 165 times means we raise taxes $1 trillion and we increase spending $1 trillion, and there is no net deficit reduction in the course of this 10-year budget.

So we are asking that this budget go back to the committee and give them full authority to produce a balanced budget in any way they wish to. They can raise taxes, they can cut spending, but we are saying we have to get off the unsustainable debt course. The choice is to have a balanced budget because it will create confidence, it will create business certainty, it will electrify the world, it will help people see that we are on a sound path and not on a dangerous path that could lead to fiscal crisis.

It is so important for my colleagues to know one more thing, and that is experts have told us—Carmen Reinhart with the Reinhart-Rogoff study has told us that when debt reaches 90 percent of the value of our GDP, growth begins to decline in the country. We are now at 104 percent, and the debt factor is the gross debt of the United States is what they used in that study. This is confirmed by the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, and the Bank for International Settlements, all of which have done studies of developed nations with high debt, and they say it cuts growth. Reinhart and Rogoff says 1 to 2 percent. A 1-percent reduction in growth amounts to a million jobs. For the last 3 years, our growth has substantially

fallen below what CBO projected. I believe the debt is already pulling down our growth.

I ask my colleagues one more thing: All of us have traveled our States. We have talked to our constituents. We have answered their questions. They ask: Are you going to do anything about the budget? Are you going to balance the budget? Why aren't you bringing up a budget? Don't you, colleagues, say we should have a balanced budget? Don't you say we should be moving toward a balanced budget, at least?

Many of you—at least half of our Democratic colleagues—have said they favor a balanced budget constitutional amendment so we have this country on a right path. You validated your promises back home. You should support moving this bill back to conference and letting the chairman write a budget that balances. It would make this economy much better.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 433, 297, 432, 156, 431, 158, 202, 439, 222, AND 438 EN BLOC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the amendments that are in order en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes amendments en bloc: for Mrs. MURRAY, amendment numbered 433; for Mr. HATCH, amendment numbered 297; for Ms. STABENOW, amendment numbered 432; for Mr. GRASSLEY, amendment numbered 156; for Ms. MIKULSKI, amendment numbered 431; for Ms. AYOTTE, amendment numbered 158; for Mr. CRUZ, amendment numbered 202; for Mrs. MURRAY, amendment numbered 439; for Mr. CRAPO, amendment numbered 222; for Mrs. SHAHEEN, amendment numbered 438.

The amendments, en bloc, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 433

(PURPOSE: TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 297

(Purpose: To promote innovation, preserve high-paying jobs and encourage economic growth for manufacturers of lifesaving medical devices and cutting edge medical therapies)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE TAX.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the House and the Senate, motions, or conference reports related to innovation, high quality manufacturing jobs, and economic growth, including the repeal of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 432

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare's guaranteed benefits and to prohibit replacing guaranteed benefits with the House passed budget plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PROHIBITING MEDICARE VOUCHERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to access for Medicare beneficiaries, which may include legislation that provides beneficiary protections from voucher payments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 156

(Purpose: To protect Americans from a $1,000,000,000,000 tax increase and provide for pro-growth revenue-neutral comprehensive tax reform)

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 3 and insert the following:

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE-NEUTRAL PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a revenue structure that is more efficient for individuals and businesses, leads to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, and may result in additional rate reductions without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 431

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to require equal pay policies and practices)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 158

(Purpose: To prohibit the consideration of a budget resolution that includes revenue increases while the civilian unemployment rate is above 5.5 percent, the administration's prediction for the unemployment rate without the stimulus)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF A BUDGET RESOLUTION THAT INCLUDES REVENUE INCREASES WHILE THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS ABOVE 5.5 PERCENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that includes a revenue increase while the unemployment rate is above 5.5 percent.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) DETERMINATION OF REVENUE INCREASE.—For purposes of this section, a revenue increase is an increase in Federal Revenues in any fiscal year above total revenues in the same fiscal year of the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline.

(d) DETERMINATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of this section, the unemployment rate is the Current Population Survey seasonally adjusted national unemployment rate for the most recent month, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

AMENDMENT NO. 202

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and to encourage patient-centered reforms to improve health outcomes and reduce health care costs, promoting economic growth)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 439

(Purpose: To amend the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to provide tax relief for low and middle income families)

On page 56, line 12, insert ''relief for low and middle income families'' after ''enterprises,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

(Purpose: To establish a deficit neutral reserve fund to repeal the tax increases enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that were imposed on low- and middle-income Americans)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL TAX INCREASES UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IMPOSED ON LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would repeal the tax increases enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that were imposed on low- and middle-income Americans by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 438

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to health care, including primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, and employer-provided contraceptive coverage, such as was provided under the Affordable Care Act (PL 111–148))

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to women's access to health care, which may include the protection of basic primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, or employer-provided contraceptive coverage for women's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for these purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 433

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want all of our Members to understand that the second amendment we will be voting on tonight is the Ryan budget.

Now, there seems to be some resistance among my Republican colleagues in bringing up the House Republican budget for a vote, and it is pretty easy to see why that is. Last year's Republican budget was, in fact, soundly rejected by the American people in the election. Since then, it continues to be very clear the American people prefer a balanced and fair approach that puts our economy and our middle class first—not an extreme, irresponsible approach.

Unfortunately, House Republicans put forward a budget last week that doubles down on the rejected ideology that the American people spoke about. They have a new talking point about their same old budget. They now claim their budget would eliminate the deficit in 2023. House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN has even said it does not really matter how their budget eliminates the deficit.

Americans across our country who will feel the impact of the choices we make in the coming weeks and months believe that it does matter. So while some of my Republican colleagues would probably prefer not to hear about it, I think that the impact of the House Republican budget is a crucial part of this debate, and we owe it to the American people to put our opinions on the record.

We have come a long way, but there are still far too many Americans today who are unemployed or underemployed, which is why our Senate budget's first priority is boosting our economic recovery.

Speaker BOEHNER has actually agreed with President Obama that our debt does not present ''an immediate crisis.'' So you might think the House budget would phase in cuts responsibly so we can protect our fragile recovery.

Instead, the House Republican budget would do serious damage to job creation and job growth, and it doubles down on the harmful cuts from sequestration, which the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates will lower employment by 750,000 jobs this year alone and slow economic growth.

The House Republican budget will weaken our economy in the long term as well. As any business owner will tell you, in tight times, the last thing you want to do is cut investments that help make you stronger. Well, that is what the House Republican budget does. It cuts investments in education, so our students and workers are less prepared for the jobs of the future. It would undermine our ability to upgrade our roads and bridges and highways and ports even though our national infrastructure just got a D-plus from the American Society of Civil Engineers. And the House budget would greatly reduce our ability to support research and development, making it so much harder for us to maintain the innovative edge that helps us attract new industries and new businesses to the United States.

Americans want to see a budget that puts the middle class first and asks the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations to do their fair share too as we work toward deficit reduction.

So our Senate budget locks in tax cuts for the middle class while closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code. Our budget uses that new revenue from the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations for deficit reduction and for investments that support our economy and strengthen our middle class.

The House Republican budget, which we will vote on tonight, does the opposite. According to the Tax Policy Center, the tax plan in the House Republican budget would cost nearly $5.7 trillion in lost Federal revenue, and the majority of that lost revenue would benefit the wealthiest Americans.

Just like past House Republican budgets, it is once again pretty unclear how this budget would pay for all those tax cuts that are skewed toward the wealthiest. But the reality is that to achieve the goals that are laid out in their budget, House Republicans will either have to add to the deficit—meaning their budget might not actually balance, as they claim—or they are going to have to raise taxes on the middle class.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, to keep from increasing the deficit while lowering rates—which they propose to do—the House budget would have to raise taxes by an average of $3,000 on families making less than $200,000 a year who have children. But in their plan, the wealthiest Americans will see a net tax cut averaging about $245,000.

There is no reason middle-class families should have to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. That is bad for our economy. It is very unfair. That kind of unbalanced approach is what made Americans reject the House Republican budget in the first place.

The same is true of Medicare. We just heard Senator STABENOW talk eloquently about the importance of Medicare. Well, the House Republican budget would replace the Medicare guarantee with a voucher, capped at growth levels below projected health care costs, forcing our seniors to pay more and more out of pocket, and ending Medicare as we know it.

That is not a solution that our seniors deserve.

AARP said, in their critique of the House Republican budget:

> Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

That is not me, that is AARP.

The Senate budget offers a much better answer. Let me remind everyone, in our budget we uphold the principle—consistent with Simpson-Bowles and all other bipartisan deficit reduction proposals—that the most vulnerable families should not be asked to bear the burden of deficit reduction.

Our budget maintains the safety net that has kept millions of families and children above the poverty line during the recession and strongly supports efforts to help our low-income students and others, as they try to get back in the job market.

House Republicans say their budget balances. Nothing in it sounds like balance to me. I would like to remind my colleagues as this debate continues that unlike what House Republicans have said about how a budget achieves its goals, how it achieves those goals really matters a lot.

The American people have rejected this plan, and, understandably, some of my colleagues across the aisle would prefer not to vote on it. Our Senate budget offers a credible, serious approach to a fair and bipartisan agreement. It puts jobs and the economy first and provides a credible, balanced path forward.

We are going to have to make some tough choices in the coming weeks and months, and I recognize moving away from the extreme approach in the House Republican budget is going to be a tough choice for many of my Republican colleagues. But I hope, as they consider the effects of the House Republican budget on our economy and on our families throughout the country, and the fact that the House Republican approach has been thoroughly reviewed and rejected by the American people, they will now be willing to come to the table, end the gridlock and dysfunction, and discuss a fair, comprehensive budget deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—53

Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Baucus	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cowan	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The motion was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while I have everyone's attention, today, this evening, and tomorrow, we are going to have a lot of votes. Everyone should understand they are not going to have time to spend a lot of time with constituents, to make phone calls. When the time is up, we are turning it in—Democrats or Republicans. There are no excuses. We have a lot to do and we are determined to get these votes in very quickly.

AMENDMENT NO. 433

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this next amendment is the Ryan budget. The House Republicans have doubled down on failed policies by passing the same budget that was rejected by the American people just a few months ago. Now Senate Republicans are going to have to decide whether they agree with this approach.

This budget would be devastating for the middle class and the economy. It would cause millions of our workers to lose their jobs and dismantle programs such as Medicare that seniors and families depend on. It relies on gimmicks and tricks to eliminate the deficit by an arbitrary date and does all that while giving the wealthiest Americans a tax cut.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the House Republican budget does something the Democratic budget does not do—it balances. It actually balances in 10 years, and it does it not by taxing more but by spending less, spending at a slower rate—3.4 percent over that 10-year period.

If we look at what the House Republican budget does, it is focused on growing the economy, not growing the government. What the Democratic budget, before the Senate this evening, does is it grows the government, not the economy.

In fact, if we look at the analysis that has been done, it is suspected the Democratic budget would cost us 850,000 jobs and reduce take-home pay for middle-class families by $1,500. The House Republican budget takes seriously the challenges that are facing this country, takes the steps necessary to save and protect Medicare for future generations of Americans, something this budget—the Senate Democratic budget—does not do.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget, and it is a serious one, that balances the budget in 10 years and puts our economy back in growing mode and our fiscal house back in order.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Thune
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—59

Baldwin	Cruz	King
Baucus	Donnelly	Klobuchar
Begich	Durbin	Landrieu
Bennet	Feinstein	Leahy
Blumenthal	Franken	Lee
Boxer	Gillibrand	Levin
Brown	Hagan	Manchin
Cantwell	Harkin	McCaskill
Cardin	Heinrich	Menendez
Carper	Heitkamp	Merkley
Casey	Heller	Mikulski
Collins	Hirono	Murphy
Coons	Johnson (SD)	Murray
Cowan	Kaine	Nelson

Paul
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 433) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 297

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 297, offered by Mr. HATCH.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what we want to do is repeal the $30 billion costly medical device tax. It is a gross tax on these businesses. We have already lost 5,000 jobs and we will lose 46,000 more.

I hope everybody will vote for this.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, this is a bipartisan amendment. This is about innovation and jobs. The medical device industry is one of our biggest exporters. We have so many opportunities out there with a growing middle class in China and India to export even more, but we cannot have a tax that puts us at a competitive advantage. I think people understand that. This is about manufacturing, high-skilled jobs, millions of jobs in America.

I ask my colleagues to vote with Senator HATCH and me to repeal this tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Begich
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cowan
Crapo
Cruz
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Fischer
Flake
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hagan
Hatch
Heitkamp
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Lee
Manchin
McCain
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Paul
Portman
Pryor
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Schumer
Scott
Sessions
Shaheen
Shelby
Stabenow
Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Vitter
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—20

Baucus
Boxer
Brown
Carper
Coons
Feinstein
Harkin
Heinrich
Hirono
Johnson (SD)
Landrieu
Leahy
Levin
McCaskill
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Tester
Udall (NM)

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment No. 297 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 432

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 432, offered by Ms. STABENOW.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield my 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, this is a very simple, straightforward amendment. A ''yes'' vote supports Medicare as an ongoing insurance plan. A ''no'' vote sides with what the House of Representatives has done with the Ryan Republican budget: dismantling Medicare, turning it into a voucher program, adding $6,000 on average in costs to seniors and, adding insult to injury, their budget takes the money, doesn't strengthen Medicare but provides another tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, averaging about $245,000 for those at the very top. Please vote yes. Let seniors know in this country what they have paid into their entire lives will be there for them and the great American success story of Medicare will remain strong for the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise to set the record straight. Amendment No. 432, which characterizes the House budget plan as a plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program, is patently false. This amendment is not trying to voucherize Medicare. That is not true. I think it is ironic that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle attack the House budget proposal when the Affordable Care Act took $716 billion from the bankrupt Medicare Program to create an unsustainable new entitlement.

In no way can the House budget be considered as turning Medicare into a voucher program, and we reject the characterization of amendment No. 432. The House budget proposal draws from bipartisan proposals put forth by the Breaux-Thomas Medicare Commission, President Bill Clinton, and Domenici-Rivlin.

We are prepared to take the amendment. We will be happy to take it by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Baucus
Begich
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cowan
Crapo
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Feinstein
Fischer
Flake
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hagan
Harkin
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (WI)
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Landrieu
Leahy
Levin
Manchin
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Portman
Pryor
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Rubio
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Sessions
Shaheen
Shelby
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—3

Cruz
Lee
Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 432) was agreed to.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 156

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to the debate on amendment No. 156 offered by Mr. GRASSLEY.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this amendment strikes a $975 billion tax increase. This amendment in turn sets up a deficit-neutral reserve fund that will allow the Finance Committee to reform corporate and individual taxes in a revenue-neutral way.

The President got his $612 billion tax increase January 1. We should not raise taxes another $1 trillion with unemployment at 7.7 percent. We should not close loopholes for more spending. We won't grow the economy by raising taxes by $1 trillion as the majority wants to do. We will grow the economy with more efficient progrowth tax reform.

My amendment is progrowth, pro-small business, and pro-jobs. The Democrats' budget taxes the middle class to spend more. It is balanced and fair because they have finally come to the conclusion they cannot raise taxes just on the wealthy; they have to raise it on the middle class.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, again, the goal of our budget is to tackle our deficit and debt responsibly in a way that works for the middle class and the economy. That means a balanced mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue from those who can afford it the most.

All of the bipartisan groups that have examined our budget situation have acknowledged this reality—Simpson-Bowles, Gang of 6, Domenici-Rivlin—and recommended more revenue than the roughly $600 billion that we generated in the yearend deal. In fact, Simpson-Bowles and the Gang of 6 each recommended well over $2 trillion in new revenue, which is several times more than the yearend deal. Repealing this budget's proposed revenue increase and striking the reconciliation instruction would be wholly irresponsible. We cannot cut our way out of this problem.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

For the information of all Senators, this is the last vote this evening. Tomorrow there are votes beginning at 11. I ask again that all Senators be here. We are going to move through a lot of amendments tomorrow. I have a lot of Senators asking me to have their amendment voted on. I assure everyone that by 1 a.m., 2 a.m. tomorrow night, many Senators won't have that opportunity unless they are here and help move that process along.

I yield the floor and ask for a ''no'' vote.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Landrieu	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Levin	Tester
Cowan	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 156) was rejected.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, we have had a great debate here on the floor today about the budget. What we have heard is the fact that in the face of unprecedented debt and deficits, we need to get spending under control and grow the economy. Unfortunately, the Democratic budget that has been presented doesn't do that because it actually increases spending and increases taxes.

But there is an alternative, and that is to restrain spending in ways that are smart but also get this economy moving so we have more revenue and revenue the way we ought to get it, which is through growth. One obvious way to do that is through tax reform.

We just had a vote on a tax reform proposal. I am offering a couple of amendments that I want to talk about tonight. One is with regard to tax reform on the business side, where there is an amazing consensus now between Democrats and Republicans, the White House and the Capitol on how to get this economy moving again by ensuring that our Tax Code becomes more competitive globally—not to cut taxes, not to raise taxes, but in a revenue-neutral way to improve the way we collect taxes at the business level to be sure we can create more jobs at a time when we are suffering through the worst recovery we have had since the Great Depression.

Second, I am going to offer an amendment that ensures that we have the right information from the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, which are the two groups who give us information here on Capitol Hill, as to what tax reform means because we want to be sure that as we reform our Tax Code, we do it in a way that is progrowth and projobs.

Fundamental tax reform should be done across the board, in my view, not just on the business side but also on the individual side. On the individual side, we have a great opportunity to broaden the base of tax and lower the rates to make the code again more progrowth. Most businesses in America pay their taxes through the individual Tax Code because they are what are called passthrough entities, about 85 percent of businesses—they tend to be smaller businesses. That is very important.

But tonight I want to talk about the other part of that, which is the business Tax Code that relates to primarily our larger companies and a lot of the international companies, so-called C corporations.

Back in 1986 we actually reduced the rate on the corporate side from 46 percent down to 34 percent. That was 1986. It was done in a bipartisan way with Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill, and the idea at that time was to take our tax rate down to the point that it was competitive, meaning that it was below the average of our global competitors.

In the intervening 2½ decades, guess what has happened. Every single country of the developed world—the so-called OECD countries, our global trading competitors—every single one of them has reformed its tax code. They have lowered their rates, but they have also made their codes more competitive—every single country except us. So America has been on the sidelines while these other countries have moved quickly to improve their tax code. Why? Because they want investment, they want the jobs, and what has happened is, sure enough, they are more competitive.

Capital is now flowing outside of this country. We are losing headquarters. We are in a situation where if there is a foreign acquisition to be made, those companies in foreign countries have an advantage because they have a more competitive tax code. Our tax rate,

which in 1986 was purposely put in place to be just below the average of all the developed economies in the world, is now No. 1. It is the highest rate in the world. That is a No. 1 we don't want to have.

Japan just lowered their rate last year, putting America as the top corporate tax rate in the world. This means, again, we are losing people, we are losing capital, we are losing headquarters, we cannot keep up.

So what is the solution? Well, let's go do what we did back in 1986 again, let's do it quickly, and let's do it on a bipartisan basis because everybody seems to agree that our current code is not competitive, that the rate is too high. We have some disagreements on how to correct it, but actually there is a growing consensus about that as well.

The White House has talked about this. In fact, in a February 2012 white paper issued by the Treasury Department, they said: Let's lower the rate of corporate taxation by broadening the base, meaning reducing or getting rid of a lot of the preferences that have built up in the Tax Code. By the way, hundreds of them have been built up in the Tax Code since 1986. So not only has our rate become high because other countries have lowered theirs, we have added more and more complications to our Tax Code.

It is not just the White House that is talking about this. In front of our committee, the Budget Committee, a professor came to talk to us—who was the Democrats' witness; this was not the Republican witness—who was gung ho also on doing corporate tax reform. This was the Democrats' witness. This is what he said:

> . . . corporate income tax's statutory rate of 35 percent is today far outside world norms. The rate needs to come down. . . . I therefore conceive of corporate tax reform as a roughly revenue neutral undertaking, in which the corporate tax base will be broadened through closing business tax expenditures and loopholes, and the resulting revenues used to pay down the corporate rate.

Pay down the corporate rate.

In the paper from the Treasury Department in February 2012, they said we should reinvest the savings we get from getting rid of some of these loopholes and expenditures and use it, as they said, to invest in lowering the rate.

So here we have an opportunity as a Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—to do something that is good for jobs. By the way, the Congressional Budget Office has looked at this in terms of who benefits. It is not the corporate boardroom that benefits, it is the workers. They have said 70 percent of the benefit of lowering the corporate rate is going to go to workers in the form of higher salaries, better benefits, and more jobs.

By the way, the Congressional Budget Office has also said if you would like to get this economy moving, probably the best bang for your buck is going to be to do something on the corporate tax code because it has gotten so complex and the rate has gotten so high. If you do this, you are also doing something we ought to be doing generally in our Tax Code; which is you are not picking winners and losers. Instead of the government stepping in and deciding where resources are allocated, you have the private sector doing that, market forces doing that, which is going to help grow the economy.

So just as President Reagan and Democrats did in 1986, we should cap or eliminate inefficient tax preferences and loopholes, and we should use that revenue to reduce both the corporate rate and the individual rate, without adding to the deficit.

Another amendment of mine takes this same idea, which is tax reform on the individual-corporate side, and allows us, as legislators, to understand better what we are doing.

Right now, when the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation give us an analysis of taxes, they tell us the revenue is likely to be based on what they call a static score—a static score. It does not take into account the big macroeconomic changes you are likely to see from people's changed behavior from lower rates, for instance.

I will give you an example. Back in 2003, the capital gains tax, as you know, was reduced. So what did they say? Well, the Joint Committee on Taxation and CBO did their analysis, and they said: Well, that means, because you lowered the rate of taxation, you are going to get less revenue, right, because you have less taxes coming in. No. Because they lowered the capital gains tax, there was more economic activity. It turns out we actually got more revenue in. So in 2007 they said revenue was going to go down. In fact, revenues shot up. The same thing happened, by the way, back in 1997, the last time this Congress had a unified balanced budget. That was when Bill Clinton was President, and he worked with the Republican Congress to get some of the spending under control, as we talked about earlier. But they also cut the capital gains rate, and, lo and behold, as I recall, about $100 billion showed up on the revenue side that folks did not expect because we lowered the capital gains rate. Because of the behavioral change, the dynamic scoring, the macroeconomic scoring, showed that was going to happen, but the static score did not.

So as we begin to formulate what kind of tax reform we should do on the individual side and on the corporate side, wouldn't it be great if we had access to two kinds of analysis: one, the static score—and that will continue to be the official analysis; nothing changes there—but also why shouldn't we have access to the macroeconomic analysis—not done from the outside, not from groups from the outside that might have a pretty aggressive dynamic score, but let's just use the macroeconomic model that the Joint Tax Committee already does. In fact, they are required to look at it in three different ways. CBO already does. It does not add more work in the sense that this analysis is already being done; it is just that we are getting the benefit of it.

So this second amendment that I hope my Democratic colleagues will also support, as I hope they will the first one, says, quite simply: Let's have more information so we can make smarter decisions. Who could be against that?

Some have said: Well, we do not believe in dynamic scoring. Fine. If you do not believe in dynamic scoring, let's see what happens. We are going to have a static score, which will be the official score still—that is what we will have to use around here—and then we will have that dynamic score. Again, we want that so we can formulate a better tax proposal but also to know what the impact is going to be. We will see what happens.

My belief is that the macroeconomic score is more likely to be accurate, as it has been in the past, and over time I would not be surprised if this Congress decides: My gosh, that is more consistent with the behavior changes you are going to see with good tax reform. Let's make that part of the official analysis. But that is not what we are talking about tonight. The official score would still be the static score.

I believe this will enable us to be better legislators, and certainly it will enable us to have an opportunity, as we look at this budget deficit and these historic debts and the impact it is having on our kids, on our grandkids and on today's economy, to come together as Republicans and Democrats and do the two things that everybody knows have to be done: One, restrain spending, specifically to deal with these important but unsustainable entitlement programs—remember this: The Congressional Budget Office has told us in the report just about 2 weeks ago that the growth of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, incredibly important programs—and that is why we need to save them—that growth will go up by 94 percent over the next 10 years. It nearly doubles. In fact, they have told us that as a percent of the economy, which is how they look at the spending—as a percent of the economy, the only growth in our spending over the next 10 years is going to be from these entitlement programs and interest on the debt. Other parts of our budget actually, as a percent of the economy, are going to be flat or even a little bit below as a percent of the GDP. But what is going to grow dramatically are these programs.

So we know we have to have entitlement reform to save these programs so that the trust funds do not go insolvent, which they otherwise will. But we also know as part of that we should do tax reform. Those two together—entitlement reform, smart reforms to make these programs work better to ensure they are there for the future,

and then tax reform that is progrowth, that is going to generate revenue, to help us because it will change people's behavior, which will change economic growth, which will, in turn, provide more revenue—revenue, really, the right way—will help us get the debt and deficit under control and at the same time give people the opportunity to get back to work, deal with the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression, help us to get out of the doldrums we are in right now in this economy.

The shot in the arm that tax reform can give us—particularly if we have the right information from these organizations on the Hill: the Congressional Budget Office, the Joint Committee on Taxation—will enable us to move this country forward in ways that can be bipartisan, in ways that can be consistent with what the administration and the Congress are talking about: restraining spending, growing the economy.

I thank the Chair for letting me talk about this tonight. I look forward to having these amendments offered tomorrow. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be willing to stand together and to say: Yes, we can do this. We can get this economy moving. We are going to have to change the way we deal with our tax system. We are going to have to retrain the spending. If we do that, our future can be brighter.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I just want to thank the Senator from Ohio for his usual very clear way of explaining things. I know that comes from the tremendous background he has had, not just in the House but actually putting together a White House budget before. I guess the Senator has had access to these different sources of information before and knows how they could work if we could get access to them.

It is hard for me to believe that somebody would not want more information. They can analyze themselves whether they think it is useful. But more information is always better. So I thank the Senator for bringing that amendment here, and his other amendment as well. But as to that one, it is just incredible to me that anybody could oppose it.

So I thank the Senator for the thought he put into it and for the great presentation he did.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I have filed an amendment, No. 233, that I would like to visit with my colleagues about this evening.

I am pleased we are debating a budget. Budgets have great purposes in individual and business lives, and they are certainly important to us as we try to solve the country's fiscal problems.

A budget is a document that determines how much money we have to spend and how we are going to spend it. In determining how we are going to spend money, we establish priorities.

I want to talk about one of my priorities for the investment of our taxpayer dollars. Kansans and citizens from across the country pay their taxes. In many ways, they would be pleased by having to pay taxes if they knew the money was being well spent. One of the areas where I strongly believe we can prioritize and that money can be well spent is in support of the National Institutes of Health.

We have a tremendous opportunity to continue to lead in the world's research to solve individuals' problems with their health, with the treatment of disease, in eradicating disease, and treating the people of our country and really the people of our world.

This amendment I am going to discuss adds $1.4 billion in spending for the National Institutes of Health. Our citizens and our country face a significant challenge. There is not a family in our Nation who has not suffered from the consequences of cancer and other horrendous diseases. We have seen tremendous success. America leads the world in finding cures and treatments for those diseases.

A problem is, the funding for NIH has remained at a virtual standstill since 2010. In my view, those who come to Congress with the desire to make sure every dime, every nickel is wisely spent, and those who come to Congress with the belief that we need to care for people and provide compassion to all, can come together and jointly agree that money spent on the National Institutes of Health is both. It is a sense of providing well-being, comfort, care, and treatment for people who desperately need that, and it is the realization that when we invest in research, in projects that ultimately cure a disease, we are saving money. We save money by curing and treating diseases, which then means that the cost of health care is reduced.

Long before Congress passed a so-called health care reform bill, I outlined to my constituents in Kansas what we could do to save health care costs. One of the points in my plan was to invest in medical research because money invested today in research saves lives and reduces costs.

There is also the reality that the United States of America is the place to do research. But we are facing tremendous challenges because of the flat line of NIH spending and the lack of real dollars available for medical research. In fact, we have to worry that there is a brain drain, once again, going on in the United States. Other countries are investing. Other countries with more difficult economic challenges than ours are increasing their funding for medical research.

I have always worried that if we do not compete, if we do not maintain a steady opportunity for research scientists in the United States, we will lose the edge and the economic and health benefits that come from having that edge in a global economy.

Our own Director of the NIH, Francis Collins—highly regarded and with tremendous background, intellect—has indicated that we are seeing the potential for a brain drain. This is what he said in February of this year, just last month:

> Since 2003 the NIH budget has basically lost about 20% of its purchasing power by effectively flat budgets that have been eroded by inflation.
>
> The consequence of that to grantees who send us their best ideas in hopes of being supported is that their chance of being funded has dropped from about 1 in 3 which is where it has been for most of the last 50 years now down to about 1 in 6 . . .
>
> Imagine yourself as a young investigator [a scientist] with a great idea, ready to tackle it and to do so in your university setting somewhere [in the United States] knowing that you have only a 1 in or less chance of getting funded, seeing that there seems to be no real clear path forward for achieving stability in the support of biomedical research, wondering whether you can legitimately speak to young people who are wanting to follow in your path about whether this is a path they should choose.

Dr. Collins says this deeply worries her. At a time we need to encourage our children to pursue degrees in education, science, research and medicine and the absence of continued increase in funding for health research, for biomedical research, we clearly send a message this may not be the career you wish to pursue. At the same time as other countries increase their support for biomedical research, we send a message, even though you decide you want to pursue this career, maybe you should pursue it someplace else. This is a serious problem which desperately needs our attention.

I am going to ask my colleagues to support an amendment which establishes a clear understanding of the value of biomedical research, both again that opportunity to increase the longevity of our lives, to improve the quality of our lives, to combat those diseases which are so devastating to so many families in our country, knowing when we do that, not only are we improving individual lives, the well-being of families across our Nation, but we are also investing in an opportunity to reduce the long-term costs of health care in the United States.

This issue is one of great importance to me, and I can't imagine there is a Senator in our Chamber who hasn't experienced the challenges of disease and death in their own families. We have seen tremendous strides in turning this around. It is so clear to me we need to make certain those strides continue.

I was pleased to have the Senator from Illinois seek me out on the Senate floor this evening to suggest there is an opportunity for us to work together. While I have an amendment filed, Senator DURBIN and I are having a conversation tonight, tomorrow, to see if there is a way we can come together in a joint amendment to fully establish all of us are in favor of funding the

NIH, the National Institutes of Health, at a magnitude and a level which will again restore us to the forefront of medical research around the globe.

We will send a message to our students and future scientists America is the place medical research should occur and where they should pursue their careers. Disease can be conquered and lives can be restored. Most important, there may be hope in the United States. The serious and debilitating diseases, the causes of death so many families face day after day and year after year, can be cured and treated.

I look forward to those conversations with my colleagues to find the right words to bring us together to demonstrate significant and real support for funding the National Institutes of Health.

I yield my time.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I wish to speak on what almost qualifies as a historic event:

For the first time in 4 years, the Senate will try to complete a budget resolution.

Since 2009—the last year the Senate passed a budget—the government has run deficits in excess of $1 trillion every year. The Democrats' budget resolution that we are currently debating will, in fact, only reduce net deficits by $279 billion.

I have spoken on the Senate floor and around the country for the past 2 years in favor of a budget that will end excessive spending, provide a platform for tax reform, and rid ourselves of oppressive debt and deficits. But I am afraid that even after the Senate has completed its work, I will still be advocating for those changes.

Senate Democrats have not used their proposed budget resolution to make government better. Their proposal does little in the way of reform, and actually grows the government instead of the economy. It is discouraging to anyone concerned about excessive government debt, and it is discouraging to the job seekers who are, unfortunately, so abundant right now.

What the Democrats have proposed is not a budget at all. It is merely a spending plan to further stunt economic growth and job creation, while condoning increasing the deficit and growing the government. I believe the American people expect a budget that provides a platform for our economy to grow. A budget that increases government spending, increases debt, and further endangers our Medicare and Social Security is not what Georgians or people across America want.

We have a real opportunity now to correct a lot of missteps. We need a budget that will reform our Tax Code, grow the economy, reduce poverty, and fix our entitlements.

Yet here, in the middle of a global economic crisis, we are going to vote on a budget that does none of that.

Mr. President, tonight the Senate voted on a budget that will balance in 10 years the—budget proposed by House budget chairman PAUL RYAN. I can't think of better way to show the American people and the world that our government is serious about getting back on track and reclaiming our country's financial dominance. Simply put, Mr. President, even with all the provisions combined, the Murray budget doesn't get us out of debt. The Ryan Budget does.

A budget that balances in 10 years should be the starting point for discussions, and we need to make that budget a reality now to secure America's future. Economists, budget experts, and analysts across the country have come to the conclusion that the debt we have already accumulated is having a negative effect on our economy. We have known for a long time—and have been told many times by economists—that when a country's gross debts reach 90 percent of GDP, its economy will contract substantially.

We have seen in places such as Japan and Europe that when debt gets out of control, the government's response to control debts must be tougher. Unfortunately, as my friend from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS, noted yesterday, the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements, and the European Central Bank have all analyzed our debt and found that we are now at 103 percent of GDP. That is a staggering and shocking number. It is a hopeless number.

We haven't balanced our budgets in so long that we have ended up harming America's economic engine—and the Democrats' proposal doesn't fix anything. It merely continues our unsustainable spending.

We voted on a spending measure yesterday that lowered our discretionary spending down to 2008 levels. With some hard work, we can keep our discretionary spending at sustainable levels. However, what we haven't addressed is the continued rise in mandatory spending which has increased substantially since 2008.

We simply cannot continue to let mandatory spending go unchecked. This budget's approach to restraint is half-hearted, at best. President Obama likes to remind us that he is in favor of entitlement reform. I would like to give him the benefit of the doubt about that—but is this the best his party can come up with? We are a nation that believes in caring for the most vulnerable among us, but if we continue to operate our programs this way, on a path toward bankruptcy, we will never be able to keep our promises.

We can no longer allow the American people to suffer by not providing the economic basis for recovery and growth. The equation is simple: A balanced Federal budget that is free of excessive debt leads to a healthy economy and sustainable job creation.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. SANDERS. I would like to thank Chairwoman MURRAY for including the request I made in the budget resolution to provide $2.2 billion in discretionary funding and $2.2 billion in mandatory funding for community health centers in fiscal year 2014.

I believe that community health centers are the answer we are looking for to make health care work for everyone, and I am very grateful for the language included in this Budget that recognizes the value of health centers.

As the Senator knows, since enactment of the Affordable Care Act, budget cuts have significantly reduced discretionary funding for the Community Health Center Program. Current service levels for the Community Health Center Program have been maintained only by redirection of the ACA's mandatory expansion funding—which is not authorized beyond the year 2015.

In other words, beginning in fiscal year 2016, the community health center fund will expire. Unless we find a solution to this problem, community health center funding will be reduced by 69 percent. If adequate funding is not restored, the result will be dramatic reductions in the number of patients community health centers are able to serve. I believe that would be a serious mistake.

Would the Senator be willing to work with me and other Senators on resolving the funding cliff facing health centers in 2016 so we don't have a massive cut facing such a valuable program?

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator and I couldn't agree with him more on the value of the Community Health Center Program. I know very well about the value they bring to Washington State, and also to the country by controlling health care costs and delivering care to our Nation's most vulnerable people and communities. We have included language that recognizes the importance of adequately funding the Community Health Center Program and I look forward to working with the Senator and other Senators to try and find a solution to the community health center funding cliff before it occurs.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Chairwoman. The sooner we can work on this the better, as it will really give the program and all the centers across the country the stability and certainty they need to plan for the future.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for raising this very important issue. I look forward to working with him to ensure that community health centers can continue to provide care to our most vulnerable populations today and in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. There are a lot of problems with the country and the way we manage business. Frankly, President Bush became engaged in a war which used up so much of his time and effort. President Obama is not trained as a manager. He has never been a manager, Governor or managed a business. He has too little tough, serious management of the taxpayer's money in this country. It is time for us to get

under control the spending which goes on.

In my humble opinion, the American people are tired of sending more money to Washington just because we run out. We say it is not our fault; it is the way things are. We can't have any reduction in spending. There are people who are hurt and in pain, hungry, women, elderly, singles, and married. They need to have more money. Any change in our policy whatsoever means somebody is not getting something they are entitled to.

The truth is many of our programs serve many good people in need, but almost all those programs have serious management problems which could be run effectively and efficiently, and the program would cost substantially less without any significant diminishment of the effective aid which is rendered by that program. I believe the American people understand this absolutely and fully.

As we have done, as an amendment or idea comes forward to confront wasteful spending, somebody in this body, particularly in the Senate, always objects. They raise the specter of meanness and unkindness and that sort of thing. In truth, we all ought to identify serious problems and fix them.

For example, in our energy policy, we have had some of the most amazing failures and losses of Federal money I can imagine, beyond anything which is logical and absolutely should not have happened.

Most people have heard of the Solyndra company. They had political connections to the White House and received $528 million in Federal loans, went bankrupt and left Uncle Sam holding the bag.

There was another company, Abound Solar. It declared bankruptcy after receiving $400 million in Federal loan guarantees. Failing to deliver on the promises they made, somebody at the Department of Energy, apparently, was not checking very well. Maybe they were more interested in a press release, a big announcement, going to some solar factory and saying how we are going to create jobs, grow the economy and pump hundreds of millions of dollars into a program which sank.

Beacon Power received $43 million in Federal loan guarantees before it shut down.

Fisker, an electric car maker, is not making any cars now due to production problems. It received more than $190 million from the Department of Energy.

A123 Systems, a battery maker, also received substantial Federal loans. It is bankrupt.

The President emulates the failing energy programs of Europe. His policies were designed to promote an energy theory which is not ready economically. It is one thing to invest in research to try to create a new battery; it is another thing to try to loan hundreds of millions of dollars to a company to produce a product which is not competitive and not ready for prime time. This is the mistake we made.

Mr. Lomborg, from Europe, who wrote the book ''Cool It'' and is, in my opinion, an expert on these issues, pointed out a number of years ago in his book the best way to handle this is for the government to subsidize where it can and direct money to try to reach technological breakthroughs, but you should not mandate the people of the United States, or use any kind of program which will not work, cost a lot more money, and have little benefit on the environment.

Back in 2008, President Obama made this statement: ''Will America watch as the clean energy jobs and industry of the future flourish in countries like Spain, Japan, or Germany?''

That is what he said. We need to emulate Spain, Japan, and Germany.

Spain right now is having to cut back dramatically on its forward-leaning green mandates. They went probably further or as far as any country in Europe. It has been a total disappointment. They are reducing their subsidies. Their economy is in shambles, and they are not doing well.

The Financial Times in February of this year wrote:

> The Spanish government's latest bid to cut its growing debts to the country's energy sector is expected to slash profits at renewable energy companies as Madrid continues to grapple with a $37 billion deficit built up through years of subsidies.

They continue:

> Shares in Acciona, Spain's largest wind power operator, have tumbled almost 20 percent, with Analysts expecting Acciona's earnings per share to drop by 40 percent, while Abengoa's EPS are forecast to drop by 12 percent.

Germany is also cutting back. According to Reuters in January of this year:

> [The German energy company] RWE is delaying investments. SIAG filed for insolvency. REpower Systems is cutting temporary staff. All show how German Chancellor Angela Merkel's $734 billion plan to replace nuclear reactors with renewable sources is stalling.

Former Secretary of Treasury, under President Obama, Larry Summers said this: ''Government is a crappy venture capitalist.''

This is exactly correct. We have no business trying to pick and throw American taxpayers' money into risky ventures. We are not good at it. Spain and Germany are not good at it—governments aren't.

When it is your money and you are putting up $100 million, then you are at a point where you need to be very serious about that investment.

These are some points I wanted to make because I think the American people are tired of hearing Washington say send more money.

No, we are not going to cut spending in Washington. We can't do that in the budget which is on the floor. It does not cut spending, actually does not reduce the deficit. It increases spending, increases the deficit, and increases taxes by $1 trillion.

What did they say in the budget? We are not going to cut spending. There is nothing we can cut. The government is working. Every dollar we receive, every dollar we distribute is absolutely critical and cannot be contained. Send more money. Just send more money and don't complain, American people.

I think people are getting tired of that. They have a right to be tired of that. They should not send another dime until we are on the right path.

I see my friend Senator ENZI, and I would be pleased to yield the floor.

I would note Senator ENZI is the senior member of the Budget Committee and is a successful businessman who has a proven record in his State. He understands these issues, and he is trained as an accountant. I am sure when he sees what we do in the budget process around here, he must wonder what world we are connected to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for all the work he has done on the budget. He worked on a budget for 2 years previous to this which never materialized. I am so pleased he and his staff are working on a budget.

I understand his disappointment. I am an accountant, and I hope Senator JOHNSON, who is the other accountant in the Senate, will have an opportunity to come to the floor and talk about some of the numbers because there seems to be some discrepancies in the numbers. He has tried to pin those down by asking questions of the staff and, as a result, has come up with some demonstrations that show where the budget we are currently talking about goes.

I wanted to just briefly share an article I ran across today. It is called ''Mr. Penny vs. a dragon: Hey kids, it's the national debt!''

How are kids across America going to understand the debt? We are having a lot of problems understanding it in this body. Washington's budget squabbles and financial fights are enough to tangle up anyone's head, so one can only imagine how it might confuse children. So enter Mr. Penny and the Dragon of Domeville. Let's see, that would be the dome? Yes.

This children's book by Lucile McConnell seeks to raise awareness of fiscal irresponsibility and the national debt for those who are just out of diapers. The book's hero, Mr. Penny, is introduced as ''quite an individual and not a follower,'' and begins:

> Once upon a penny, in the Land of Us''—

That would be U.S.—

> in the little town of Meville, lived a little penny. In fact, a whole lot of little pennies were scattered all over the Land of Us, but our story is about one particular penny: Mr. Penny. He was a singular fellow, quite an individual and not a follower of the crowd.

The antagonist, a dragon—a black dragon—if this had been a western story, it would be the guy with the

black hat—a dragon designed to represent a bloated Federal Government that will not stop growing and loves to eat currency.

In fact, he developed a taste for charred bills . . . dollar bills. Within no time, the dragon had devoured $15 trillion—

You can tell the book is a little old, otherwise it would be $16.6 trillion, which is where we are now—

and was always looking around for more to consume.

Eventually, Mr. Penny scores a one-on-one with the dragon and does his level best to convince the dragon just how reckless Federal waste can be.

I don't think you know what effect you are having on the whole land of Us by eating the money that we send to Domeville. . . . Our schools are closing; our youngsters can't go to college; our oldsters can't get medical help; our businesses are failing because there is no money for loans; our roads and bridges are falling down; our towns and industries are not safe; our citizens do not have jobs; and we are running out of money.

On the book's Web site, McConnell describes herself as ''a tax/commercial transactions attorney'' practicing in Washington and New York and says—and this is very important—all funds from the book—all funds from the book—will go toward paying down the national debt.

In an author's note in the book, McConnell writes:

Our beloved Country is in trouble . . . big trouble. This is the kind of trouble that cannot be solved unless we all pitch in and come to the aid of our country immediately.

She adds:

My hope is that after reading this book, young people are energized about the possibility of what we can accomplish together through cooperation and teamwork.

So, Madam President, I had an amendment in the committee that would have taken care of some of those charred bills and converted them to metal coins—dollar coins. If we were to do that, it would probably save about $1 billion. That maybe doesn't sound like much around here, but $1 billion would be a good start and would put a little punctuation in this book.

We are getting to the point where if we don't do something, we will not have money to spend. If interest rates go up—and if people lose confidence in our economy, the interest rates will go up—the only thing we will be able to pay is interest. Doesn't that sound like somebody who has used their credit card too much and can't afford to pay the credit card down? Of course, we are not even worried about paying the credit card down. We are not even talking about doing that. We are not even talking about balancing the budget at this point, and we need to do that or maybe we need to pass out copies of ''Mr. Penny and the Dragon of Domeville.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we talked about a number of challenges our Nation faces and the debt course we are on. The Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Elmendorf, testified just a few weeks ago before our Budget Committee and declared that we remain on an unsustainable financial course even after the Budget Control Act that reduced spending and even after the tax increase in January, and that this does not get us out of the danger zone.

We have hundreds of billions of dollars in deficits every year, and he is projecting that interest on our debt in the 10th year will rise to $800 billion, which is about what the score of the Murray budget that is on the floor today would add to our debt.

Fundamentally, this budget that is before us today did not change the debt course we are on. It does not have $2 trillion in spending reductions, and it leaves us on the same dangerous course as Mr. Elmendorf said we are on, so we have to get off of it.

I want to share a few things that drive home the danger we are in. Now, we have a strong economy. We have a great entrepreneurial spirit. We have a tremendous infrastructure compared to most places. We have a rule of law that helps us tremendously in terms of managerial efficiency and contracts and complex documents that can be entered into. If there is a dispute over it, you can go to a Federal or State court and have a pretty good chance of a fair decision being reached even in the most complex matters involving high finance. That is not true in most places in the world, so it gives us an advantage.

We have an educated workforce. We have a lot of people who are willing to work and hustle. So we have some advantages. We have a history of trade and freedom. But I want to show this chart, because we may not be doing as well as we think we are, and the debt that we are facing may be more serious than a lot of people will acknowledge.

This is a chart that shows the debt per person in the Eurozone compared to the United States. It is a stunning chart. Some people have explained it somewhat by saying, well, our economy in the United States is bigger than other economies in the world. Therefore, individual Americans normally make more money and, therefore, they can carry more debt. But anybody who sees this chart has to begin to understand and worry that the needle of our debt is in the red zone—the danger zone.

Look at this. This includes spending for Federal, State, and local government. These are 2012 projections of general government expenditures in nominally U.S. dollars—all converted to U.S. dollars by the International Monetary Fund. This is not the United States. This is the world's economic outlook according to the International Monetary Fund. This is the way they score our debt compared to the rest of the world in comparable U.S. dollars.

Look at this: In dollars, Spain's debt per person is $24,000. Spain is in serious financial difficulty now. Its debt has caused the interest on their debt to surge. They are paying a large amount. They have tried to bring that under control, but their unemployment is high, and the net result has been the economy is stagnating dangerously. It is a sad thing.

Italy has more, with $26,000; Portugal, $39,000 per person; Greece, $42,000 per person; but the debt per person in the United States, according to the International Monetary Fund, is $53,400—higher than all those countries.

I would say to my colleagues, we are not in a position of safety. I would say to my colleagues that this is a kind of debtload that we need not to underestimate. We might find that this economy is more unpredictable than we think.

As I said last night, I remember Alan Greenspan being before the Budget Committee in 2001 and telling us we had to worry. And the worry was that we had so much money that we would pay down all the debt in the United States and then—he worried—what we would do with the extra money when we paid the whole debt down. This is the maestro, Alan Greenspan.

I say that just to indicate that if he misses it that badly, maybe Mr. Bernanke will miss it. Actually, the Wall Street Journal documented that when Mr. Bernanke was advising Alan Greenspan, the Federal Reserve Chairman, about the bank mortgage situation in the mid-2000s—2003, 2004, 2005—he was advising Mr. Greenspan to keep pouring the low money out, keep encouraging banks to lend, lend, lend, and he rejected the idea we were in danger. Then, whammo, we had this horrible recession of 2007.

So I would just say this chart shows us that we need to get our house in order. The American people know that. They tell me that everywhere I go. So why won't Congress respond?

Well, the House has responded. I know my Democratic friends don't like to hear that, but this budget that PAUL RYAN produced, while not a perfect document, it changes the debt course of America. It balances the budget, and we could do the same thing if we wanted to, and do it in a different way. Let's do it a different way, but we should have a balanced budget. And we don't, and there is no plan to get there—not even close.

One of the things that is happening in America today is the growth in our economy is not where it should be. This chart is a vivid indicator that the Congressional Budget Office, our top adviser, has been consistently wrong about its projections in the last several years. This is CBO forecasts 2 years before an event. OK? So in 2008, what was CBO projecting the growth rate to be in 2010?

They projected it would be 3.1 percent, but it came in at 2.4 percent. In 2009, what did they project we would have as growth in 2011? They projected we would have 4 percent growth in 2011.

We had less than half of that—1.8 percent. That is a huge difference.

Now Christina Romer, who served President Obama as his top adviser on economic matters, has estimated that the difference in 1 and 2 percent growth is 1 million jobs. So what do we have here? We have more than 2 million less jobs being created in 2011 than were projected by the experts that we relied on in 2009.

And look at this. It is even worse in 2012. They projected back in 2010 that growth in 2012—just 2 years in advance—would be at 4.4 percent, and it came in at 2.2 percent. So these 1.8 and 2.2 percent growth figures are really not growth. That is not a job-creating factor. You need to have more growth than that to create real jobs and hiring and wage improvements and raises.

So I just would ask my colleagues: What is causing that? What is causing that? Professors Rogoff and Reinhart did the fabulous book, ''This Time It's Different,'' and they did an empirical actual study of the economies of over 200 years of nations who ran up too much debt.

They studied what happened and the ones that had debt crises. What did they conclude? And not based on theory, not some ideal formula reached in academic situations, but what actually happened in these countries? What they concluded was that when the gross debt exceeds 90 percent of GDP, 90 percent of the size of the economy, then growth begins to slow. They found that the growth was slowed by 1 to 2 percent.

In 2010, the gross debt of the United States exceeded 90 percent of the economy and CBO's forecast was off. The next year, we were still way above 90 percent. In 2012, we were way above 90 percent of GDP. The debt is so high that it impacts economic growth, it would appear to me. I think this is a fact not being fully considered by CBO and it is impacting our economy, and it argues against any idea that we have no responsibility to start confronting our debt situation now.

In addition to Rogoff and Reinhart—perhaps stimulated by Rogoff and Reinhart, in the last couple of years, the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, and the Bank for International Settlements have studied these very issues because it is a big deal in Europe. Many of the countries in Europe are deeply in debt, their economies are stagnating, and they have studied this issue. And what did they conclude? They concluded basically the same thing. Every one of those studies shows that when a country reaches a high level of debt—in the range of the 90 percent—they begin to suffer economic growth reduction. One of the studies went as low as 60 percent of your GDP in debt begins to slow the economy.

They have various factors in how it is done and the studies are constructed in different ways, but the net result is that when our debt situation is applied to each of those three studies, our economy is projected to be suffering as a result of the high debt we have. So I would say those three studies validate the concerns of Rogoff and Reinhart. Those three studies indicate we are already in America suffering growth loss because of the debt we have.

As we wrestle with how to deal with our economy, I would challenge all of our Members and challenge commentators in the media to ask tough questions: Can we continue to borrow more, run up more debt, and attempt to create a stimulus effect in our economy today? How much can we do that?

The Congressional Budget Office early this year concluded in a thorough report that if we were to balance the budget and bring our debt down to the level—as Congressman RYAN proposed and as we proposed in the committee, and as I proposed in my amendment tonight—and balanced the budget, what would happen? They predict this economy in 10 years would be stronger than it is if we hadn't done that, if we used two other scenarios that had less reduction and allowed more debt to accumulate.

Did you hear that? The economy over the long term will be healthier in this country, according to our own CBO, if we get our debt under control and balance our budget. It is in their report in January of this year. We need to listen to that. The American people know you can't get something for nothing. They know you can't borrow your way out of debt. As one of my citizens in Evergreen told me several years ago at a town meeting, My daddy said you can't borrow your way out of debt. Isn't that true? That is what we have been doing. We are going to borrow somehow and create a false high, a sugar high, and that is going to fix our problems. It has proven not to be the case.

What do we need to do? We need to do the same thing responsible people all over the world do. We need to do the same thing families do, the same thing States do that are well managed—and many are very well managed—and that counties and cities do; that is, operate within our means. Let's have a budget that actually balances, and all of the other factors will come into play. Debt as a percentage of GDP and these arguments about primary debt, and debt as a percentage of the economy, that is not where we need to be.

If we balance the budget over a period of time—carefully, so it doesn't do damage to the economy—and do this in the right way, we will make this economy better, and we will have people working who are now on unemployment. We will have people working and bringing home paychecks who are now on food stamps and TANF and other welfare programs. They will have jobs and they will be able to get pay raises and they will be able to work longer hours and get some overtime, and be able to pay down the house payment or the car payment. People are hurting out there. We have fewer people working today than we did in 2000. The average wage has declined—not increased—in the last 10 years. This economy is not growing. My Democratic colleagues are correct about that. People are hurting.

So how do you fix it? Do you borrow more so we can spend more? Is the government going to lift people out of poverty by giving them more checks that we taxed more and passed out more money? Is that compassion? I don't think so.

I have worked with working people. I have worked construction. I grew up in the country. I know people who didn't have money and how they can live and take care of their families on modest means, and they were independent, with pride and self-respect. We have an award being given in North Carolina to a food stamp office employee who talked people into taking food stamps who said they didn't need them. The award was given to her for overcoming mountain pride. So is this the status of the American economy today, that we are talking people into not being independent, we encourage them to take benefits from the government when they say they don't need them? That is what they gave her the award for.

We have got food stamp promoters in foreign embassies, in the consulate offices all over. They are meeting and promoting new residents to America—legal, presumably—to get on food stamps and other benefits programs. But you are not supposed to be admitted to the United States if you are going to be a charge on the State, so we checked on that. Do you know what we found? That about two-tenths of 1 percent—not 1 percent, but two-tenths of 1 percent of the people who apply to enter the United States are turned down because they might not be financially able to support themselves. One study said at least 36 percent of lawful immigrants in our country today are on some sort of welfare benefit program.

If they have to have health care to survive and go to the hospital, they need to get it, and we want to help people who are in need. But doesn't anybody follow common sense? Doesn't anybody understand we have a reasonable law that says, If you are going to come to America, we need to know you are going to be able to take care of yourself? You shouldn't be coming to America to get on a benefit program. We are not checking. Nobody is checking. Nobody is worried.

So what will they do? They will get Uncle Sam to ask the taxpayers to send more money, and we will keep spending more. It is a bottomless pit, you know. We will just tax the rich. How about that? Because shouldn't the rich pay more because somebody immigrated to America and their income was low? And so we will just give them money.

Do you know they did the same thing, the Department of Agriculture,

with people who entered the country? They had a soap opera series of videos, and this is what they did: A lady speaks to another lady and she says something about food stamps. The other lady says, Well, my husband has a good job. I don't need food stamps. That is the first scene. The first lady says, Well, you don't understand.

After two or three of these videos, the first lady convinces the second lady that she should ask for these benefits when she said she didn't want them. She was a lady of pride and dignity. She didn't think she had to have this and wasn't asking for it. But our government overcame her resistance. The U.S. Department of Agriculture was promoting this and paid money to buy these ads: Don't worry, we will ask the American people to send more money. But we won't ask you to send more, we will ask the rich to send more money.

I remember years ago George Wallace used to want to tax the power company. He always wanted to tax the power companies. I was looking at my electric bill the other day and they list your charges, and one of them is the State tax. So they taxed the power company, and the power company passes it on to the person who buys the electricity. Give me a break. A tax on the economy is a tax on the economy. It is a weak argument that you can have an unlimited amount of money by taxing the rich. At some point it becomes not correct, not fair, and not right if the money is being thrown away on Solyndras and A–123 battery companies that go bankrupt. But nobody worries about it: Send more money.

We are having abuses in the SNAP program, and I proposed an amendment that would eliminate an abusive part of the food stamp program a year ago. In 2001, we spent $20 billion a year on SNAP. Last year, we spent $80 billion. It has gone up, from 20 to 80, four times. We identified a categorical eligibility gimmick that was allowing people to get food stamps who did not qualify and should not have received them. I said, Let's close that loophole. Over 10 years we were projected to spend $800 billion on the food stamp program. This would have reduced it by 11, so we would have been spending $789 billion instead of $800 billion. And do you know what they said? Sessions wants to take food out of the mouths of babies. People are going to starve. He is uncompassionate. He is unkind. He wants to chop the budget so we can hurt people. It was voted down. And we had reports showing that this was an abusive practice that should have been fixed.

Now we want to ask the American people, Send more money. We want to tax you more. Well, what about the abuse in the food stamp program? There is no abuse. The Department of Agriculture said we have less fraud than we have ever had in history. And I used to prosecute that as a Federal prosecutor. I know there is fraud in there. We established without any doubt that their claim that they have minimal fraud is only in the computer part of the program.

Nobody is checking to see if somebody who qualified for any of these government programs later gets a job and doesn't meet the qualifications. They still are getting benefits all over the country, unless they self-report. All kinds of things such as this are going on. No one is checking to see if somebody goes into two food stamp offices, two other benefit offices of various kinds and asks for them under different names at each place and produces some sort of ID. There is all kinds of abuse in this system and I hear it all the time.

Most people who get food stamps need it, they qualify for it, and they would get it under any kind of reasonable reform that would occur. But to suggest that we aren't wasting money through practices that allow unqualified individuals to gain access to multiple programs of this kind is a mistake. It absolutely happens every day.

I tried cases to a jury of stores selling food stamps, manipulating the program, dealing with corrupt individuals who brought the food stamps in to sell because they had obtained them fraudulently and never needed the food at all. This idea that there is no fraud in this program is ludicrous. That is what the leaders of the Department of Agriculture are saying: We have no problem. It is OK. Just send us more money. We will keep expanding and growing every year—maybe double the thing again, I guess.

These are the kinds of things that I believe this budget does not address. This budget allows spending to continue at its current rate, it allows the debt to continue at its current rate. Spending goes up and taxes go up. That is what this budget does. Spending goes up and taxes go up and the deficit is not reduced.

I hope that somehow we will come to our senses, go back home, and talk to our constituents. We will listen to them when they plead with us to do something about the debt course we are on. They tell us they are disgusted with the way things are going in Washington, and we say: We cannot do anything about it. They said there is not a problem. You don't understand the challenge we face. We really have to have more money. That is what we have to have. We can't get by on the money we have been having. We have to increase the money you give us.

Do you know that if we increase spending every year 3.4 percent—and these figures are not disputed—if we increase spending each year 3.4 percent, we could balance the budget? The problem is that our spending is increasing at 5.4 percent. It is hard to believe that difference would cause as many billion dollars in debt as it does, but it does. Each year, we add hundreds of billions of dollars to the debt. In fact, the last 4 years we have averaged adding $1,100 billion to the debt each year. As those dollars are added to the debt, we pay interest on them, and interest is surging.

We are going to find, according to the CBO, on the course we are on and on the course we would stay on if this budget passes, that we would not do anything different than where we are today, which means we would be paying about $800 billion in 1 year in interest. The road bill is $40 billion, education is about $100 billion—it is going to crowd out spending for every agency in our government. For research and development—we are just going to keep raising taxes now?

When we talk about a $650 billion tax increase in January this year on the rich, that passed. That went through. That will be $65 billion a year in extra revenue. I am saying to you that the Congressional Budget Office tells us that in 10 years from now, we will be paying $800 billion a year in interest. You are not going to tax the rich out of that. It is just not going to happen.

We are at a point where the debate today and the last week in the Budget Committee has put us in a position to confront the choices we have. Forgive me if I am passionate about this. We have waited 4 years to even see a budget brought to the floor when the law of the United States of America says a budget should be brought every year to the floor and every year before the committee and the President is required to produce a budget every year. For the first time since the Budget Act has been passed, the President has not produced a budget this year. But the Senate has begun to act, so I guess we are supposed to be happy for that. And I am happy for that, but I think we would be a lot better off, the country would be a lot better off—we may be in a better position to reach some sort of compromise on some of the great issues had we been publicly wrestling with these issues for the last 4 years instead of sweeping them under the table.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate Women's History Month. This March, we pay tribute to the generations of women in

America whose commitment to their community, their State, and their Nation has proved invaluable to society. I know Kentuckians are proud this March to honor the more than 2.2 million women who live in the Commonwealth.

Women's History Month began as a national celebration in 1981 thanks to an act of Congress, and since 1995 every President has issued an annual proclamation designating March as Women's History Month. For Women's History Month 2013, I would like to shine the spotlight on some very admirable women's groups in Kentucky who are working hard to make the Bluegrass State a better place for women to live, grow, and prosper—and making history themselves.

The Family Scholar House in Louisville is an organization that strives to end the cycle of poverty for many women by giving students who are single parents the support they need to earn a 4-year college degree. By working from poverty to self-sufficiency, these parent-students are then able to provide their children with a better life. The Family Scholar House is transforming families and communities through the power of education, and I had the pleasure of meeting with some of this organization's leaders in my Capitol office last week.

The Chrysalis House, in Lexington, provides substance-abuse treatment programs for women. Their mission is to support women and their families in recovery from alcohol and drugs. In operation for over 34 years, Chrysalis House specializes in treating substance-dependent expecting mothers, allowing them to keep their newborn babies with them while in treatment. They also counsel the children of these women on substance abuse prevention. Chrysalis uses a combination of the 12-step program, long-term living arrangements, and a caring and nurturing environment to ensure women and their families live fulfilling lives free of abusive substances. I have visited Chrysalis House and seen firsthand how much good they are doing, and I want to especially recognize president Lindy Karns and her husband, Rick Christman, for their dedicated efforts.

The Hope Center, also located in Lexington, is an organization that addresses homelessness on multiple fronts. They provide food, shelter, and clothing to the homeless; recovery for those who are addicted; health services for the sick; diagnosis and treatment for the mentally ill; employment services for those looking for work; housing for those who need it; and childcare and higher education opportunities for single-parent families. The Hope Center seeks to identify the underlying causes that compel people to seek out their services and then work to address them in fundamental ways.

The Isaiah House, located in the town of Willisburg in Washington County, seeks to provide real hope for those who suffer from addiction. This faith-based program helps men but also has special facilities and programs for women. They exist to help provide women struggling with drug or alcohol addiction the peace and serenity they have been searching for, through counseling that tends to the spiritual, mental, and physical needs of the residents.

Then we have the Western Kentucky University Sisterhood. Western Kentucky University, located in Bowling Green, is one of the Commonwealth's leading universities, and with women making up 65 percent of the school's current students and half of all alumni, the WKU Sisterhood is a way for women to make an impact at the university. The WKU Sisterhood is a group of women who donate at least $1,000 each and then decide collectively how that money shall be used. Two grant recipients, the groups Women in Transition and Project CLASS, are both programs specifically geared to help women succeed in college.

The New Opportunity School for Women, located in the town of Berea, was founded to improve the educational, financial, and personal circumstances of low-income, middle-aged women in the Appalachian region of Kentucky. In the past 23 years, the New Opportunity School for Women has hosted more than 580 women in its 3-week residential program and provided hundreds more with career and educational outreach and counseling.

What a marvel it is to consider all of the resources, programs, and charities that have been founded in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by women, for women, to empower women to improve their own lives and then, in turn, improve their communities. Kentucky is truly blessed to have so many people of compassion.

This Women's History Month is an entirely appropriate occasion on which to pay tribute to them and their accomplishments on this floor. I know my colleagues in the U.S. Senate join me in congratulating the leaders and supporters of the several groups I have enumerated here, as well as the many others I did not get to mention, for their good works. And the people of Kentucky thank them as well. History will remember them for their dedication and achievements.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN SMIT

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to honor a leader who has tirelessly fought to educate young people in my State. After 9 years of dedicated service as superintendent of the Wagner Community School District, Susan Smit will retire at the end of the school year.

Susan Smit's career in education has spanned a period of over 30 years. She embarked on this path in 1970, first as a vocational home economics teacher. Throughout her time in the field of education, she has held many positions: teacher, counselor, principal and superintendent. Most recently, Susan has spent the last 16 years serving in public schools in Indian Country, working to close the achievement gap between Native and non-Native students. Students in the Wagner Community School District face a unique set of challenges, and Susan Smit's approach to addressing them has been nothing short of visionary. The nature of the district is rural and low income, with over 70 percent of students qualifying for free and reduced meals.

As a founder and cochair of the Senate Impact Aid Coalition, I have enjoyed working with Susan over the years. In November 2012, Susan was invited to speak to congressional offices about the importance of continued Federal investments in education. Susan provided testimony to more than 80 congressional staff members and dozens of education leaders on the negative effect of education funding cuts and the need to maintain funding for critical education programs. During the 2013 annual conference for the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, NAFIS, Susan was awarded the Friends of NAFIS award, one of the highest honors the organization bestows upon an educator. The honor recognized Susan for her aptitude for problem-solving and her ability to integrate the needs of the Wagner community into school initiatives.

As a superintendent, Susan has strived to broaden access to academic opportunities for youth by maximizing the use of technology in the classroom. The school district's one-to-one laptop initiative provides students with a laptop for their 4 years of high school. This program has increased retention and gives students the opportunity to hone computer skills that will serve them well beyond graduation. Students apply these skills to further their education through online classes. Although the school district does not have the resources to offer traditional advanced placement classes, this does not prevent students from enrolling in these advanced and rigorous courses. Advanced placement classes are offered online though the distance education lab.

One of the crowning achievements of Susan's tenure as superintendent is the implementation of Jobs for America's Graduates, JAG, Program in South Dakota. Through leadership development and mentorship, the program prepares at-risk students for success in college and future careers. Due in part to the program, the school district's graduation rate is above the state average, and the high school has been recognized as a distinguished school under the title I program.

Susan has been a tireless champion for expanding access to quality and affordable early education. As superintendent, Susan spearheaded the creation of a preschool program that is in

its sixth year and serves over 100 3- and 4-year-old children each year. Of the children enrolled in the program, 75 percent of the children are Native American. I am a strong supporter of early education and appreciate Susan's commitment to helping young people get the right start by nurturing their development and providing for their well-being.

As superintendent of the Wagner Community School District, Susan Smit has successfully overcome many of the challenges associated with operating a rural school district. It is my pleasure to thank her for many years of dedicated service to the youth of South Dakota. I wish Susan, her husband Roland, and their family all the best in retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO C.L. SWOPES

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, we salute our veterans for their selfless commitment and immeasurable sacrifice to protect this nation and its ideals so we can continue to be the greatest, freest country the world has ever known. Standing up to tyranny, oppression and cruelty around the world, our troops exhibit courage under the most daunting circumstances.

Today I want to recognize the service and sacrifice of one of our veterans from the ''Greatest Generation'' who exemplified these traits during World War II and who is celebrating a milestone—his 100th birthday, C.L. Swopes.

Mr. Swopes spent 25 years in the Navy, originally entering the service to get relief from the hardships of the Great Depression. ''The money was what I was after,'' he told a local newspaper about his reason for enlisting.

Serving in the Pacific during WWII, Mr. Swopes experienced first-hand the realities of war on the U.S.S. Hornet during the Doolittle Raid, the Battle of Midway and its sinking at the Battle of Santa Cruz.

''Teaching you how to climb down a rope in practice is one thing, but reality is another,'' Mr. Swopes recalled to local media about his evacuation from the sinking aircraft carrier.

Admittedly a weak swimmer, he spent hours in the water until being picked up by a lifeboat.

He continued his military career after WWII serving around the world and throughout the country before retiring in Millington, Tennessee.

During his service, the Desha County native made a family with his wife Mary Jane. He impressed upon his children Marva, Paulette, Lorraine, and Anthony, the importance of education. ''I wished for an education so many days,'' Mr. Swopes said because it would have given him additional opportunities in his career.

After his Naval career, Mr. Swopes returned to his native Watson, Arkansas to take over the family farm.

I thank C.L. Swopes for his service and sacrifice as he celebrates his 100th birthday and wish him many more years of happiness.●

THE CANNON STREET ALL-STARS

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the heart of Charleston, SC, lies Cannon Street; it's a modest street spanning just a few city blocks. However, within its history lies the story of what Dr. Creighton Hale, the former CEO of little league baseball, called ''the most significant amateur team in baseball history.''

In 1955, the area surrounding this street was one of economic blight and social unease. In an effort to keep kids out of trouble and teach skills that only team sports can provide, the local YMCA organized four little league teams for the neighborhood kids. The Cannon Street YMCA All-Stars consisted of seventeen players: John Bailey, Charles Bradley, Vermont Brown, William Godfrey, Vernon Grey, Allen Jackson, Carl Johnson, John Mack, Leroy Major, David Middleton, Arthur Peoples, John Rivers, Norman Robinson, Maurice Singleton, Leroy Carter, George Gregory, and Augustus Holt. They were coached and founded by: Lee J. Bennett, Walter Burke, Rufus Dilligard, A.O. Graham, Robert Morrison, R.H. Penn, and Benjamin Singleton. The team would advance to the Charleston City Little League playoff games but would never be given the opportunity to earn a spot in the Little League World Series. It was not because they were unworthy players or because they could not afford to go. The color of their skin stifled the dreams of these twelve-year-old boys.

The Charleston playoff games were boycotted in 1955 to preserve racial segregation. Because teams again refused to play against them, the Cannon Street All-Stars advanced past the state and regional playoffs. The National Little League invited the All-Stars to the Little League World Series as special guests; they could not compete for the title because technically they hadn't played their way to the championships. They returned to Charleston, dismayed and disappointed.

As children, they embodied the very characteristics that organized sports aim to impart—teamwork, courage and respect. As adults they have worked in productive and valuable careers such as architecture, law enforcement and education. As they have grown older, they are now volunteers in their communities—giving back, yet again. While they never had the opportunity to compete, their story has demonstrated where we have come from as a nation.

Last month members of my staff had the opportunity to meet several of the original Cannon Street Little Leaguers who traveled to Washington, DC to be recognized at Nationals Stadium before the Nationals-Phillies game. Their story remains powerful more than 65 years later, and I know my staff will never forget having the opportunity to meet them.

Today, the neighborhood that encompasses Cannon Street has developed into an integral part of the Charleston education and science community. It is home to a number of colleges and universities and a world-class research hospital. The boys of the Cannon Street Little League Team are men who through their careers and service to the community have become assets to their neighborhoods. In spite of the adversity they encountered and the challenges they confronted, these young people illustrated to the world the absurdity of segregation and the hatred inherent in racism.

In the 55 years since they were excluded from competing to earn a spot at the Little League World Series in their own right, America has matured. I would like to believe that a handful of twelve-year-olds contributed to our maturity.

It is with great admiration that I share their story and my respect for these men with you, my colleagues.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Schneider of Illinois, Ms. Frankel of Florida, and Mr. Connolly of Virginia.

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. Shimkus of Illinois, Mr. Womack of Arkansas, Mr. Israel of New York, and Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 649. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a

background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–872. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the evacuation of U.S. citizens, U.S. embassy personnel, and several private U.S. citizens from Bangui, Central African Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–873. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, NeighborWorks America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for NeighborWorks America's fiscal year 2012 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–874. A communication from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Government Employees Serving in Official Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations; Sector Unit Investment Trusts'' (RIN3209–AA09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–875. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–876. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Agriculture's fiscal year 2012 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–877. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''2011 Impact and Effectiveness of Administration for Native Americans (ANA) Projects: Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–878. A communication from the Director, Executive Office for United States Trustees, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application Procedures and Criteria for Approval of Nonprofit Budget and Credit Counseling Agencies by United States Trustees'' (RIN1105–AB17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–879. A communication from the Director, Executive Office for United States Trustees, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application Procedures and Criteria for Approval of Providers of a Personal Financial Management Instructional Course by United States Trustees'' (RIN1105–AB31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–880. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exemption of a Privacy Act System of Records of the Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration Notice: 'Investigative Reporting and Filing System''' (CPCLO Order No. 002–2013) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–881. A communication from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Compassionate Release; Technical Changes'' (RIN1120–AB66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–882. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone, Potomac and Anacostia Rivers; Washington, DC'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–883. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone within the Lower Portion of Anchorage #9, Mantua Creek Anchorage; Paulsboro, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1092)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–884. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Sellwood Bridge Move; Willamette River, Portland, OR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–885. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Monongahela River, Charleroi, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1071)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–886. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Oak Island, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1062)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–887. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Military Ocean Terminal Concord Safety Zone, Suisun Bay, Military Ocean Terminal Concord, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1008)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–888. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bridge Demolition Project; Indiana Harbor Canal, East Chicago, Indiana'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1099)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–889. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lake Worth Dredge Operations, Lake Worth Inlet; West Palm Beach, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0036)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–890. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone within the Lower Portion of Anchorage #9, Mantua Creek Anchorage; Paulsboro, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1092)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–891. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Vigor Industrial Roll-Out, West Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0039)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–892. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Sea World San Diego Fireworks, Mission Bay; San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–893. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Coast Guard Exercise Area, Hood Canal, Washington'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0900)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–894. A communication from the Acting Director, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Mandatory Automated Export System Filing for all Shipments Requiring Shipper's Export Declaration (SED) Information: Substantive Changes and Corrections'' (RIN0607–AA50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–895. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of the Aggravated Maximum Civil Monetary Penalty for a Violation of a Federal Railroad Safety Law or Federal Railroad Administration Safety Regulation or Order; Correction'' (RIN2130–AB94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–896. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Addition of Post-Accident Toxicological Testing for Non-Controlled Substances'' (RIN2130–AC24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–897. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Insurer Reporting Requirements'' (RIN2127–AL26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–898. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems'' (RIN2127–AL11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–899. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Hampton-Norfolk, Virginia; Norfolk, Virginia-Elizabeth City, North Carolina'' (MB Docket No. 11–139; DA 13–258) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–900. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ehrenberg, First Mesa, Kachina Village Mund Park, Wickenburg and Williams, Arizona)'' (MB Docket No. 11–207) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–901. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission's Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules; 2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations—Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology'' (FCC 13–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–902. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Environmental Impact and Related Procedures'' (RIN2125–AF46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–903. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (79); Amdt. No. 3522'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–904. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (7); Amdt. No. 3523'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–905. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Casper, WY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0509)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–906. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gaylord, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1401)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–907. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sault Ste Marie, ON'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0791)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–908. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hot Springs, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0655)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–909. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; Houston, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0079)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–910. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class B Airspace Description; Tampa, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0080)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–911. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Goldsboro, NC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0610)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–912. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—April 2013'' (Rev. Rul. 2013–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–913. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Stock Transfers and the Coordination Rule Exceptions; Transfers of Stock or Securities in Outbound Asset Reorganizations'' (TD 9615) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–914. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Certain Outbound Property Transfers by Domestic Corporations; Certain Stock Distributions by Domestic Corporations'' ((RIN1545–AM97) (TD 9614)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–915. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–916. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–027); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–917. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Audit of the Fraud Prevention Fund''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–918. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees; Correction'' (RIN0651–AC86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Special Report entitled ''History, Jurisdiction, and a Summary of Activities of the Committee on Energey and Natural Resources During the 112th Congress'' (Rept. No. 113–4).

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Finance:

Special Report entitled ''Report on the Activities of the Committee on Finance During the 112th Congress.'' (Rept. No. 113–5).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Special Report entitled ''Report on the Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary During the 112th Congress'' (Rept. No. 113–6).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Sarah Jewell, of Washington, to be Secretary of the Interior.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 632. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 633. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 634. A bill to allow members of the Armed Forces and National Guard to defer principal on Federal student loans for a certain period in connection with receipt of orders for mobilization for war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 635. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 636. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow certain hospitals in Puerto Rico to qualify for incentives for adoption and meaningful use of certified EHR Technology under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 637. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 638. A bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 639. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 640. A bill to reauthorize the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing assistance for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 641. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 642. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 643. A bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 644. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 645. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 646. A bill to create the National Endowment for the Oceans to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 647. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 648. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support teacher and school professional training on awareness of student mental health conditions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID:

S. 649. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 650. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution to consent to certain amendments enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. Res. 86. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. Res. 87. A resolution designating April 4, 2013, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 88. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 89. A resolution designating March 25, 2013, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 195

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 195, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 380

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include human trafficking as a part 1 violent crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 475

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 475, a bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes.

S. 477

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to modify a provision relating to gaming on land acquired after October 17, 1988.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 516

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 516, a bill to reduce disparities and improve access to effective and cost efficient diagnosis and treatment of prostate cancer through advances in testing, research, and education, including through telehealth, comparative effectiveness research, and identification of best practices in patient education and outreach particularly with respect to underserved racial, ethnic and rural populations and men with a family history of prostate cancer, to establish a directive on what constitutes clinically appropriate prostate cancer imaging, and to create a prostate cancer scientific advisory board for the Office of the Chief Scientist at the Food and Drug Administration to accelerate real-time sharing of the latest research and accelerate movement of new medicines to patients.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to require a study and report by the Small Business Administration regarding the costs to small business concerns of Federal regulations.

S. 536

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 536, a bill to require a study and report by the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the costs of Federal regulations.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 596, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to furnish remote patient monitoring services that reduce expenditures under such program.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. RES. 77

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 77, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the commemoration of the 180th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand.

AMENDMENT NO. 136

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 136 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 138

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 138 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 139

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 139 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 141

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 141 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 146

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 146 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 148

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 148 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 149

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 149 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 152

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 152 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 156

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 156 proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 158

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 158 proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 161

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 161 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 162

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 162 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 163

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 163 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 177 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 184 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 185

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 185 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 186 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 187

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 187 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 188

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 188 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 189

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 189 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 190 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 191

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 191 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 192

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 192 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 195 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 202

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 202 proposed to S. Con. Res. 8, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 641. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the critical need in today's health care workforce for additional training related to palliative care. Palliative care is an interdisciplinary model of care focused on relieving the pain, stress and other debilitating symptoms of serious illness, such as cancer, cardiac disease, respiratory disease, kidney failure, Alzheimer's, AIDS, ALS, and MS. Its goal is to relieve suffering and provide the best possible quality of life for patients and their families.

Many people mistakenly believe that palliative care is only beneficial when a cure is not possible. Actually, palliative care is not dependent on a life-limiting prognosis and may actually help individuals recover by relieving symptoms such as pain, anxiety or loss of appetite while they are undergoing sometimes difficult medical treatments or procedures, such as surgery or chemotherapy. Palliative care is provided by a team of doctors, nurses, social workers, and other specialists who work with a patient's other health care providers to provide an extra layer of support, including assistance with difficult medical decision-making and coordination of care among specialists. Palliative care is appropriate for people of any age and at any stage in an illness, whether that illness is curable, chronic or life-threatening.

There is a specific type of palliative care, called hospice, for people for whom a cure is no longer possible and who likely have 6 months or less to live. Hospice care can be provided at one's home, a hospice facility, a hospital or a nursing home. Hospice care is about giving patients control, dignity and comfort so they have the best possible quality of life during the time they have. Hospice care also provides support and grief therapy for loved ones whose struggles are often cast aside or forgotten during treatment.

A growing evidence base has demonstrated that palliative care, including hospice, improves quality, controls cost and enhances patient and family satisfaction for the rapidly expanding population of individuals with serious or life-threatening illness. Palliative care may also prolong the lives of some seriously ill patients.

Over the last 10 years, the number of hospital-based palliative care programs has more than doubled due to the increasing number of Americans living with serious, complex and chronic illnesses and the realities of the care responsibilities faced by their families. Studies suggest that in states with more hospital-based palliative care programs, patients are less likely to die in the hospital, are likely to spend fewer days in the ICU, have better pain management and higher satisfaction with their health care.

As usual, Oregon is ahead of the curve and I'm proud to say that in a 2011 report ranking states on their citizens' access to hospital-based palliative care programs, Oregon was among the seven states who earned an ''A'' rating, with 88 percent of Oregon hospitals offering palliative care.

Unfortunately, many seriously ill patients and their families lack the type of access available to Oregonians. Palliative care is a relatively new medical specialty and more must be done to ensure an adequate, well-trained palliative care workforce is available to provide comprehensive symptom management, intensive communication and a level of care coordination that addresses the episodic and long-term nature of serious, chronic illness. I believe that, with Federal support, we can help address the workforce gap between those currently practicing in palliative care and hospice and the number of health care professionals required to care for this expanding patient population. That is why today I am introducing the ''Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act'' or PCHETA. This authoring legislation focuses on three key areas to grow the palliative care and hospice workforce: education centers to expand interdisciplinary training in palliative and hospice care; training of physicians who plan to teach palliative medicine and fellowships to encourage re-training for mid-career physicians; and academic career awards and career incentive awards to support physicians and other health care providers who provide palliative and hospice care training.

With this legislation, patients and families who are facing serious or life-threatening illness will have access to the high-quality palliative care and hospice services that can maximize their quality of life. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 645. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am pleased to reintroduce the Refugee Protection Act. The Senate will soon turn to comprehensive immigration reform and the changes to the refugee system contained in this bill are a critical component of fixing our broken immigration system. As we address the

many complex immigration issues facing our country, we must ensure that America upholds its longstanding commitment to refugee protection.

The Refugee Protection Act of 2013 reaffirms the commitments we made in ratifying the 1951 Refugee Convention, and will help to restore the United States as a global leader on human rights. This legislation seeks to repeal the most harsh, inefficient, and unnecessary elements of current law, and restore the United States to its rightful role as a safe and welcoming home for those suffering from persecution around the world.

During this challenging economic time, it can be tempting to look inward rather than to fulfill our global humanitarian commitments. I believe this bill is needed more now than ever. Millions of refugees remain displaced and warehoused in refugee camps in Eastern Africa, Southeast Asia, and other parts of the world. Ongoing political struggles in the Middle East and North Africa are causing dislocation of significant populations. We will continue to see genuine refugees who are in dire need of protection. The Refugee Protection Act helps ensure that America will continue to be a haven for these individuals and their families, just as it has been historically.

Since passage of the landmark Refugee Act of 1980, more than 2.6 million refugees and asylum seekers have been granted protection in the United States. In my home State of Vermont, I have seen how the admission of these refugees and asylum seekers, almost 5,600 in the last 20 years, has revitalized and enriched communities, resulting in the creation of new businesses, safer neighborhoods, and stronger schools. We are fortunate to have the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program, with its decades of experience and award-winning volunteer program, leading this effort. Over the last 5 years, many of these new Vermonters have come from Bhutan, Burma, and the Congo. As they become small business owners, nurses, and soccer coaches, they contribute to the well-being of our communities and their culture enriches my historically Anglo-Saxon and French-Canadian state.

Vermonters have played a tremendous role in welcoming refugees and asylum-seekers to their communities. Many have hosted refugee families in their homes until suitable housing could be found. Despite this generous community support, however, Vermont's resettlement program is not without its challenges. We experience many of the same hurdles faced by resettlement efforts and receiving communities across the Nation. To help address these hurdles, the Refugee Protection Act of 2013 includes provisions that will help the nationwide resettlement effort operate more effectively.

In addition to support and improvement of the resettlement program, this bill concerns several areas of domestic asylum adjudication that are in need of significant reform. This bill would repeal the one-year filing deadline for asylum seekers, removing an unnecessary barrier to protection. The bill would allow arriving aliens and minors to seek asylum first before the Asylum Office, rather than referring those cases immediately to immigration court. The Asylum Office is well trained to screen for fraud and is able to handle a slight increase in its caseload. Meanwhile, as we have heard from many immigration experts, the immigration courts are overburdened, under-resourced, and facing steady increases in their caseloads.

The Refugee Protection Act ensures that persons who were victims of terrorism or persecution by terrorist groups will not be doubly victimized with a denial of protection in the United States. Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates, a legal aid provider and a collaborator in the New England Survivor of Torture and Trauma program, continues to see cases where persons granted asylum are later blocked from bringing their families to the United States or from applying for permanent residency by overly broad definitions in current law. This bill would help such persons prove their cases without taking any shortcuts that could harm national security. The bill also gives the President the authority to designate certain particularly vulnerable groups for expedited consideration. All refugees would still have to complete security and background checks prior to entry to the United States.

Finally, the bill recognizes the need to treat genuine asylum seekers as persons in need of protection, not as criminals. It calls for asylum seekers who can prove their identities and who pose no threat to the United States to be released from immigration detention. Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates, like other legal aid providers across the Nation, struggle to visit detention facilities located at great distance, or to reach clients who have been transferred to far away locations. I appreciate efforts made by the Obama administration to parole eligible asylum seekers and to improve the conditions of detention overall, but more must be done. The Refugee Protection Act will improve access to counsel so that asylum seekers with genuine claims can gain legal assistance in presenting their claims. It will require the Government to codify detention standards to ensure that reforms are meaningful and enforceable. These reforms are humane and fair, but they will also save taxpayer dollars because of the high costs associated with unnecessary detentions.

There is no question that the United States is a leader among nations in refugee protection, but we can do better. The refugees we welcome to our shores contribute to the fabric of our Nation, and enrich the communities where they settle. I urge all Senators to support the Refugee Protection Act of 2013.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 645

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Refugee Protection Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Elimination of time limits on asylum applications.
Sec. 4. Protecting victims of terrorism from being defined as terrorists.
Sec. 5. Protecting certain vulnerable groups of asylum seekers.
Sec. 6. Effective adjudication of proceedings.
Sec. 7. Scope and standard for review.
Sec. 8. Efficient asylum determination process.
Sec. 9. Secure Alternatives Program.
Sec. 10. Conditions of detention.
Sec. 11. Timely notice of immigration charges.
Sec. 12. Procedures for ensuring accuracy and verifiability of sworn statements taken pursuant to expedited removal authority.
Sec. 13. Study on the effect of expedited removal provisions, practices, and procedures on asylum claims.
Sec. 14. Refugee opportunity promotion.
Sec. 15. Protections for minors seeking asylum.
Sec. 16. Legal assistance for refugees and asylees.
Sec. 17. Protection of stateless persons in the United States.
Sec. 18. Authority to designate certain groups of refugees for consideration.
Sec. 19. Multiple forms of relief.
Sec. 20. Protection of refugee families.
Sec. 21. Reform of refugee consultation process.
Sec. 22. Admission of refugees in the absence of the annual presidential determination.
Sec. 23. Update of reception and placement grants.
Sec. 24. Protection for aliens interdicted at sea.
Sec. 25. Modification of physical presence requirements for aliens serving as translators.
Sec. 26. Assessment of the Refugee Domestic Resettlement Program.
Sec. 27. Refugee assistance.
Sec. 28. Resettlement data.
Sec. 29. Protections for refugees.
Sec. 30. Extension of eligibility period for Social Security benefits for certain refugees.
Sec. 31. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 32. Determination of budgetary effects.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASYLUM SEEKER.—The term ''asylum seeker''—

(A) means—

(i) any applicant for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158);

(ii) any alien who indicates an intention to apply for asylum under that section; and

(iii) any alien who indicates an intention to apply for withholding of removal, pursuant to—

(I) section 241 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231); or

(II) the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984;

(B) includes any individual described in subparagraph (A) whose application for asylum or withholding of removal is pending judicial review; and

(C) does not include an individual with respect to whom a final order denying asylum and withholding of removal has been entered if such order is not pending judicial review.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF TIME LIMITS ON ASYLUM APPLICATIONS.

Section 208(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or the Secretary of Homeland Security'' after ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears;

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (D);

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(4) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (C) and (D)''; and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (B), as redesignated, the following:

''(C) CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), an application for asylum of an alien may be considered if the alien demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, the existence of changed circumstances that materially affect the applicant's eligibility for asylum.

''(D) MOTION TO REOPEN ASYLUM CLAIM.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) or section 240(c)(7), an alien may file a motion to reopen an asylum claim during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Refugee Protection Act of 2013 if the alien—

''(i) was denied asylum based solely upon a failure to meet the 1-year application filing deadline in effect on the date on which the application was filed;

''(ii) was granted withholding of removal to the alien's country of nationality (or, if stateless, to the country of last habitual residence under section 241(b)(3));

''(iii) has not obtained lawful permanent residence in the United States pursuant to any other provision of law;

''(iv) is not subject to the safe third country exception in section 208(a)(2)(A) or a bar to asylum under section 208(b)(2) and should not be denied asylum as a matter of discretion; and

''(v) is physically present in the United States when the motion is filed.''.

SEC. 4. PROTECTING VICTIMS OF TERRORISM FROM BEING DEFINED AS TERRORISTS.

(a) TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.—Section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii) and subsection (d)(3)(B)(i), an alien is inadmissible if—

''(I) the alien has engaged in a terrorist activity;

''(II) a consular officer, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security knows, or has reasonable ground to believe, that the alien is engaged, or is likely to engage after entry, in any terrorist activity;

''(III) the alien has, under circumstances indicating an intention to cause death or serious bodily harm, incited terrorist activity;

''(IV) the alien is a representative of—

''(aa) a terrorist organization; or

''(bb) a political, social, or other group that endorses or espouses terrorist activity;

''(V) the alien is a member of a terrorist organization;

''(VI) the alien endorses or espouses terrorist activity or persuades others to endorse or espouse terrorist activity or support a terrorist organization;

''(VII) the alien has received military-type training (as defined in section 2339D(c)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from, or on behalf of, any organization that, at the time the training was received, was a terrorist organization; or

''(VIII) the alien is an officer, official, representative, or spokesman of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(I) LACK OF KNOWLEDGE.—Clause (i)(V) shall not apply to an alien who is a member of a terrorist organization described in clause (iii)(V)(cc) if the alien demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the alien did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization.

''(II) DURESS.—Clause (i)(VII) and items (dd) through (ff) of clause (iii)(I) shall not apply to an alien who establishes that his or her actions giving rise to inadmissibility under such clause were committed under duress and the alien does not pose a threat to the security of the United States. In determining whether the alien was subject to duress, the Secretary of Homeland Security may consider, among relevant factors, the age of the alien at the time such actions were committed.

''(iii) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(I) ENGAGE IN TERRORIST ACTIVITY.—The term 'engage in terrorist activity' means, in an individual capacity or as a member of an organization—

''(aa) to commit or to incite to commit, under circumstances indicating an intention to cause death or serious bodily injury, a terrorist activity;

''(bb) to prepare or plan a terrorist activity;

''(cc) to gather information on potential targets for terrorist activity;

''(dd) to solicit funds or other things of value for—

''(AA) a terrorist activity;

''(BB) a terrorist organization described in item (aa) or (bb) of clause (iii)(V); or

''(CC) a terrorist organization described in clause (iii)(V)(cc), unless the solicitor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he or she did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization;

''(ee) to solicit any individual—

''(AA) to engage in conduct otherwise described in this subsection;

''(BB) for membership in a terrorist organization described in item (aa) or (bb) of clause (iii)(V); or

''(CC) for membership in a terrorist organization described in clause (iii)(V)(cc) unless the solicitor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he or she did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization; or

''(ff) to commit an act that the actor knows, or reasonably should know, affords material support, including a safe house, transportation, communications, funds, transfer of funds or other material financial benefit, false documentation or identification, weapons (including chemical, biological, or radiological weapons), explosives, or training—

''(AA) for the commission of a terrorist activity;

''(BB) to any individual who the actor knows, or reasonably should know, has committed or plans to commit a terrorist activity;

''(CC) to a terrorist organization described in item (aa) or (bb) of clause (iii)(V) or to any member of such an organization; or

''(DD) to a terrorist organization described in clause (iii)(V)(cc), or to any member of such an organization, unless the actor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he or she did not know, and should not reasonably have known, that the organization was a terrorist organization.

''(II) MATERIAL SUPPORT.—The term 'material support' means support that is significant and of a kind directly relevant to terrorist activity.

''(III) REPRESENTATIVE.—The term 'representative' includes—

''(aa) an officer, official, or spokesman of an organization; and

''(bb) any person who directs, counsels, commands, or induces an organization or its members to engage in terrorist activity.

''(IV) TERRORIST ACTIVITY.—The term 'terrorist activity' means any activity which is unlawful under the laws of the place where it is committed (or which, if it had been committed in the United States, would be unlawful under the laws of the United States or any State) and which involves—

''(aa) the highjacking or sabotage of any conveyance (including an aircraft, vessel, or vehicle);

''(bb) the seizing or detaining, and threatening to kill, injure, or continue to detain, another individual in order to compel a third person (including a governmental organization) to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the individual seized or detained;

''(cc) a violent attack upon an internationally protected person (as defined in section 1116(b)(4) of title 18, United States Code) or upon the liberty of such a person;

''(dd) an assassination;

''(ee) the use, with the intent to endanger the safety of 1 or more individuals or to cause substantial damage to property, of any—

''(AA) biological agent, chemical agent, or nuclear weapon or device; or

''(BB) explosive, firearm, or other weapon or dangerous device (other than for mere personal monetary gain); or

''(ff) a threat, attempt, or conspiracy to carry out any of the activities described in items (aa) through (ee).

''(V) TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.—The term 'terrorist organization' means an organization—

''(aa) designated under section 219;

''(bb) otherwise designated, upon publication in the Federal Register, by the Secretary of State in consultation with or upon the request of the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security, as a terrorist organization, after finding that the organization engages in the activities described in items (aa) through (ff) of subclause (I); or

''(cc) that is a group of 2 or more individuals, whether organized or not, which engages in, or has a subgroup which engages in, the activities described in items (aa) through (ff) of subclause (I).''.

(b) CHILD SOLDIERS.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(G)) is amended by adding at the end the following ''This subparagraph shall not apply to an alien who establishes that the actions giving rise to inadmissibility under this subparagraph were committed under duress or carried out while the alien was younger than 18 years of age.''.

(2) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(4)(F) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)(F)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (E) (as added by section 5502(b)), as subparagraph (F); and

(C) in subparagraph (G), as redesignated, by adding at the end the following ''This subparagraph shall not apply to an alien who establishes that the actions giving rise to deportability under this subparagraph were committed under duress or carried out while the alien was younger than 18 years of age.''.

(c) TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 212(d)(3)(B)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B)(i) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, may conclude, in such Secretary's sole, unreviewable discretion, that subsection (a)(3)(B) shall not apply to an alien or that subsection (a)(3)(B)(iii)(V)(cc) shall not apply to a group. The Secretary of State may not exercise discretion under this clause with respect to an alien after removal proceedings against the alien have commenced under section 240.''.

SEC. 5. PROTECTING CERTAIN VULNERABLE GROUPS OF ASYLUM SEEKERS.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—Section 101(a)(42) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)) is amended to read as follows:

''(42)(A) The term 'refugee' means any person who—

''(i)(I) is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such person last habitually resided; and

''(II) is unable to return to, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of, that country because of persecution, or a well-founded fear of persecution, on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; or

''(ii) in such circumstances as the President may specify, after appropriate consultation (as defined in section 207(e))—

''(I) is within the country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, within the country in which such person is habitually residing; and

''(II) is persecuted, or who has a well-founded fear of persecution, on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

''(B) The term 'refugee' does not include any person who ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

''(C) For purposes of determinations under this Act—

''(i) a person who has been forced to abort a pregnancy or to undergo involuntary sterilization, or who has been persecuted for failure or refusal to undergo such a procedure or for other resistance to a coercive population control program, shall be deemed to have been persecuted on account of political opinion; and

''(ii) a person who has a well-founded fear that he or she will be forced to undergo such a procedure or subject to persecution for such failure, refusal, or resistance shall be deemed to have a well-founded fear of persecution on account of political opinion.

''(D) For purposes of determinations under this Act, any group whose members share a characteristic that is either immutable or fundamental to identity, conscience, or the exercise of the person's human rights such that the person should not be required to change it, shall be deemed a particular social group, without any additional requirement.''.

(b) CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING ASYLUM.—Section 208(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''at least one central reason for persecuting the applicant'' and inserting ''a factor in the applicant's persecution or fear of persecution'';

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''If the trier of fact determines that the applicant should provide evidence that corroborates otherwise credible testimony, the trier of fact shall provide notice and allow the applicant a reasonable opportunity to file such evidence unless the applicant does not have the evidence and cannot reasonably obtain the evidence.'';

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv);

(4) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) SUPPORTING EVIDENCE ACCEPTED.—Direct or circumstantial evidence, including evidence that the State is unable to protect the applicant or that State legal or social norms tolerate such persecution against persons like the applicant, may establish that persecution is on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.''; and

(5) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by striking '', without regard to whether an inconsistency, inaccuracy, or falsehood goes to the heart of the applicant's claim, or any other relevant factor.'' and inserting ''. If the trier of fact determines that there are inconsistencies or omissions, the alien shall be given an opportunity to explain and to provide support or evidence to clarify such inconsistencies or omissions.''.

(c) REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—Section 240(c)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''If the trier of fact determines that the applicant should provide evidence that corroborates otherwise credible testimony, the trier of fact shall provide notice and allow the applicant a reasonable opportunity to file such evidence unless the applicant does not have the evidence and cannot reasonably obtain the evidence.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', without regard to whether an inconsistency, inaccuracy, or falsehood goes to the heart of the applicant's claim, or any other relevant factor.'' and inserting ''. If the trier of fact determines that there are inconsistencies or omissions, the alien shall be given an opportunity to explain and to provide support or evidence to clarify such inconsistencies or omissions.''.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE ADJUDICATION OF PROCEEDINGS.

Section 240(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''In proceedings under this section, under regulations of the Attorney General'' and inserting ''The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations for proceedings under this section, under which—''

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', and'' at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) the Attorney General, or the designee of the Attorney General, may appoint counsel to represent an alien if the fair resolution or effective adjudication of the proceedings would be served by appointment of counsel; and''.

SEC. 7. SCOPE AND STANDARD FOR REVIEW.

Section 242(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: ''The alien shall not be removed during such 30-day period, unless the alien indicates in writing that he or she wishes to be removed before the expiration of such period.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) SCOPE AND STANDARD FOR REVIEW.—Except as provided in paragraph (5)(B), the court of appeals shall sustain a final decision ordering removal unless it is contrary to law, an abuse of discretion, or not supported by substantial evidence. The court of appeals shall decide the petition only on the administrative record on which the order of removal is based.''.

SEC. 8. EFFICIENT ASYLUM DETERMINATION PROCESS.

Section 235(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum.'' and inserting ''may, in the Secretary's discretion, be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum by an asylum officer designated by the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. The asylum officer, after conducting a nonadversarial asylum interview, may grant asylum to the alien under section 208 or refer the case to a designee of the Attorney General, for a de novo asylum determination, for relief under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984, or for withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3).''; and

(2) in clause (iii)(IV)—

(A) by amending the subclause heading to read as follows:

''(IV) DETENTION.—''; and

(B) by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may, in the Secretary's discretion,''.

SEC. 9. SECURE ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish the Secure Alternatives Program (referred to in this section as the ''Program'') under which an alien who has been detained may be released under enhanced supervision—

(1) to prevent the alien from absconding;

(2) to ensure that the alien makes appearances related to such detention; and

(3) to authorize and promote the utilization of alternatives to detention of asylum seekers.

(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) NATIONWIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall facilitate the nationwide implementation of the Program.

(2) UTILIZATION OF ALTERNATIVES.—The Program shall utilize a continuum of alternatives based on the alien's need for supervision, which may include placement of the alien—

(A) with an individual or organizational sponsor; or

(B) in a supervised group home.

(3) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The Program shall include—

(A) individualized case management by an assigned case supervisor; and

(B) referral to community-based providers of legal and social services.

(4) RESTRICTIVE ELECTRONIC MONITORING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Restrictive electronic monitoring devices, such as ankle bracelets,

may not be used unless there is a demonstrated need for such enhanced monitoring.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Secretary shall periodically review any decision to require the use of devices described in subparagraph (A).

(5) ALIENS ELIGIBLE FOR SECURE ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Asylum seekers denied parole under section 235(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)) shall be eligible to participate in the Program.

(B) PROGRAM DESIGN.—The Program shall be designed to ensure sufficient supervision of the population described in subparagraph (A).

(6) INDIVIDUALIZED DETERMINATIONS.—For aliens who pose a flight risk, the Secretary shall make an individualized determination as to whether this risk can be mitigated through the Program.

(7) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General and the Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing procedures for the review of any determination under this section by an immigration judge, unless the alien waives the right to such review.

(8) CONTRACTS.—The Secretary shall enter into contracts with qualified nongovernmental entities to implement the Program.

(9) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In designing the Program, the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with relevant experts; and

(B) consider programs that have proven successful in the past, including the Appearance Assistance Program developed by the Vera Institute of Justice.

(c) PAROLE OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—Section 235(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (vi); and

(2) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

''(v) RELEASE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Any alien subject to detention under this subsection who has been determined to have a credible fear of persecution shall be released from the custody of the Department of Homeland Security not later than 7 days after such determination unless the Secretary of Homeland Security demonstrates by substantial evidence that the alien—

''(aa) poses a risk to public safety, which may include a risk to national security; or

''(bb) is a flight risk, which cannot be mitigated through other conditions of release, such as bond or secure alternatives, that would reasonably ensure that the alien would appear for immigration proceedings.

''(II) NOTICE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide every alien and the alien's legal representative with written notification of the parole decision, including a brief explanation of the reasons for any decision to deny parole. The notification should be communicated to the alien orally or in writing, in a language the alien claims to understand.''.

SEC. 10. CONDITIONS OF DETENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

(1) establish the conditions for the detention of asylum seekers that ensure a safe and humane environment; and

(2) include the rights and procedures set forth in subsections (c) through (e).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DETAINEE.—The term ''detainee'' means an individual who is detained under the authority of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) DETENTION FACILITY.—The term ''detention facility'' means any Federal, State, or local government facility or privately owned and operated facility, which is being used to hold detainees longer than 72 hours.

(3) GROUP LEGAL ORIENTATION PRESENTATIONS.—The term ''group legal orientation presentations'' means live group presentations, supplemented by individual orientations, pro se workshops, and pro bono referrals, that—

(A) are carried out by private nongovernmental organizations;

(B) are presented to detainees;

(C) inform detainees about United States immigration law and procedures; and

(D) enable detainees to determine their eligibility for relief.

(4) SHORT-TERM DETENTION FACILITY.—The term ''short-term detention facility'' means any detention facility that is used to hold immigration detainees for not more than 72 hours.

(c) ACCESS TO LEGAL SERVICES.—

(1) LISTS OF LEGAL SERVICE PROVIDERS.—All detainees arriving at a detention facility shall promptly receive—

(A) access to legal information, including an on-site law library with up-to-date legal materials and law databases;

(B) free access to the necessary equipment and materials for legal research and correspondence, such as computers, printers, copiers, and typewriters;

(C) an accurate, updated list of free or low-cost immigration legal service providers that—

(i) are near such detention facility; and

(ii) can assist those with limited English proficiency or disabilities;

(D) confidential meeting space to confer with legal counsel; and

(E) services to send confidential legal documents to legal counsel, government offices, and legal organizations.

(2) GROUP LEGAL ORIENTATION PRESENTATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for regularly scheduled, group legal orientation presentations.

(3) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall establish a program to award grants to nongovernmental agencies for the purpose of developing, implementing, or expanding legal orientation programs available for all detainees at the detention facilities in which such programs are offered.

(4) VISITS.—Detainees shall be provided adequate access to contact visits from—

(A) legal service providers, including attorneys, paralegals, law graduates, law students, and representatives accredited by the Board of Immigration Appeals;

(B) consultants, as authorized under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)), before and during interviews in which determinations of credible fear of persecution are made; and

(C) individuals assisting in the provision of legal representation and documentation in support of the asylum seekers' cases, including interpreters, medical personnel, mental health providers, social welfare workers, expert and fact witnesses, and others.

(5) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to provide detainees with adequate and prompt notice, in the language of the detainee, of their available release options and the procedures for requesting such options.

(6) LOCATION OF NEW DETENTION FACILITIES.—All detention facilities first used by the Department of Homeland Security after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be located within 50 miles of a community in which there is a demonstrated capacity to provide free or low-cost legal representation by—

(A) nonprofit legal aid organizations; or

(B) pro bono attorneys with expertise in asylum or immigration law.

(7) NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFERS.—The Secretary shall establish procedures requiring the prompt notification of the legal representative of a detainee before transferring such detainee to another detention facility.

(8) ACCESS TO TELEPHONES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 hours after the commencement of a detention of a detainee, the detainee shall be provided reasonable access to a telephone, with at least 1 working telephone available for every 25 detainees.

(B) CONTACTS.—Each detainee has the right to contact by telephone, free of charge—

(i) legal representatives;

(ii) nongovernmental organizations designated by the Secretary;

(iii) consular officials;

(iv) the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(v) Federal and State courts in which the detainee is, or may become, involved in a legal proceeding; and

(vi) all Government immigration agencies and adjudicatory bodies, including the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, through confidential toll-free numbers.

(d) RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) ACCESS TO RELIGIOUS SERVICES.—Detainees shall be given full and equitable access to religious services, religious materials, opportunity for religious group study, and religious counseling appropriate to their religious beliefs and practices.

(2) CHAPLAINS.—Each detention facility shall have a chaplain, who shall be responsible for—

(A) managing the religious activities at the detention facility, including providing pastoral care and counseling to detainees; and

(B) facilitating access to pastoral care and counseling from external clergy or religious service providers who represent the faiths of the detainees at the facility.

(3) DIETARY NEEDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the religious, medical, and cultural dietary needs of the detainees are met.

(4) QUALIFICATIONS OF STAFF.—The Secretary shall ensure that detention facility staff members are trained to recognize and address cultural and gender issues relevant to male, female, and child detainees.

(5) ACCESS TO DETENTION FACILITIES BY NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Nongovernmental organizations shall be provided reasonable access to a detention facility to—

(A) observe the conditions of detention outlined in this section;

(B) engage in teaching and training programs for the detainees detained at the facility; and

(C) provide legal or religious services to the detainees.

(e) LIMITATIONS ON SOLITARY CONFINEMENT, SHACKLING, AND STRIP SEARCHES.—

(1) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Solitary confinement, shackling, and strip searches of detainees—

(A) may not be used unless such techniques are necessitated by extraordinary circumstances in which the safety of other persons is at imminent risk; and

(B) may not be used for the purpose of humiliating detainees within or outside the detention facility.

(2) PROTECTED CLASSES.—Solitary confinement, shackling, and strip searches may not be used on pregnant women, nursing mothers, women in labor or delivery, or children who are younger than 18 years of age. Strip searches may not be conducted in the presence of children who are younger than 21 years of age.

(3) WRITTEN POLICIES.—Detention facilities shall—

(A) adopt written policies pertaining to the use of force and restraints; and

(B) train all staff on the proper use of such techniques and devices.

SEC. 11. TIMELY NOTICE OF IMMIGRATION CHARGES.

Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) NOTICE AND CHARGES.—Not later than 48 hours after the commencement of a detention of an individual under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(1) file a Notice to Appear or other relevant charging document with the immigration court closest to the location at which the individual was apprehended; and

''(2) serve such notice or charging document on the individual.''.

SEC. 12. PROCEDURES FOR ENSURING ACCURACY AND VERIFIABILITY OF SWORN STATEMENTS TAKEN PURSUANT TO EXPEDITED REMOVAL AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish quality assurance procedures to ensure the accuracy and verifiability of signed or sworn statements taken by employees of the Department of Homeland Security exercising expedited removal authority under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)).

(b) RECORDING OF INTERVIEWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any sworn or signed written statement taken from an alien as part of the record of a proceeding under section 235(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be accompanied by a recording of the interview which served as the basis for such sworn statement.

(2) CONTENT.—The recording shall include—

(A) a reading of the entire written statement to the alien in a language that the alien claims to understand; and

(B) the verbal affirmation by the alien of the accuracy of—

(i) the written statement; or

(ii) a corrected version of the written statement.

(3) FORMAT.—The recording shall be made in video, audio, or other equally reliable format.

(4) EVIDENCE.—Recordings of interviews under this subsection may be considered as evidence in any further proceedings involving the alien.

(c) EXEMPTION AUTHORITY.—

(1) EXEMPTED FACILITIES.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to interviews that occur at detention facilities exempted by the Secretary under this subsection.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Secretary, or the Secretary's designee, may exempt any detention facility if compliance with subsection (b) at that facility would impair operations or impose undue burdens or costs.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit a report to Congress that identifies the facilities that have been exempted under this subsection.

(4) NO PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to create a private cause of action for damages or injunctive relief.

(d) INTERPRETERS.—The Secretary shall ensure that a professional fluent interpreter is used if—

(1) the interviewing officer does not speak a language understood by the alien; and

(2) there is no other Federal Government employee available who is able to interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially.

SEC. 13. STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF EXPEDITED REMOVAL PROVISIONS, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES ON ASYLUM CLAIMS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') is authorized to conduct a study to determine whether immigration officers described in paragraph (2) are engaging in conduct described in paragraph (3).

(2) IMMIGRATION OFFICERS DESCRIBED.—An immigration officer described in this paragraph is an immigration officer performing duties under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)) with respect to aliens who—

(A) are apprehended after entering the United States; and

(B) may be eligible to apply for asylum under section 208 or 235 of such Act.

(3) CONDUCT DESCRIBED.—An immigration officer engages in conduct described in this paragraph if the immigration officer—

(A) improperly encourages an alien referred to in paragraph (2) to withdraw or retract claims for asylum;

(B) incorrectly fails to refer such an alien for an interview by an asylum officer to determine whether the alien has a credible fear of persecution (as defined in section 235(b)(1)(B)(v) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)(v)));

(C) incorrectly removes such an alien to a country in which the alien may be persecuted; or

(D) detains such an alien improperly or under inappropriate conditions.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Commission initiates the study under subsection (a), the Commission shall submit a report containing the results of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(5) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(6) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) FROM OTHER AGENCIES.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission may identify employees of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Government Accountability Office that have significant expertise and knowledge of refugee and asylum issues.

(B) DESIGNATION.—At the request of the Commission, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Comptroller General of the United States shall authorize staff identified under subparagraph (A) to assist the Commission in conducting the study under subsection (a).

(2) ADDITIONAL STAFF.—The Commission may hire additional staff and consultants to conduct the study under subsection (a).

(3) ACCESS TO PROCEEDINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary and the Attorney General shall provide staff designated under paragraph (1) or hired under paragraph (2) with unrestricted access to all stages of all proceedings conducted under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)).

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary and the Attorney General may not permit unrestricted access under subparagraph (A) if—

(i) the alien subject to a proceeding under such section 235(b) objects to such access; or

(ii) the Secretary or Attorney General determines that the security of a particular proceeding would be threatened by such access.

SEC. 14. REFUGEE OPPORTUNITY PROMOTION.

Section 209 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1159) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by striking ''one year,'' and inserting ''1 year (except as provided under subsection (d));'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''asylum,'' and inserting ''asylum (except as provided under subsection (d));''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) EXCEPTION TO PHYSICAL PRESENCE REQUIREMENT.—An alien who does not meet the 1-year physical presence requirement under subsection (a)(1)(B) or (b)(2), but who otherwise meets the requirements under subsection (a) or (b) for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, may be eligible for such adjustment of status if the alien—

''(1) is or was employed by—

''(A) the United States Government or a contractor of the United States Government overseas and performing work on behalf of the United States Government for the entire period of absence, which may not exceed 1 year; or

''(B) the United States Government or a contractor of the United States Government in the alien's country of nationality or last habitual residence for the entire period of absence, which may not exceed 1 year, and the alien was under the protection of the United States Government or a contractor while performing work on behalf of the United States Government during the entire period of employment; and

''(2) returned immediately to the United States upon the conclusion of the employment.''.

SEC. 15. PROTECTIONS FOR MINORS SEEKING ASYLUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), as amended by section 3, by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

''(E) APPLICABILITY TO MINORS.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) shall not apply to an applicant who is younger than 18 years of age on the earlier of—

''(i) the date on which the asylum application is filed; or

''(ii) the date on which any Notice to Appear is issued.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) INITIAL JURISDICTION.—An asylum officer (as defined in section 235(b)(1)(E)) shall have initial jurisdiction over any asylum application filed by an applicant who is younger than 18 years of age on the earlier of—

''(i) the date on which the asylum application is filed; or

''(ii) the date on which any Notice to Appear is issued.''.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF REMOVAL.—Section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''If the Attorney General'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (8), if the Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(2) by adding at the end of the following:

''(8) APPLICABILITY OF REINSTATEMENT OF REMOVAL.—Paragraph (5) shall not apply to an alien who has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed or having departed voluntarily, under an order of removal, if the alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien was removed or departed voluntarily under an order of removal.''.

SEC. 16. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR REFUGEES AND ASYLEES.

Section 412(c)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(c)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at an end;

(2) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(3) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) to provide legal services for refugees to assist them in obtaining immigration benefits for which they are eligible; and''.

SEC. 17. PROTECTION OF STATELESS PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 210A. PROTECTION OF STATELESS PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) DEFINED TERM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'de jure stateless person' means an individual who is not considered a national under the laws of any country. Individuals who have lost their nationality as a result of their voluntary action or knowing inaction after arrival in the United States shall not be considered de jure stateless persons.

''(2) DESIGNATION OF SPECIFIC DE JURE GROUPS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, designate specific groups of individuals who are considered de jure stateless persons, for purposes of this section.

''(b) MECHANISMS FOR REGULARIZING THE STATUS OF STATELESS PERSONS.—

''(1) RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS DETERMINED TO BE DE JURE STATELESS PERSONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may, in his or her discretion, provide conditional lawful status to an alien who is otherwise inadmissible or deportable from the United States if the alien—

''(A) is a de jure stateless person;

''(B) applies for such relief;

''(C) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 212(a); and

''(D) is not described in section 241(b)(3)(B)(i).

''(2) WAIVERS.—The provisions under paragraphs (4), (5), (6)(A), (7)(A), and (9) of section 212(a) shall not be applicable to any alien seeking relief under paragraph (1). The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may waive any other provision of such section (other than paragraph (2)(C) or subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (E) of paragraph (3)) with respect to such an alien for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or if it is otherwise in the public interest.

''(3) SUBMISSION OF PASSPORT OR TRAVEL DOCUMENT.—Any alien who seeks relief under this section shall submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General—

''(A) any passport or travel document issued at any time to the alien (whether or not the passport or document has expired or been cancelled, rescinded, or revoked); or

''(B) an affidavit, sworn under penalty of perjury—

''(i) stating that the alien has never been issued a passport or travel document; or

''(ii) identifying with particularity any such passport or travel document and explaining why the alien cannot submit it.

''(4) WORK AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may—

''(A) authorize an alien who has applied for relief under paragraph (1) to engage in employment in the United States while such application is being considered; and

''(B) provide such applicant with an employment authorized endorsement or other appropriate document signifying authorization of employment.

''(5) TREATMENT OF SPOUSE AND CHILDREN.—The spouse or child of an alien who has been granted conditional lawful status under paragraph (1) shall, if not otherwise eligible for admission under paragraph (1), be granted conditional lawful status under this section if accompanying, or following to join, such alien if—

''(A) the spouse or child is admissible (except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2)); and

''(B) the qualifying relationship to the principal beneficiary existed on the date on which such alien was granted conditional lawful status.

''(c) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—

''(1) INSPECTION AND EXAMINATION.—At the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date on which an alien has been granted conditional lawful status under subsection (b), the alien may apply for lawful permanent residence in the United States if—

''(A) the alien has been physically present in the United States for at least 5 years;

''(B) the alien's conditional lawful status has not been terminated by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary or the Attorney General may prescribe; and

''(C) the alien has not otherwise acquired permanent resident status.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General, under such regulations as the Secretary or the Attorney General may prescribe, may adjust the status of an alien granted conditional lawful status under subsection (b) to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if such alien—

''(A) is a de jure stateless person;

''(B) properly applies for such adjustment of status;

''(C) has been physically present in the United States for at least 5 years after being granted conditional lawful status under subsection (b);

''(D) is not firmly resettled in any foreign country; and

''(E) is admissible (except as otherwise provided under subsection (b)(2)) as an immigrant under this chapter at the time of examination of such alien for adjustment of status.

''(3) RECORD.—Upon approval of an application under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General shall establish a record of the alien's admission for lawful permanent residence as of the date that is 5 years before the date of such approval.

''(d) PROVING THE CLAIM.—In determining an alien's eligibility for lawful conditional status or adjustment of status under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General shall consider any credible evidence relevant to the application. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Secretary or the Attorney General.

''(e) REVIEW.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—No appeal shall lie from the denial of an application by the Secretary, but such denial will be without prejudice to the alien's right to renew the application in proceedings under section 240.

''(2) MOTIONS TO REOPEN.—Notwithstanding any limitation imposed by law on motions to reopen removal, deportation, or exclusion proceedings, any individual who is eligible for relief under this section may file a motion to reopen removal or deportation proceedings in order to apply for relief under this section. Any such motion shall be filed not later than the later of—

''(A) 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Refugee Protection Act of 2013; or

''(B) 90 days after the date of entry of a final administrative order of removal, deportation, or exclusion.

''(f) LIMITATION.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this section shall only apply to aliens present in the United States.

''(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize or require—

''(A) the admission of any alien to the United States;

''(B) the parole of any alien into the United States; or

''(C) the grant of any motion to reopen or reconsider filed by an alien after departure or removal from the United States.''.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 242(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by inserting ''or 210A'' after ''208(a)''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210 the following:

''Sec. 210A. Protection of stateless persons in the United States.''.

SEC. 18. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN GROUPS OF REFUGEES FOR CONSIDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(c)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''Subject to the numerical limitations''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) The President, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of State made in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, and after appropriate consultation, may designate specifically defined groups of aliens—

''(I) whose resettlement in the United States is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest; and

''(II) who—

''(aa) share common characteristics that identify them as targets of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion or of other serious harm; or

''(bb) having been identified as targets as described in item (aa), share a common need for resettlement due to a specific vulnerability.

''(ii) An alien who establishes membership in a group designated under clause (i) to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security shall be considered a refugee for purposes of admission as a refugee under this section unless the Secretary determines that such alien ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

''(iii) A designation under clause (i)—

''(I) may be revoked by the President at any time after notification to Congress;

''(II) if not revoked under subclause (I), shall expire at the end of the fiscal year; and

''(III) may be renewed by the President after appropriate consultation.

''(iv) Categories of aliens established under section 599D of Public Law 101–167 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

''(I) shall be designated under clause (i) until the end of the first fiscal year commencing after the date of the enactment of the Refugee Protection Act of 2013; and

''(II) shall be eligible for designation thereafter at the discretion of the President.

''(v) An alien's admission under this subparagraph shall count against the refugee admissions goal under subsection (a).

''(vi) A designation under clause (i) shall not influence decisions to grant, to any alien, asylum under section 208, protection under section 241(b)(3), or protection under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984.''.

(b) WRITTEN REASONS FOR DENIALS OF REFUGEE STATUS.—Each decision to deny an application for refugee status of an alien who is within a category established under section 207(c)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a) shall be in writing and shall state, to the maximum extent feasible, the reason for the denial.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 19. MULTIPLE FORMS OF RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Applicants for admission as refugees may simultaneously pursue admission under any visa category for which such applicants may be eligible.

(b) ASYLUM APPLICANTS WHO BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR DIVERSITY VISAS.—Section 204(a)(1)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv)(I) An asylum seeker in the United States who is notified that he or she is eligible for an immigrant visa pursuant to section 203(c) may file a petition with the district director that has jurisdiction over the district in which the asylum seeker resides (or, in the case of an asylum seeker who is or was in removal proceedings, the immigration court in which the removal proceeding is pending or was adjudicated) to adjust status to that of a permanent resident.

''(II) A petition under subclause (I) shall be filed not later than 30 days before the end of the fiscal year for which the petitioner received notice of eligibility for the visa and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Secretary of State may require.

''(III) The district director or immigration court shall attempt to adjudicate each petition under this clause before the last day of the fiscal year for which the petitioner was selected. Notwithstanding clause (ii)(II), if the district director or immigration court is unable to complete such adjudication during such fiscal year, the adjudication and adjustment of the petitioner's status may take place after the end of such fiscal year.''.

SEC. 20. PROTECTION OF REFUGEE FAMILIES.

(a) CHILDREN OF REFUGEE OR ASYLEE SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—A child of an alien who qualifies for admission as a spouse or child under section 207(c)(2)(A) or 208(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(c)(2)(A) and 1158(b)(3)) shall be entitled to the same admission status as such alien if the child—

(1) is accompanying or following to join such alien; and

(2) is otherwise admissible under such section 207(c)(2)(A) or 208(b)(3).

(b) SEPARATED CHILDREN.—A child younger than 18 years of age who has been separated from the birth or adoptive parents of such child and is living under the care of an alien who has been approved for admission to the United States as a refugee shall be admitted as a refugee if—

(1) it is in the best interest of such child to be placed with such alien in the United States; and

(2) such child is otherwise admissible under section 207(c)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(c)(3)).

(c) ELIMINATION OF TIME LIMITS ON REUNIFICATION OF REFUGEE AND ASYLEE FAMILIES.—

(1) EMERGENCY SITUATION REFUGEES.—Section 207(c)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(c)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''A spouse or child (as defined in section 101(b)(1) (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E))'' and inserting, ''Regardless of when such refugee was admitted to the United States, a spouse or child (other than a child described in section 101(b)(1)(F))''.

(2) ASYLUM.—Section 208(b)(3)(A) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(3)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A spouse or child (other than a child described in section 101(b)(1)(F)) of an alien who was granted asylum under this subsection at any time may, if not otherwise eligible for asylum under this section, be granted the same status as the alien if accompanying or following to join such alien.''.

(d) TIMELY ADJUDICATION OF REFUGEE AND ASYLEE FAMILY REUNIFICATION PETITIONS.—Title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 207(c)(2), as amended by subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) The Secretary shall ensure that the application of an alien who is following to join a refugee who qualifies for admission under paragraph (1) is adjudicated not later than 90 days after the submission of such application.''; and

(2) in section 208(b)(3), as amended by section 15(a)(2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) TIMELY ADJUDICATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the application of each alien described in subparagraph (A) who applies to follow an alien granted asylum under this subsection is adjudicated not later than 90 days after the submission of such application.''.

SEC. 21. REFORM OF REFUGEE CONSULTATION PROCESS.

Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) All officers of the Federal Government responsible for refugee admissions or refugee resettlement shall treat the determinations made under this subsection and subsection (b) as the refugee admissions goal for the fiscal year.'';

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) Not later than 15 days after the last day of each calendar quarter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that contains—

''(A) the number of refugees who were admitted during the previous quarter;

''(B) the percentage of those arrivals against the refugee admissions goal for such quarter;

''(C) the cumulative number of refugees who were admitted during the fiscal year as of the end of such quarter;

''(D) the number of refugees to be admitted during the remainder of the fiscal year in order to meet the refugee admissions goal for the fiscal year; and

''(E) a plan that describes the procedural or personnel changes necessary to achieve the refugee admissions goal for the fiscal year.''; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (7) as subparagraphs (A) through (G), respectively;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(e)''; and

(ii) by inserting '', which shall be commenced not later than May 1 of each year and continue periodically throughout the remainder of the year, if necessary,'' after ''discussions in person'';

(C) by striking ''To the extent possible,'' and inserting the following:

''(2) To the extent possible''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) The plans referred to in paragraph (1)(C) shall include estimates of—

''(i) the number of refugees the President expects to have ready to travel to the United States at the beginning of the fiscal year;

''(ii) the number of refugees and the stipulated populations the President expects to admit to the United States in each quarter of the fiscal year; and

''(iii) the number of refugees the President expects to have ready to travel to the United States at the end of the fiscal year.

''(B) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that an adequate number of refugees are processed during the fiscal year to fulfill the refugee admissions goals under subsections (a) and (b).''.

SEC. 22. ADMISSION OF REFUGEES IN THE ABSENCE OF THE ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.

Section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (1), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''after fiscal year 1982''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''If the President does not issue a determination under this paragraph before the beginning of a fiscal year, the number of refugees that may be admitted under this section in each quarter before the issuance of such determination shall be 25 percent of the number of refugees admissible under this section during the previous fiscal year.''; and

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''(beginning with fiscal year 1992)''.

SEC. 23. UPDATE OF RECEPTION AND PLACEMENT GRANTS.

Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 30 days before the beginning of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount of funds that the Secretary will provide in its Reception and Placement Grants in the coming fiscal year. In setting the amount of such grants each year, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the grant amount is adjusted so that it is adequate to provide for the anticipated initial resettlement needs of refugees, including adjusting the amount for inflation and the cost of living;

(2) an amount is provided at the beginning of the fiscal year to each national resettlement agency that is sufficient to ensure adequate local and national capacity to serve the initial resettlement needs of refugees the Secretary anticipates the agency will resettle throughout the fiscal year; and

(3) additional amounts are provided to each national resettlement agency promptly upon the arrival of refugees that, exclusive of the amounts provided pursuant to paragraph (2), are sufficient to meet the anticipated initial resettlement needs of such refugees and support local and national operational costs in excess of the estimates described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 24. PROTECTION FOR ALIENS INTERDICTED AT SEA.

Section 241(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''TO A COUNTRY WHERE ALIEN'S LIFE OR FREEDOM WOULD BE THREATENED'' and inserting ''OR RETURN IF REFUGEE'S LIFE OR FREEDOM WOULD BE THREATENED OR ALIEN WOULD BE SUBJECTED TO TORTURE'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(i) LIFE OR FREEDOM THREATENED.—Notwithstanding''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) ASYLUM INTERVIEW.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a United States officer may not return any alien interdicted or otherwise encountered in international waters or United States waters who has expressed a fear of return to his or her country of departure, origin, or last habitual residence—

''(I) until such alien has had the opportunity to be interviewed by an asylum officer to determine whether that alien has a well-founded fear of persecution because of the alien's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, or because the alien would be subject to torture in that country; or

''(II) if an asylum officer has determined that the alien has such a well-founded fear of persecution or would be subject to torture in his or her country of departure, origin, or last habitual residence.'';

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) PROTECTIONS FOR ALIENS INTERDICTED IN INTERNATIONAL OR UNITED STATES WATERS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue regulations establishing a uniform procedure applicable to all aliens interdicted in international or United States waters that—

''(i) provides each alien—

''(I) a meaningful opportunity to express, through a translator who is fluent in a language the alien claims to understand, a fear of return to his or her country of departure, origin, or last habitual residence; and

''(II) in a confidential setting and in a language the alien claims to understand, information concerning the alien's interdiction, including the ability to inform United States officers about any fears relating to the alien's return or repatriation;

''(ii) provides each alien expressing such a fear of return or repatriation a confidential interview conducted by an asylum officer, in a language the alien claims to understand, to determine whether the alien's return to his or her country of origin or country of last habitual residence is prohibited because the alien has a well-founded fear of persecution—

''(I) because of the alien's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; or

''(II) because the alien would be subject to torture in that country;

''(iii) ensures that each alien can effectively communicate with United States officers through the use of a translator fluent in a language the alien claims to understand; and

''(iv) provides each alien who, according to the determination of an asylum officer, has a well-founded fear of persecution for the reasons specified in clause (ii) or would be subject to torture, an opportunity to seek protection in—

''(I) a country other than the alien's country of origin or country of last habitual residence in which the alien has family or other ties that will facilitate resettlement; or

''(II) if the alien has no such ties, a country that will best facilitate the alien's resettlement, which may include the United States.''.

SEC. 25. MODIFICATION OF PHYSICAL PRESENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR ALIENS SERVING AS TRANSLATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1059(e)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE.—An absence from the United States described in paragraph (2) shall not be considered to break any period for which continuous residence in the United States is required for naturalization under title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

''(B) PHYSICAL PRESENCE.—In the case of a lawful permanent resident, for an absence from the United States described in paragraph (2), the time spent outside of the United States in the capacity described in paragraph (2) shall be counted towards the accumulation of the required physical presence in the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the amendment made by section 1(c)(2) of the Act entitled ''An Act to increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, and for other purposes'', approved June 15, 2007 (Public Law 110–36; 121 Stat. 227).

SEC. 26. ASSESSMENT OF THE REFUGEE DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding the effectiveness of the domestic refugee resettlement programs operated by the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

(b) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall determine and analyze—

(1) how the Office of Refugee Resettlement defines self-sufficiency;

(2) if this definition is adequate in addressing refugee needs in the United States;

(3) the effectiveness of the Office of Refugee Resettlement programs in helping refugees to meet self-sufficiency;

(4) an analysis of the unmet needs of the programs;

(5) an evaluation of the Office of Refugee Resettlement's budgetary resources and projection of the amount of additional resources needed to fully address the unmet needs of refugees with regard to self-sufficiency;

(6) the role of community-based organizations in serving refugees in areas experiencing a high number of new refugee arrivals;

(7) an analysis of how community-based organizations can be better utilized and supported in the Federal domestic resettlement process; and

(8) recommendations on statutory changes to improve the Office of Refugee Resettlement and the domestic refugee program in relation to the matters analyzed under paragraphs (1) through (7).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress that contains the results of the study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 27. REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING.—Section 412(c)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(c)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) The funds available for a fiscal year for grants and contracts under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated among the States based on a combination of—

''(i) the total number or refugees (including children and adults) who arrived in the United States not more than 36 months before the beginning of such fiscal year and are actually residing in each State (taking into account secondary migration) as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

''(ii) the total number of all other eligible populations served by the Office during the period described who are residing in the State as of the beginning of the fiscal year; and

''(iii) projections on the number and nature of incoming refugees and other populations served by the Office during the subsequent fiscal year.''.

(b) REPORT ON SECONDARY MIGRATION.—Section 412(a)(3) of such Act (814 U.S.C. 1522(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''a periodic'' and inserting ''an annual''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''At the end of each fiscal year, the Assistant Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the findings of the assessment, including States experiencing departures and arrivals due to secondary migration, likely reasons for migration, the impact of secondary migration on States hosting secondary migrants, availability of social services for secondary migrants in those States, and unmet needs of those secondary migrants.''.

(c) ASSISTANCE MADE AVAILABLE TO SECONDARY MIGRANTS.—Section 412(a)(1) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) When providing assistance under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that such assistance is provided to refugees who are secondary migrants and meet all other eligibility requirements for such services.''.

(d) NOTICE AND RULEMAKING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, but in no event later than 30 days before the effective date of the amendments made by this section, the Assistant Secretary shall—

(1) issue a proposed rule of the new formula by which grants and contracts are to be allocated pursuant to the amendments made by subsection (c); and

(2) solicit public comment.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 28. RESETTLEMENT DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Refugee and Asylee Resettlement (referred to in this section as the ''Assistant Secretary'') shall expand the Office of Refugee Resettlement's data analysis, collection, and sharing activities in accordance with this section.

(b) DATA ON MENTAL AND PHYSICAL MEDICAL CASES.—The Assistant Secretary shall coordinate with the Centers for Disease Control, national resettlement agencies, community-based organizations, and State refugee health programs to track national and State trends on refugees arriving with Class A medical conditions and other urgent medical needs. In collecting information under this subsection, the Assistant Secretary shall utilize initial refugee health screening data, including history of severe trauma, torture, mental health symptoms, depression, anxiety and post traumatic stress disorder, recorded during domestic and international health screenings, and Refugee Medical Assistance utilization rate data.

(c) DATA ON HOUSING NEEDS.—The Assistant Secretary shall partner with State refugee programs, community-based organizations, and national resettlement agencies to collect data relating to the housing needs of refugees, including—

(1) the number of refugees who have become homeless; and

(2) the number of refugees at severe risk of becoming homeless.

(d) DATA ON REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY.—The Assistant Secretary shall gather longitudinal information relating to refugee self-sufficiency and employment status for 2-year period beginning 1 year after the refugee's arrival.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—The Assistant Secretary shall annually—

(1) update the data collected under this section; and

(2) submit a report to Congress that contains the updated data.

SEC. 29. PROTECTIONS FOR REFUGEES.

Section 209 (8 U.S.C. 1159) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''return or be returned to the custody of the Department of Homeland Security for inspection and examination for admission to the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 240, and 241'' and inserting ''be eligible for adjustment of status as an immigrant to the United States'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''upon inspection and examination''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: ''An application for adjustment under this section may be filed up to 3 months before the date the applicant would first otherwise be eligible for adjustment under this section.''.

SEC. 30. EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY PERIOD FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN REFUGEES.

(a) EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(a)(2)(M)(i) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1612(a)(2)(M)(i)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''9-year'' and inserting ''10-year''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''2-year'' and inserting ''3-year''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 402(a)(2)(M)(i) of such Act is amended by striking ''TWO-YEAR EXTENSION'' and inserting ''EXTENSION''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on October 1, 2013.

(b) EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR COLLECTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION DEBTS RESULTING FROM FRAUD.—Paragraph (8) of section 6402(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to collection of unemployment compensation debts resulting from fraud) is amended by striking ''10 years'' and inserting ''10 years and 2 months''.

SEC. 31. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 32. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139), shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mr. REID:

S. 649. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 649

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Safe Communities, Safe Schools Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FIX GUN CHECKS ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Subtitle A—Ensuring That All Individuals Who Should Be Prohibited From Buying a Gun Are Listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System

Sec. 111. Reauthorization of NICS Act Record Improvement Program grants.

Sec. 112. Penalties for States that do not make data electronically available to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Sec. 113. Clarification that Federal court information is to be made available to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Subtitle B—Requiring a Background Check for Every Firearm Sale

Sec. 121. Purpose.

Sec. 122. Firearms transfers.

Sec. 123. Lost and stolen reporting.

Sec. 124. Effective date.

TITLE II—STOP ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS ACT

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard anti-straw purchasing and firearms trafficking amendments.

Sec. 203. Amendments to section 922(d).

Sec. 204. Amendments to section 924(a).

Sec. 205. Amendments to section 924(h).

Sec. 206. Amendments to section 924(k).

Sec. 207. Limitation on operations by the Department of Justice.

TITLE III—SCHOOL AND CAMPUS SAFETY ENHANCEMENTS ACT

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Grant program for school security.

Sec. 303. Applications.

Sec. 304. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 305. Accountability.

Sec. 306. CAMPUS Safety Act of 2013.

TITLE I—FIX GUN CHECKS ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Fix Gun Checks Act of 2013''.

Subtitle A—Ensuring That All Individuals Who Should Be Prohibited From Buying a Gun Are Listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System

SEC. 111. REAUTHORIZATION OF NICS ACT RECORD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii); and

(B) by redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi) as clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) SCOPE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in determining the compliance of a State under this section or section 104 for the purpose of granting a waiver or imposing a loss of Federal funds, shall assess the total percentage of records provided by the State concerning any event occurring within the time period established by the Attorney General under subparagraph (B), which would disqualify a person from possessing a firearm under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Fix Gun Checks Act of 2013, the Attorney General shall, through regulation, establish the time period described in subparagraph (A).''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—Section 103 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available to carry out this section and subject to section 102(b)(1)(B), the Attorney General shall make grants to States and Indian tribal governments, in a manner consistent with the National Criminal History Improvement Program, which shall be used by the States and Indian tribal governments, in conjunction with units of local government and State and local courts to—

''(A) establish and plan information and identification technologies for firearms eligibility determinations; and

''(B) make improvements or upgrade information and identification technologies for firearms eligibility determinations.'';

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded to States or Indian tribes under subsection (a)(1) may only be used to—

''(A) create electronic systems, which provide accurate and up-to-date information that is directly related to checks under the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (referred to in this section as 'NICS'), including court disposition and corrections records;

''(B) assist States in establishing or enhancing their own capacities to perform NICS background checks;

''(C) supply accurate and timely information to the Attorney General concerning final dispositions of criminal records to databases accessed by NICS;

''(D) supply accurate and timely information to the Attorney General concerning the identity of persons who are prohibited from obtaining a firearm under section 922(g)(4) of title 18, United States Code, to be used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation solely to conduct NICS background checks;

''(E) supply accurate and timely court orders and records of misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence for inclusion in Federal and State law enforcement databases used to conduct NICS background checks; and

''(F) collect and analyze data needed to demonstrate levels of State compliance with this Act.

''(2) ADDITIONAL USES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the uses described in paragraph (1)—

''(i) a grant awarded under subsection (a)(1)(A) may be used to assist States in establishing or enhancing a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105; and

''(ii) a grant awarded under subsection (a)(1)(B) may be used to maintain the relief

from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Not less than 3 percent and not more than 10 percent of each grant awarded under subsection (a)(1)(B) shall be used for the purpose described in subparagraph (A)(i) of this paragraph.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under section 103(a)(1)(B), a State shall certify, to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, that the State has implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are to be authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) USE OF AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year under paragraph (1), not more than 30 percent may be used to carry out subsection (a)(1)(B) .

''(B) ALLOCATIONS.—A State may not be awarded more than 2 grants under subsection (a)(1)(B).''.

SEC. 112. PENALTIES FOR STATES THAT DO NOT MAKE DATA ELECTRONICALLY AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 104(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(1) DISCRETIONARY REDUCTION.—

''(A) During the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General publishes final rules required under section 102(b)(2)(B), the Attorney General may withhold not more than 3 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State provides less than 50 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103.

''(B) During the 3-year period after the expiration of the period described in subparagraph (A), the Attorney General may withhold 4 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State provides less than 70 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103.

''(2) MANDATORY REDUCTION.—After the expiration of the period referred to in paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General shall withhold 5 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755), if the State provides less than 90 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103.''.

(b) REPORTING OF STATE COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall publish, and make available on a publicly accessible website, a report that ranks the States by the ratio of number of records submitted by each State under sections 102 and 103 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) to the estimated total number of available records of the State.

SEC. 113. CLARIFICATION THAT FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION IS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

Section 103(e)(1) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'department or agency of the United States' and 'Federal department or agency' include a Federal court; and

''(ii) for purposes of any request, submission, or notification, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall perform the functions of the head of the department or agency.''.

Subtitle B—Requiring a Background Check for Every Firearm Sale

SEC. 121. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to extend the Brady Law background check procedures to all sales and transfers of firearms.

SEC. 122. FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing subsection (s);

(2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s);

(3) in subsection (s), as redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (3)(C)(ii), by striking ''(as defined in subsection (s)(8))''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) In this subsection, the term 'chief law enforcement officer' means the chief of police, the sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such individual.''; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

''(t)(1) Beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of the Fix Gun Checks Act of 2013, it shall be unlawful for any person who is not licensed under this chapter to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not licensed under this chapter, unless a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer has first taken possession of the firearm for the purpose of complying with subsection (s). Upon taking possession of the firearm, the licensee shall comply with all requirements of this chapter as if the licensee were transferring the firearm from the licensee's inventory to the unlicensed transferee.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

''(A) bona fide gifts between spouses, between parents and their children, between siblings, or between grandparents and their grandchildren;

''(B) a transfer made from a decedent's estate, pursuant to a legal will or the operation of law;

''(C) a temporary transfer of possession that occurs between an unlicensed transferor and an unlicensed transferee, if —

''(i) the temporary transfer of possession occurs in the home or curtilage of the unlicensed transferor;

''(ii) the firearm is not removed from that home or curtilage during the temporary transfer; and

''(iii) the transfer has a duration of less than 7 days; and

''(D) a temporary transfer of possession without transfer of title made in connection with lawful hunting or sporting purposes if the transfer occurs—

''(i) at a shooting range located in or on premises owned or occupied by a duly incorporated organization organized for conservation purposes or to foster proficiency in firearms and the firearm is, at all times, kept within the premises of the shooting range;

''(ii) at a target firearm shooting competition under the auspices of or approved by a State agency or nonprofit organization and the firearm is, at all times, kept within the premises of the shooting competition; or

''(iii) while hunting or trapping, if—

''(I) the activity is legal in all places where the unlicensed transferee possesses the firearm;

''(II) the temporary transfer of possession occurs during the designated hunting season; and

''(III) the unlicensed transferee holds any required license or permit.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'transfer'—

''(A) shall include a sale, gift, loan, return from pawn or consignment, or other disposition; and

''(B) shall not include temporary possession of the firearm for purposes of examination or evaluation by a prospective transferee while in the presence of the prospective transferee.

''(4)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Attorney General may implement this subsection with regulations.

''(B) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph—

''(i) shall include a provision setting a maximum fee that may be charged by licensees for services provided in accordance with paragraph (1); and

''(ii) shall include a provision requiring a record of transaction of any transfer that occurred between an unlicensed transferor and unlicensed transferee accordance with paragraph (1).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 922.—Section 922(y)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', (g)(5)(B), and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)'' and inserting ''and (g)(5)(B)''.

(2) SECTION 925A.—Section 925A of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (s) or (t) of section 922'' and inserting ''section 922(s)''.

(3) NICS IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS ACT.—Section 103(f) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 is amended by striking ''section 922(t)'' and inserting ''section 922(s)''.

(4) CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012.—Section 511 of title V of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking ''subsection 922(t)'' and inserting ''section 922(s)'' each place it appears.

SEC. 123. LOST AND STOLEN REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end—

''(aa) It shall be unlawful for any person who lawfully possesses or owns a firearm that has been shipped or transported in, or has been possessed in or affecting, interstate or foreign commerce, to fail to report the theft or loss of the firearm, within 24 hours after the person discovers the theft or loss, to the Attorney General and to the appropriate local authorities.''.

(b) PENALTY.—Section 924(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) knowingly violates subsection (a)(4), (f), (k), (q), or (aa) of section 922;''.

SEC. 124. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—STOP ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. HADIYA PENDLETON AND NYASIA PRYEAR-YARD ANTI-STRAW PURCHASING AND FIREARMS TRAFFICKING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 932. Straw purchasing of firearms

''(a) For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(3);

''(2) the term 'drug trafficking crime' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(2); and

''(3) the term 'purchase' includes the receipt of any firearm by a person who does not own the firearm—

''(A) by way of pledge or pawn as security for the payment or repayment of money; or

''(B) on consignment.

''(b) It shall be unlawful for any person (other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed collector, or licensed dealer) to knowingly purchase, or attempt or conspire to purchase, any firearm in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce—

''(1) from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed collector, or licensed dealer for, on behalf of, or at the request or demand of any other person, known or unknown; or

''(2) from any person who is not a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed collector, or licensed dealer for, on behalf of, or at the request or demand of any other person, known or unknown, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such other person—

''(A) is under indictment for, or has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year;

''(B) is a fugitive from justice;

''(C) is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802));

''(D) has been adjudicated as a mental defective or has been committed to any mental institution;

''(E) is an alien who—

''(i) is illegally or unlawfully in the United States; or

''(ii) except as provided in section 922(y)(2), has been admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(26) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(26));

''(F) has been discharged from the Armed Forces under dishonorable conditions;

''(G) having been a citizen of the United States, has renounced his or her citizenship;

''(H) is subject to a court order that restrains such person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child, except that this subparagraph shall only apply to a court order that—

''(i) was issued after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had the opportunity to participate; and

''(ii)(I) includes a finding that such person represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such intimate partner or child; or

''(II) by its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such intimate partner or child that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury;

''(I) has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence;

''(J) intends to—

''(i) use, carry, possess, or sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition in furtherance of a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime; or

''(ii) export the firearm or ammunition in violation of law;

''(K)(i) does not reside in any State; and

''(ii) is not a citizen of the United States; or

''(L) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition to a person described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (K).

''(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

''(2) If a violation of subsection (b) is committed knowing or with reasonable cause to believe that any firearm involved will be used to commit a crime of violence, the person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than 25 years.

''(d) Subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to any firearm that is lawfully purchased by a person—

''(1) to be given as a bona fide gift to a recipient who provided no service or tangible thing of value to acquire the firearm, unless the person knows or has reasonable cause to believe such recipient is prohibited by Federal law from possessing, receiving, selling, shipping, transporting, transferring, or otherwise disposing of the firearm; or

''(2) to be given to a bona fide winner of an organized raffle, contest, or auction conducted in accordance with law and sponsored by a national, State, or local organization or association, unless the person knows or has reasonable cause to believe such recipient is prohibited by Federal law from possessing, purchasing, receiving, selling, shipping, transporting, transferring, or otherwise disposing of the firearm.

''§ 933. Trafficking in firearms

''(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to—

''(1) ship, transport, transfer, cause to be transported, or otherwise dispose of 2 or more firearms to another person in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the use, carrying, or possession of a firearm by the transferee would be in violation of, or would result in a violation of, any Federal law punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding 1 year;

''(2) receive from another person 2 or more firearms in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the recipient knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such receipt would be in violation of, or would result in a violation of, any Federal law punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding 1 year; or

''(3) attempt or conspire to commit the conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2).

''(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

''(2) If a violation of subsection (a) is committed by a person in concert with 5 or more other persons with respect to whom such person occupies a position of organizer, leader, supervisor, or manager, the person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than 25 years.

''§ 934. Forfeiture and fines

''(a)(1) Any person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933 shall forfeit to the United States, irrespective of any provision of State law—

''(A) any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of such violation; and

''(B) any of the person's property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation.

''(2) The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed pursuant to section 932 or 933, that the person forfeit to the United States all property described in paragraph (1).

''(b) A defendant who derives profits or other proceeds from an offense under section 932 or 933 may be fined not more than the greater of—

''(1) the fine otherwise authorized by this part; and

''(2) the amount equal to twice the gross profits or other proceeds of the offense under section 932 or 933.''.

(b) TITLE III AUTHORIZATION.—Section 2516(1)(n) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and 924'' and inserting '', 924, 932, or 933''.

(c) RACKETEERING AMENDMENT.—Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''section 932 (relating to straw purchasing), section 933 (relating to trafficking in firearms),'' before ''section 1028''.

(d) MONEY LAUNDERING AMENDMENT.—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 924(n)'' and inserting ''section 924(n), 932, or 933''.

(e) DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to ensure that persons convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, and other offenses applicable to the straw purchases and firearms trafficking of firearms are subject to increased penalties in comparison to those currently provided by the guidelines and policy statements for such straw purchasing and firearms trafficking offenses. The Commission shall also review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to reflect the intent of Congress that a person convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, who is affiliated with a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise should be subject to higher penalties than an otherwise unaffiliated individual.

(f) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''932. Straw purchasing of firearms.
''933. Trafficking in firearms.
''934. Forfeiture and fines.''.

SEC. 203. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 922(d).

Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking the matter following paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

''(10) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition to a person described in any of paragraphs (1) through (9); or

''(11) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition in furtherance of a crime of violence or drug trafficking offense or to export the firearm or ammunition in violation of law.

This subsection shall not apply with respect to the sale or disposition of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector who pursuant to subsection (b) of section 925 is not precluded from dealing in firearms or ammunition, or to a person who has been granted relief from disabilities pursuant to subsection (c) of section 925.''.

SEC. 204. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(a).

Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(d), (g),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (d) or (g) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.''.

SEC. 205. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(h).

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

''(h)(1) Whoever knowingly receives or transfers a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearm or ammunition will be used to commit a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)), a drug trafficking crime (as defined in subsection (c)(2)), or a crime under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), or section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(C)) shall be imprisoned not more than 25 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both.

''(2) No term of imprisonment imposed on a person under this subsection shall run concurrently with any term of imprisonment imposed on the person under section 932.''.

SEC. 206. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(k).

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

''(k)(1) A person who, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

''(A) is punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

''(B) violates any law of a State relating to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802); or

''(C) constitutes a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)),

smuggles or knowingly brings into the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined under this title, or both.

''(2) A person who, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

''(A) would be punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46, if the conduct had occurred within the United States; or

''(B) would constitute a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, if the conduct had occurred within the United States,

smuggles or knowingly takes out of the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined under this title, or both.''.

SEC. 207. LIMITATION ON OPERATIONS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

The Department of Justice, and any of its law enforcement coordinate agencies, shall not conduct any operation where a Federal firearms licensee is directed, instructed, enticed, or otherwise encouraged by the Department of Justice to sell a firearm to an individual if the Department of Justice, or a coordinate agency, knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such an individual is purchasing on behalf of another for an illegal purpose unless the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division personally reviews and approves the operation, in writing, and determines that the agency has prepared an operational plan that includes sufficient safeguards to prevent firearms from being transferred to third parties without law enforcement taking reasonable steps to lawfully interdict those firearms.

TITLE III—SCHOOL AND CAMPUS SAFETY ENHANCEMENTS ACT

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''School and Campus Safety Enhancements Act of 2013''.

SEC. 302. GRANT PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL SECURITY.

Section 2701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Placement'' and inserting ''Installation''; and

(ii) by inserting ''surveillance equipment,'' after ''detectors,'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) Establishment of hotlines or tiplines for the reporting of potentially dangerous students and situations.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the School and Campus Safety Enhancements Act of 2013, the Director and the Secretary of Education, or the designee of the Secretary, shall establish an interagency task force to develop and promulgate a set of advisory school safety guidelines.

''(2) PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the School and Campus Safety Enhancements Act of 2013, the advisory school safety guidelines promulgated by the interagency task force shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(3) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—In developing the final advisory school safety guidelines under this subsection, the interagency task force shall consult with stakeholders and interested parties, including parents, teachers, and agencies.''.

SEC. 303. APPLICATIONS.

Section 2702(a)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797b(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) be accompanied by a report—

''(A) signed by the heads of each law enforcement agency and school district with jurisdiction over the schools where the safety improvements will be implemented; and

''(B) demonstrating that each proposed use of the grant funds will be—

''(i) an effective means for improving the safety of 1 or more schools;

''(ii) consistent with a comprehensive approach to preventing school violence; and

''(iii) individualized to the needs of each school at which those improvements are to be made.''.

SEC. 304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 2705 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797e) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$40,000,000''; and

(2) by striking ''2001 through 2009'' and inserting ''2014 through 2023''.

SEC. 305. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 2701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a), as amended by section 302, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this part shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

''(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this part to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this part that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this part during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this part.

''(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this part during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

''(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

''(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

''(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this part and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

''(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this part may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this part, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

''(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

''(A) indicating whether—

''(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

''(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

''(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

''(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.''.

SEC. 306. CAMPUS SAFETY ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Center to Advance, Monitor, and Preserve University Security Safety Act of 2013'' or the ''CAMPUS Safety Act of 2013''.

(b) NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 501 (42 U.S.C. 3751)—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or purposes'' after ''one or more of the following programs''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) Making subawards to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations to assist the National Center for Campus Public Safety in carrying out the functions of the Center required under section 509(c).''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations, for purposes of carrying out section 509.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 509. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.

''(a) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—In this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

''(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE CENTER.—The Attorney General may establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety (referred to in this section as the 'Center').

''(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER.—The Center shall—

''(1) provide quality education and training for public safety personnel of institutions of higher education and their collaborative partners, including campus mental health agencies;

''(2) foster quality research to strengthen the safety and security of institutions of higher education;

''(3) serve as a clearinghouse for the identification and dissemination of information, policies, protocols, procedures, and best practices relevant to campus public safety, including off-campus housing safety, the prevention of violence against persons and property, and emergency response and evacuation procedures;

''(4) coordinate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, State, local and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, private and nonprofit organizations and associations, and other stakeholders, to develop protocols and best practices to prevent, protect against and respond to dangerous and violent situations involving an immediate threat to the safety of the campus community;

''(5) promote the development and dissemination of effective behavioral threat assessment and management models to prevent campus violence;

''(6) identify campus safety information (including ways to increase off-campus housing safety) and identify resources available from the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education, State, local, and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations and associations;

''(7) promote cooperation, collaboration, and consistency in prevention, response, and problem-solving methods among public safety and emergency management personnel of institutions of higher education and their campus- and non-campus-based collaborative partners, including law enforcement, emergency management, mental health services, and other relevant agencies;

''(8) disseminate standardized formats and models for mutual aid agreements and memoranda of understanding between campus security agencies and other public safety organizations and mental health agencies; and

''(9) report annually to Congress on activities performed by the Center during the previous 12 months.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—In establishing the Center, the Attorney General shall—

''(1) coordinate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, and appropriate State or territory officials;

''(2) ensure coordination with campus public safety resources within the Department of Homeland Security, including within the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Department of Education; and

''(3) coordinate within the Department of Justice and existing grant programs to ensure against duplication with the program authorized by this section.

''(e) REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Attorney General shall—

''(1) issue a report that assesses the impacts, outcomes and effectiveness of the grants distributed to carry out this section;

''(2) in compiling such report, assess instances of duplicative activity, if any, performed through grants distributed to carry out this section and other grant programs maintained by the Department of Justice, the Department of Education, and the Department of Homeland Security; and

''(3) make such report available on the Department of Justice website and submit such report to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall preclude public elementary and secondary schools or their larger governing agencies from receiving the informational and training benefits of the National Center for Campus Public Safety authorized under section 509 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by this title.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution to consent to certain amendments enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 12

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONSENT AND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.

In accordance with section 4 of Public Law 86–3 (73 Stat. 4) (commonly known as the ''Hawaii Statehood Admissions Act, 1959'') and section 204 of the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act (48 U.S.C. note prec. 491; Public Law 104–42), the United States amends sections 208, 209, and 215 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108, chapter 42) by giving its consent to the following amendments by the State of Hawaii adopted in the manner required for State legislation:

(1) Act 107, Section 1, of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 2000.

(2) Act 12, Section 1, of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 2002.

(3) Act 16, Section 1, of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 2005.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 86—HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGACY OF CESAR ESTRADA CHAVEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 86

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez spent his early years on a family farm;

Whereas, at the age of 10, César Estrada Chávez joined the thousands of migrant farm workers laboring in fields and vineyards

throughout the Southwest after a bank foreclosure resulted in the loss of the family farm;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez, after attending more than 30 elementary and middle schools and achieving an eighth grade education, left school to work full-time as a farm worker to help support his family;

Whereas, at the age of 17, César Estrada Chávez entered the United States Navy and served the United States with distinction for 2 years;

Whereas, in 1948, César Estrada Chávez returned from military service to marry Helen Fabela, whom he had met while working in the vineyards of central California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez and Helen Fabela had 8 children;

Whereas, as early as 1949, César Estrada Chávez was committed to organizing farm workers to campaign for safe and fair working conditions, reasonable wages, livable housing, and the outlawing of child labor;

Whereas, in 1952, César Estrada Chávez joined the Community Service Organization, a prominent Latino civil rights group, and worked with the organization to coordinate voter registration drives and conduct campaigns against discrimination in east Los Angeles;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez served as the national director of the Community Service Organization;

Whereas, in 1962, César Estrada Chávez left the Community Service Organization to found the National Farm Workers Association, which eventually became the United Farm Workers of America;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was a strong believer in the principles of nonviolence practiced by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez effectively used peaceful tactics that included fasting for 25 days in 1968, 25 days in 1972, and 38 days in 1988, to call attention to the terrible working and living conditions of farm workers in the United States;

Whereas, under the leadership of César Estrada Chávez, the United Farm Workers of America organized thousands of migrant farm workers to fight for fair wages, health care coverage, pension benefits, livable housing, and respect;

Whereas, through his commitment to nonviolence, César Estrada Chávez brought dignity and respect to the organized farm workers and became an inspiration to and a resource for individuals engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world;

Whereas the influence of César Estrada Chávez extends far beyond agriculture and provides inspiration for those working to better human rights, empower workers, and advance the American Dream, which includes all inhabitants of the United States;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez died on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66 in San Luis, Arizona, only miles from his birthplace;

Whereas more than 50,000 people attended the funeral services of César Estrada Chávez in Delano, California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was laid to rest at the headquarters of the United Farm Workers of America, known as Nuestra Señora de La Paz, located in the Tehachapi Mountains in Keene, California;

Whereas, since the death of César Estrada Chávez, schools, parks, streets, libraries, and other public facilities, as well as awards and scholarships, have been named in his honor;

Whereas 10 States and dozens of communities across the United States honor the life and legacy of César Estrada Chávez on March 31st of each year;

Whereas, during his lifetime, César Estrada Chávez was a recipient of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Peace Prize;

Whereas, on August 8, 1994, César Estrada Chávez was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas President Barack Obama honored the life of service of César Estrada Chávez by proclaiming March 31, 2012, to be ''César Chávez Day'';

Whereas, on October 8, 2012, President Barack Obama authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a César Estrada Chávez National Monument in Keene, California; and

Whereas the United States should continue the efforts of César Estrada Chávez to ensure equality, justice, and dignity for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments and example of a great hero of the United States, César Estrada Chávez;

(2) pledges to promote the legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of César Estrada Chávez and to always remember his great rallying cry, ''¡Sí, se puede!'', which is Spanish for ''Yes, we can!''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—DESIGNATING APRIL 4, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR AUXILIARIES DAY''

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 87

Whereas the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries and the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries provide valuable service and leadership opportunities for women who wish to take an active role in their communities;

Whereas the mission of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries is to encourage member chapters to render charitable services that—

(1) are beneficial to the general public; and

(2) place a particular emphasis on providing for the needs of children; and

Whereas since the founding of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries in 1941, the organization has provided strength and inspiration to women who want to effect positive change in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 4, 2013, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day'';

(2) recognizes the great contributions made by members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to their communities and to the people of the United States; and

(3) especially commends the work of the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to better the lives of children in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 88—PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 88

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Schumer, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Warner, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Chambliss.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Blunt.

SENATE RESOLUTION 89—DESIGNATING MARCH 25, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 89

Whereas the term ''cerebral palsy'' refers to any number of neurological disorders that appear in infancy or early childhood and permanently affect body movement and the muscle coordination necessary to maintain balance and posture;

Whereas cerebral palsy is caused by damage to 1 or more specific areas of the brain, which usually occurs during fetal development, before, during, or shortly after birth, or during infancy;

Whereas the majority of children who have cerebral palsy are born with the disorder, although cerebral palsy may remain undetected for months or years;

Whereas 75 percent of people with cerebral palsy also have 1 or more developmental disabilities, including epilepsy, intellectual disability, autism, visual impairment, and blindness;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has released information indicating that cerebral palsy is increasingly prevalent and that approximately 1 in 278 children have cerebral palsy;

Whereas approximately 800,000 people in the United States are affected by cerebral palsy;

Whereas, although there is no cure for cerebral palsy, treatment often improves the capabilities of a child with cerebral palsy;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful that breakthroughs in cerebral palsy research will be forthcoming;

Whereas researchers across the United States are conducting important research projects involving cerebral palsy; and

Whereas the Senate is an institution that can raise awareness in the general public and the medical community about cerebral palsy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 25, 2013, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day'';

(2) encourages all people in the United States to become more informed and aware of cerebral palsy; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit a copy of this resolution to Reaching for the Stars: A Foundation of Hope for Children with Cerebral Palsy.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 210. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 211. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 212. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 213. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 214. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 215. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 216. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 217. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 218. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 219. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 220. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 221. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 222. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 223. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 224. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 225. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHANNS, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 226. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 227. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 228. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 229. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 230. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 231. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 232. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 233. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 234. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. COWAN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 235. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 237. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 238. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 239. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 240. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 241. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 242. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 243. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 244. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 245. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 246. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 247. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 248. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 249. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 250. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 251. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 252. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 253. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 254. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 255. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 256. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 257. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 258. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 259. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 260. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 261. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 262. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 263. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 264. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 265. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 266. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 267. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET,

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 268. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 269. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 270. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 271. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 272. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 273. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 274. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 275. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 276. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 277. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 278. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 279. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 280. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 281. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 282. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 283. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 284. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 285. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 286. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 287. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 288. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 289. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 290. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 291. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 292. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 293. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 294. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 295. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 296. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 297. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COBURN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 298. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 299. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 300. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 301. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 302. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 303. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 304. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 305. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 306. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 307. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 308. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 309. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 310. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 311. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 312. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 313. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 314. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 315. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 316. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 317. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 318. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 319. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 320. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 321. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 322. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 323. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 324. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 325. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 326. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 327. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 328. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 329. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 330. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 331. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 332. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 333. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 334. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 335. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 336. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 337. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 338. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 339. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 340. Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 341. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 342. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 343. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 344. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 345. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 346. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 347. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 348. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 349. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORKER, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 350. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 351. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 352. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 353. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 354. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 355. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 356. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 357. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 358. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 359. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 360. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 361. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 362. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 363. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 364. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 365. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 366. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 367. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 368. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 369. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 370. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 371. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 372. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 373. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 374. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 375. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 376. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 377. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 378. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 379. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 380. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 381. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 382. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 384. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 385. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 386. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 387. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 388. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 389. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 390. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 391. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 392. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 393. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 394. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 395. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 396. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 397. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 398. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 399. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 400. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 401. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 402. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 403. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 404. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 405. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 406. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 407. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 408. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 409. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 410. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 411. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 412. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 413. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 414. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 415. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 416. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 417. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 418. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 419. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 420. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 421. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 422. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 423. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 424. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 425. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 426. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 427. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 428. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 429. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 430. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 431. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 432. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 433. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 434. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 435. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 436. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 437. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 438. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 439. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra.

SA 440. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 441. Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 442. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 443. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 444. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 445. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 446. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 447. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 448. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 449. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 450. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 451. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 452. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 453. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 454. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 455. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 456. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 457. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 458. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 459. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 460. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 461. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 462. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 463. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 464. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 465. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 466. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 467. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 468. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 469. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 470. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 471. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 472. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 473. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 474. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 475. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 476. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 477. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 478. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 479. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 480. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 481. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 482. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 483. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 484. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 485. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 486. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 487. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 488. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 489. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 490. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 491. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 492. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 493. Mr. McCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 494. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 495. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 496. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 497. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 498. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 499. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 500. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 501. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 502. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 503. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 504. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 505. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 506. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 507. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 508. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 509. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 510. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 511. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 512. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 513. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 514. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 515. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 516. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 210. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the strengthening of sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to Iran, which may include sanctions with respect to the energy sector of Iran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 211. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST A BUDGET RESOLUTION THAT DOES NOT ACHIEVE A UNIFIED BUDGET SURPLUS BY 2023.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for any budget year (or any amendment, amendment between the Houses of Congress, motion, or conference report on that concurrent resolution) that does not achieve a unified budget surplus in each fiscal year after fiscal year 2022.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 212. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE BAILOUT OF IMPROVIDENT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would, except in the case of Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster, prohibit any entity of the Federal Government from providing funds to State or local governments to prevent receivership or to facilitate exit from receivership by local government, or to prevent default on its obligations by a State government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 213. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERING BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT ASSUME THE INSOLVENCY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon whose revenue and outlay assumptions do not assume that Social Security and Medicare will be solvent for the seventy-five years following the year in which the budget resolution is considered.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 214. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for

fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may fund the inland waterways system without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 215. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 18, insert ''proposals for reforming cost-benefit analysis used in agency rulemaking to adequately consider direct and indirect effects on manufacturing,'' after ''partnerships,''.

SA 216. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, increase the amount by $9,400,000.

On page 13, line 14, increase the amount by $9,400.000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,400,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $9,400,000.

SA 217. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 218. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 13, line 14, increase the amount by $5,000.000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

SA 219. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $88,039,221,200.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $93,057,456,808.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $98,361,731,846.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $103,968,350,562.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $109,894,546,544.

On page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

SA 220. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $48,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $54,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $57,183,700,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $60,443,170,900.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $63,888,431,641.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $67,530,072,245.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $71,379,286,363.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $75,447,905,685.

On page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

SA 221. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,650,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

SA 222. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL TAX INCREASES UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IMPOSED ON LOW- AND MIDDLE-INOME FAMILIES

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would repeal the tax increases enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that were imposed on low- and middle-income Americans by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years of 2013 through 2023.

SA 223. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STOP ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SURVEILLANCE OF LIVESTOCK OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the reform of applicable statutes to eliminate the risk of the Environmental Protection Agency conducting aerial surveillance for the inspection of agricultural operations or for the recording of images for the purpose of enforcement of regulations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 224. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 64, line 23, insert ''(which may include provisions resulting in the prohibition of certain aerial surveillance of agricultural operations by the Environmental Protection Agency)'' after ''Acts''.

SA 225. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. AYOTTA, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHANNS, and Mr. UDALL, of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT CONTAINS EARMARKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or resolution introduced in the Senate or the House of Representatives, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that includes an earmark.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) PROCEDURE.—Upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a) against an earmark, and such point of order being sustained, such earmark shall be deemed stricken.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT AND AMENDMENT BETWEEN THE HOUSES PROCEDURE.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable under the same conditions as was the conference report. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) EARMARK.—For the purpose of this section, the term ''earmark'' means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives as certified under paragraph 1(a)(1) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(A) providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process; or

(B) that—

(i)(I) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to a particular beneficiary or limited group of beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(II) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

(ii) modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SENATE.—In the event the Chair is unable to ascertain whether or not the offending provision constitutes an earmark as defined in this subsection, the question of whether the provision constitutes an earmark shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(e) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality or congressional district.

SA 226. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AMMUNITION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Department of Homeland Security ammunition procurement, which may include unobligated funds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 227. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM INCREASES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other

appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may require the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to include premium impact analysis in any regulatory and sub-regulatory regulation or guidance implementing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) without raising new revenue, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 228. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO REPEAL ALL TAXES ENACTED UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may repeal those provisions of, and amendments made by, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 that increase taxes without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 229. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE RELIEF TO SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may repeal the 30 hour weekly work requirement for purposes of determining a full-time employee under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) without raising new revenue, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 230. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE RELIEF TO SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may define a large employer for purposes of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) as an employer with 50 or more employees rather than considering full-time equivalent employees for such purposes without raising new revenue, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 231. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT MILLIONAIRES ON MEDICARE PAY THE FULL PREMIUM COSTS IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM FOR SENIORS AND PUT THE PROGRAM ON A SUSTAINABLE PATH FOR TAXPAYERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that require that Medicare beneficiaries with an annual income of $1,000,000 or more pay the full cost of the Medicare part B and D premiums, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 232. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BARDA AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may provide for full funding for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority under section 319L of the Public Health Serve Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and the Special Reserve Fund under Section 319-F2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b) without raising new revenue by the amounts provided in such authorizing legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 233. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 31, line 19, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 31, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 31, line 24__, increase the amount by $784,000,000.

On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 32, line 7, increase the amount by $42,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $784,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

SA 234. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. COWAN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 67, line 3, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The Chairman''.

On page 67, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(b) EXCLUSION OF EFFORT ON MEADS FROM AUTHORIZED EFFORTS COVERED BY RESERVE FUND.—

(1) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(A) According to a February 2011 Office of the Secretary of Defense Fact Sheet the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) has encountered significant schedule and cost overruns since its inception in the 1990s.

(B) The Fact Sheet states that the restructured acquisition design and development program would end by 2014, consistent with the expiration of the Memorandum of Understanding between the United States, Germany, and Italy, and the cost ceiling negotiated between those parties.

(2) EXCLUSION OF EFFORTS ON MEADS FROM AUTHORIZED EFFORTS.—A revision in the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports for acquisition or research and development on the Medium Extended Air Defense System would be an increase in the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023 and would be inconsistent with acquisition reform efforts of the Department of Defense otherwise authorized by subsection (a).

SA 235. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 67, beginning on line 8, strike ''Department of Defense audiability and acquisition reform efforts'' and insert ''efforts of the Department of Defense on auditability reform, acquisition reform, and the deployment of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System''.

SA 236. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 67, line 3, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The Chairman''.

On page 67, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(b) ADDITIONAL ELEMENT FOR FUND ON GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(A) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate is aware of extensive contract and acquisition reform the Missile Defense Agency has exercised over the last two years resulting in cost savings and increased contractor performance.

(B) Specifically, the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System development and sustainment contract awarded on December 30, 2011, was under budget, saving the taxpayers approximately $1,000,000,000 over 5 years.

(C) The Ballistic Missile Defense Review of 2010 concluded the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System is the only system currently capable of protecting the United States from an intercontinental ballistic missile.

(D) North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear capabilities at an alarming rate, despite imposed sanctions, while the two regimes continue irresponsible and reckless provocation of the United States and our allies.

(E) The proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction are of particular concern, and robust missile defense is a necessity to defend the United States against state and non-state actors.

(F) In response to this increasing threat, the Secretary of Defense announced on March 15, 2013, that an additional 14 interceptors would be deployed to Alaska by the end of 2017, raising the total to 44 missiles stationed along the West Coast of the United States.

(G) Adequate funding for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System, including the measures outlined in the Secretary of Defense's announcement on March 15, 2013, should remain a priority for the Department of Defense in the interest of national security.

(2) ADDITIONAL ELEMENT.—The efforts supported by the deficit-neutral reserve fund established by this section shall include, in addition to the efforts specified in subsection (a), efforts to deploy the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System.

SA 237. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT THE CLOSURE AND CONSOLIDATION OF OVERSEAS MILITARY PROPERTIES AND INSTALLATIONS TO ACHIEVE COST SAVINGS AND EFFICIENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would support the closure and consolidation of overseas military properties and installations to achieve cost savings and efficiencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING A DOMESTIC ROUND OF BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT IN FISCAL YEAR 2015 OR 2017.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would authorize a domestic round of base closure and realignment in fiscal year 2015 or 2017.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 238. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STUDYING THE EXPOSURE OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO THE EUROZONE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the ability of the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research at the Department of the Treasury to complete a detailed study of the exposure of the United States financial system to the European sovereign debt crisis, and to evaluate the impact and possible outcomes for United States markets, particularly derivatives markets, and detail any institutional vulnerabilities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 239. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

SA 240. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government

for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 76, line 20, by inserting ''including on-the-job training programs,'' after ''programs,''.

SA 241. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 324. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND ON OFFSHORE TAX SHELTERS BY LARGE PROFITABLE CORPORATIONS TO AVOID PAYING FEDERAL INCOME TAXES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to address offshore tax shelters used by large profitable corporations, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit and create jobs. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved.

SA 242. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A MEDICAID FMAP BONUS FOR ANY STATE THAT ENACTS MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may increase the Medicaid Federal medical assistance percentage of any State that enacts medical liability reform without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 243. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RESCINDING REDUCTIONS IN MEDICAID DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITAL ALLOTMENTS OF STATES THAT CHOOSE NOT TO EXPAND MEDICAID UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may rescind reductions under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in Medicaid disproportionate share hospital allotments for States that choose not to expand Medicaid under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 244. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 19, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, decrease the amount by $7,700,000.

On page 20, line 23, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,200,000.

On page 21, line 2, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $9,600,000.

On page 21, line 6, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,900,000.

On page 21, line 10, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 11, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 14, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,300,000.

On page 21, line 23, decrease the amount by $800,000.

On page 22, line 3, decrease the amount by $400,000.

On page 22, line 7, decrease the amount by $100,000.

SA 245. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXEMPT AMERICAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS IN FORECLOSURE FROM A TAX INCREASE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to an exemption on the sale of land by farmers and ranchers in foreclosure from any tax increases on investment income enacted in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 246. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXEMPT FAMILIES WITH SICK CHILDREN AND SENIORS FROM THE TAX INCREASE ON MEDICAL EXPENSES ENACTED IN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to an exemption for families with chronically and terminally ill dependents, which may include children and seniors, from any tax increase on medical expenses enacted in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 247. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR NO BUDGET, NO OMB PAY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the federal budget process, which may include prohibiting paying the salaries of either the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the OMB Deputy Director, or the OMB Deputy Director for Management, or all three officials, for the period of time after which the President fails to submit a budget, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and until the day the President submits a budget to Congress.

SA 248. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASES ON FEDERAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that includes any provision that increases Federal income tax rates.

(2) FEDERAL INCOME TAX RATES.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Federal income tax rates'' means any rate of tax that is imposed under subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, section 11(b), or section 55(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 249. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO EXEMPT ALL PEOPLE FROM THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE UNTIL FAMILY INSURANCE PREMIUMS HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY $2,500.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that exempts all people from the requirement imposed under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for individuals to maintain health care coverage unless the Office of the Actuary at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) certifies that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has reduced family insurance premiums by $2,500, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 250. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE ANNUAL FEE ON HEALTH INSURANCE PROVIDERS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would decrease health insurance premiums, increase jobs, and allow for more affordable health care options, which may include repealing the tax on health insurance plans included in section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 251. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 93, line 9, insert before the period '', and shall provide an analysis of the impact of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on major economic indicators measured relative to prior law, including the civilian labor force, the employment to population ratio, the status of employed persons, the index of hours worked in major industrial categories, inflation-adjusted gross domestic product, the rate of unemployment, and inflation-adjusted private investment, and an estimate of the budgetary effects of such impacts''.

SA 252. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ABORTION OF PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier;

(2) there is a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain;

(3) the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other;

(4) the Council of the District of Columbia, operating under authority delegated to the Council by Congress, repealed the law limiting abortions in its entirety, effective April 29, 2004, so that in the District of Columbia, abortion is now legal, for any reason, until the moment of birth;

(5) article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power to ''exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever'' over the District established as the seat of the Government of the United States, now known as the District of Columbia, and therefore the constitutional responsibility for the protection of pain-capable unborn children within the District of Columbia resides with Congress; and

(6) Congress should enact legislation to amend chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion within the District of Columbia, or attempt to do so, unless the physician performing or attempting the abortion first makes a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably relies upon such a determination made by another physician, and that it shall be unlawful to perform or attempt to perform an abortion if the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater, unless, in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions, with violators subject to imprisonment for not more than 2 years; provided, however, that a woman upon whom such an abortion is performed or attempted shall not be subject to prosecution for any such violation.

SA 253. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE POOL OF HIGHLY SKILLED WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES BY REMOVING PER-COUNTRY LIMITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to immigrant visas, which may include increasing the number of employment- and family-based immigrant visas available to nationals of any single foreign country without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 254. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN CROP INSURANCE INFORMATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would require the Secretary of Agriculture on an annual basis to make available to the public certain crop insurance information, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 255. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, PLANNING, OR SUPPORT OF A NEW UNITED NATIONS BUILDING ON THE PROPERTY OF THE ROBERT MOSES PLAYGROUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to repealing funding for the design, renovation, purchase of property, or construction of facilities of international organizations, including the United Nations Headquarters in New York in excess of the United States payment for the assessment agreed upon pursuant to paragraph 10 of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 61/251, the Strategic Heritage Plan of the United Nations Office in Geneva, or a new United Nations Building, sometimes identified as DC5, on the property of the Robert Moses Playground, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 256. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO LIMIT FUNDS FOR INSTITUTIONS OR ORGANIZATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to repealing funding to be made available for any institution or organization established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, including the International Seabed Authority, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, and the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 257. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR ACCOUNTING OF TOTAL UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report of all contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the Untied Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 258. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriation place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause a net increase in deficits in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 years after the budget year provided for in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a net increase in deficits in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) BUDGETARY RULE.—In the Senate, for purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in deficits shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Senate Committee on the Budget. Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increase offsetting receipts collected by the Federal Government shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate the point of order established by this section.

SA 259. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriation place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause a net increase in direct spending in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 years after the budget year provided for in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a net increase in direct spending in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) BUDGETARY RULE.—In the Senate, for purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Senate Committee on the Budget. Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate the point of order established by this section, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increase offsetting receipts collected by the Federal Government shall not be scored under this section with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SA 260. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, strike line 3.

SA 261. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) would result in revenues that would be greater than the level of revenues set forth for the first fiscal year or the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years under the concurrent resolution on the budget then in effect for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) for any year covered by such resolution, includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 262. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 30, line 4, increase the amount by $78,000,000.

On page 30, line 8, increase the amount by $577,000,000.

On page 30, line 12, increase the amount by $722,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, increase the amount by $737,000,000.

On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by $753,000,000.

On page 30, line 24, increase the amount by $769,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $785,000,000.

On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $801,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $817,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $577,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $722,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $737,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $753,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $769,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $785,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $801,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $817,000,000.

SA 263. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of unused or vacant Federal properties.
Sec. 202. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for selling excess Federal lands.
Sec. 203. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the repeal of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws.
Sec. 204. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the reduction of purchasing and maintaining Federal vehicles.
Sec. 205. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of financial assets purchased through the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2014 through 2023, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.
Sec. 302. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 304. Point of order against any Budget Resolution that fails to achieve balance.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 311. Oversight of Government performance.
Sec. 312. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 313. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 314. Rescind unspent or unobligated balances after 36 months.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 401. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

Sec. 501. Policy statement on Social Security.
Sec. 502. Policy statement on Medicare.
Sec. 503. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. Regulatory reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $1,724,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,034,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,318,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,468,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,734,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,323,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,501,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,671,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,817,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $−547,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $−573,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $−461,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $−436,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $−295,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $−110,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $−15,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,509,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,461,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,541,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,649,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,763,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,876,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,980,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,062,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,220,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,287,823,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,497,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,445,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,512,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,607,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,705,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,822,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,914,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,011,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,169,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,232,819,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $−765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $−411,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $−193,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $−140,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $201,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $390,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $467,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $478,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $560,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $13,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,576,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,095,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,156,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,049,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,772,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,437,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,119,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $12,740,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $13,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,576,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,095,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,156,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,049,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,772,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,437,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,119,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $12,740,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $732,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $812,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $908,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $952,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $995,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,084,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,129,000,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $634,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $711,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $756,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $805,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $856,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $907,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $962,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,022,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,086,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,227,009,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,754,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2011 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $529,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $530,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $541,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $555,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $568,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $582,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $596,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $611,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $628,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $644,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,204,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,794,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $23,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,446,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $854,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $26,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $26,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $27,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,483,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $18,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $18,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $19,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,949,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−4,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−11,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $11,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−10,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $11,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $11,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−8,454,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $79,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $70,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $70,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, 73,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $76,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $76,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $79,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $79,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $80,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $80,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,689,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $12,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $13,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,729,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $13,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $42,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $47,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $47,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $48,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,467,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $344,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $339,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $353,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $358,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $371,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $382,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $328,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $414,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $416,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $429,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $442,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $437,732,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $516,044,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $338,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $336,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $340,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $345,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $354,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $364,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $375,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $387,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $397,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $408,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,741,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $48,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,911,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $28,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,357,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $370,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $413,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $413,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $492,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $492,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $582,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $642,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $653,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $661,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $664,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,720,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−4,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,882,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−89,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−89,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−98,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−98,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−114,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−114,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−131,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−131,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−154,180,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−154,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−163,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−163,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−168,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−168,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−155,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−155,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−143,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−143,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−151,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−151,025,000,000.
(21) Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $−0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(22) Congressional Health Insurance for Seniors (990):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $3,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $495,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $495,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $528,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $527,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $531,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $567,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $588,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $605,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $681,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $706,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $706,150,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF UNUSED OR VACANT FEDERAL PROPERTIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any unused or vacant Federal properties. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR SELLING EXCESS FEDERAL LANDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any excess Federal lands. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON PREVAILING WAGE LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports from savings achieved by repealing the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REDUCTION OF PURCHASING AND MAINTAINING FEDERAL VEHICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by reducing the Federal vehicles fleet. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF FINANCIAL ASSETS PURCHASED THROUGH THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling financial instruments and equity accumulated through the Troubled Asset Relief Program. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2023, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.
(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—
(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.
(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.
(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—
(1) for fiscal year 2014, $942,636,000,000 in new budget authority and $997,677,000,000 in outlays;
(2) for fiscal year 2015, $899,935,000,000 in new budget authority and $942,103,000,000 in outlays;
(3) for fiscal year 2016, $885,842,000,000 in new budget authority and $910,362,000,000 in outlays;
(4) for fiscal year 2017, $906,645,000,000 in new budget authority and $925,457,000,000 in outlays;
(5) for fiscal year 2018, $929,163,000,000 in new budget authority and $939,667,000,000 in outlays;
(6) for fiscal year 2019, $951,179,000,000 in new budget authority and $966,694,000,000 in outlays;
(7) for fiscal year 2020, $976,080,000,000 in new budget authority and $990,498,000,000 in outlays;
(8) for fiscal year 2021, $999,540,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,013,879,000,000 in outlays;
(9) for fiscal year 2022, $1,024,753,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,044,562,000,000 in outlays; and
(10) for fiscal year 2023, $1,050,347,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,064,229,000,000 in outlays;
as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).
(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment or motion thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—
(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO SUPPORT ONGOING OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas deployments and other activities in the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ii) for fiscal year 2015, $25,000,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iii) for fiscal year 2016, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iv) for fiscal year 2017, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(v) for fiscal year 2018, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vi) for fiscal year 2019, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vii) for fiscal year 2020, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(viii) for fiscal year 2021, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ix) for fiscal year 2022, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(x) for fiscal year 2023, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go), section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits), and section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits), and section 301 of this resolution (relating to discretionary spending). Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of this resolution.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 304. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY BUDGET RESOLUTION THAT FAILS TO ACHIEVE BALANCE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any budget resolution following the enactment of this resolution that does not achieve balance within 10 fiscal years.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 311. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list reports. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 313. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 314. RESCIND UNSPENT OR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES AFTER 36 MONTHS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall require that any unobligated or unspent allocations be rescinded after 36 months.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments resulting from the required rescissions shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 401. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—(1) Not later than September 1, 2013, the Senate committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the United States Senate. After receiving those recommendations from the applicable committees of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $2,456,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(B) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $3,195,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(C) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND ENERGY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Energy shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $465,600,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(E) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $504,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $4,676,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(G) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $10,818,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the Senate revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure the Social Security System achieves solvency over the 75 year window. Legislation should be enacted that adopts the following:

(1) The legislation must modify the Primary Insurance Amount formula to gradually reduce benefits on a progressive basis for workers with career-average earnings above the 40th percentile of newly retired workers.

(2) The normal retirement age (NRA) be increased to reflect longevity growth rate.

(3) The legislation should allow for and provide the option of private Social Security retirement accounts.

(4) Implement and allow for certain individuals to completely forego Social Security benefits and contribution.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a reduction in the unfunded liabilities of Medicare. Legislation should be enacted that adopts the following:

(1) Enrolls seniors in the same health care plan as Federal employees and Members of Congress, similar to the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP).

(2) Beginning on January 1, 2015, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall ensure seniors currently enrolled or eligible for Medicare will have access to Congressional Health Care for Seniors Act.

(3) Prevents the Office of Personnel Management from placing onerous new mandates on health insurance plans, but allows the agency to continue to enforce reasonable minimal stands for plans, ensure the plans are fiscally solvent, and enforces rules for consumer protections.

(4) The legislation must create a new ''high-risk pool'' for the highest cost patients, providing a direct reimbursement to health care plans that enroll the costliest 5 percent of patients.

(5) Ensures that every senior can afford the high-quality insurance offered by FEHBP, providing support for 75 percent of the total costs, providing additional premium assistance to those who cannot afford the remaining share.

(6) The legislation must increase the age of eligibility gradually over 20 years, increasing the age from 65 to 70, resulting in a 3 month increase per year.

(7) High-income seniors will be provided less premium support than low-income seniors.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a tax reform that broadens the tax base, reduces tax complexity, includes a consumption-based income tax, and a globally competitive flat tax.

(1) TAXES ON INDIVIDUALS.—This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax rate on adjusted gross income. The individual tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, with exception to the mortgage interest deduction, offsetting these with a substantially higher standard deduction and personal exemption. The standard deduction for joint filers should be equal to or greater than $35,000, $21,690 for head of household, and $17,500 for single filers. The personal exemption amount is $6,800. This proposal eliminates the individual alternative minimum tax (AMT). The tax reform would repeal all tax on savings and investments, including capital gains, qualified and ordinary dividends, estate, gift, and interest saving taxes.

(2) TAXES ON BUSINESSES.—This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax on adjusted gross income. The business tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, offsetting these with a lower tax rate and immediate expensing of all business inputs. Such inputs shall be determined by total revenue from the sale of goods and services less purchases of inputs from other firms less wages, salaries, and pensions paid to workers less purchases of plant and equipment.

(3) SINGLE SYSTEM.—The individuals and businesses would be subject to taxation on only those incomes that are produced or derived, as a territorial system in the United States. The aggregate taxes paid should provide the ability to fill out a tax return no larger than a postcard.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

SEC. 601. REGULATORY REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a regulatory reform.

(1) APPLY REGULATORY ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS TO INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.—It shall be the policy of Congress to pass into law a requirement for independent agencies to abide by the same regulatory analysis requirement as those required by executive branch agencies.

(2) ADOPT THE REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT (REINS).—It shall be the policy of Congress to vote on the REINS Act, legislation that would require all regulations that impose a burden greater than $100,000,000 in economic aggregate may not be implemented as law unless Congress gives [their/its] consent by voting on the rule.

(3) SUNSET ALL REGULATIONS.—It is the policy of Congress that regulations imposed by the Federal Government shall automatically sunset every two years unless repromulgated by Congress.

(4) PROCESS REFORM.—It shall be the policy of Congress to implement regulatory process reform by instituting statutorily required regulatory impact analysis for all agencies, require the publication of regulatory impact analysis before the regulation is finalized, and ensure that not only are regulatory impact analysis conducted, but applied to the issued regulation or rulemaking.

(5) INCORPORATION OF FORMAL RULEMAKING FOR MAJOR RULES.—It shall be the policy of

Congress to apply formal rulemaking procedures to all major regulations or those regulations that exceed $100,000,000 in aggregate economic costs.

SA 264. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND ON OFFSHORE TAX SHELTERS BY LARGE PROFITABLE CORPORATIONS TO AVOID PAYING FEDERAL INCOME TAXES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to address offshore tax shelters used by large profitable corporations, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit and create jobs. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved.

SA 265. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, line 18, strike ''reduce'' and all that follows through ''job training,'' on lines 19 and 20 and insert ''ensure effective administration, reduce inefficient overlap, improve access, and enhance outcomes of Federal workforce development, youth and adult job training,''

SA 266. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE ON-THE-JOB TRAINING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to job training, which may include on-the-job training for adult and dislocated workers at worksites related to the exploration, production, or transportation of natural gas from the Marcellus Shale formation or other such sites, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 267. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and districts, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 268. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, line 18, by inserting ''provide training that leads to recognized postsecondary credentials,'' after ''access,''.

SA 269. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS RELATING TO TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to strengthening the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to textile and apparel articles, which may include increased training with respect to, and monitoring and verification of, textile and apparel articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 270. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION THAT ENABLES INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES TO USE EXISTING SAVINGS VEHICLES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to individuals with disabilities, which may include the financial independence of individuals with disabilities and their families by allowing them to utilize an existing tax-advantaged savings vehicle, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 271. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE TAX INCENTIVES FOR LIFE SCIENCES RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to tax incentives, which may include providing tax incentives for life sciences research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of

the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 272. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, line 21, insert ''\, energy efficiency,'' after ''conservation''.

On page 58, line 9, strike ''or'' at the end.

On page 58, line 11, strike ''gram;'' and insert the following:

gram; or

(10) advancing alternative sources of fuel, which may include advanced biofuels and second-generation ethanol products;

SA 273. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN WITH MEDICAID COVERAGE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the oral health outcomes for children covered by Medicaid, including legislation that may allow for risk-based disease prevention and comprehensive, coordinated chronic disease treatment approaches, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 274. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE GREATER OUTREACH AND EDUCATION ABOUT THE SAVER'S TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to tax incentives for retirement savings, which may include providing greater outreach and education about the saver's tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 275. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ELECTION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that either (1) enacts the recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration or (2) strengthens and reforms the Federal election system, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 276. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62, line 13, insert ''improve overall population health, promote health equity and reduce health disparities,'' after ''nation,''.

SA 277. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, strike lines 9 and 10, and insert the following:

(8) the protection of public health, including children, pregnant women, workers, and other vulnerable subpopulations, from toxic chemicals;

(9) the cleanup of contaminated properties that threaten public health and discourage local economic development;

(10) wildland fire management activities; or

(11) the restructure of the nuclear waste program;

SA 278. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including—

(1) expanding educational opportunities;

(2) providing increased access to job training and placement services;

(3) tracking and reporting on suicides of family members of members of the Armed Forces;

(4) ensuring access to high-quality and affordable healthcare; or

(5) improving military housing;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 279. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TANF WORK REQUIREMENTS.

The levels for function 600 in this resolution are amended by—

(1) reducing the budget authority for each fiscal year by—

(A) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
(B) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(C) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(D) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(E) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(F) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
(G) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(H) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(I) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
(J) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2023; and

(2) reducing the outlays for each fiscal year by—

(A) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
(B) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(C) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(D) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(E) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(F) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;

(G) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(H) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(I) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
(J) $7,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

SA 280. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING STATES TO IMPLEMENT DRUG TESTING FOR FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS FOR APPLICANTS AND RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring States to operate a drug testing program as part of their Federal welfare programs including, but not limited to, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 281. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAINTAIN IMPACT AID FUNDING AT 2012–2013 LEVELS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring adequate funding for impact aid payments under sections 8002 and 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702, 7703) in order to enable local educational agencies to provide a level of service that is not less than the level provided to students during the 2012–2013 school year without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 282. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT COMMUNITY BANKS FROM BASEL III CAPITAL STANDARDS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports for legislation related to the reform of the statutes governing community banking regulations, which may include a reduction in the role of international agreements establishing capital standards, without raising new revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 283. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 5, line 9, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, reduce the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, reduce the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, reduce the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, reduce the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 20, line 19, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 20, line 20, reduce the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 23, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 20, line 24, reduce the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 21, line 2, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 3, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 21, line 6, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 7, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 10, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 11, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 14, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 15, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 18, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 21, line 19, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 19, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 22, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 21, line 23, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 22, line 3, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 22, line 6, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 22, line 7, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.

SA 284. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT JOBS BY PREVENTING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM OVERRIDING EFFORTS BY STATES TO CONSERVE SPECIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference

reports relating to amending any statute governing the protection of any species from extinction, which may include deferring conservation planning and implementation to State and local governments, unless the efforts of the State and local governments are determined to be inadequate for species conservation, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 285. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $36,000,000,000.

On page 46, line12, decrease the amount by $36,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $100,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $100,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $147,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $147,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $179,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $179,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $193,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $193,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $203,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $203,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $211,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $211,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $225,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $225,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $237,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $237,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $251,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $251,000,000,000.

SA 286. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST UNFUNDED MANDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider—

(1) any bill or joint resolution that is reported by a committee unless the committee has published a statement of the Director on the direct costs of Federal mandates in accordance with section 423(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 before such consideration, except this paragraph shall not apply to any supplemental statement prepared by the Director under section 424(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would increase the direct costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates by an amount that causes the thresholds specified in section 424(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to be exceeded, unless—

(A)(i) the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report provides new budget authority or new entitlement authority in the House of Representatives or direct spending authority in the Senate for each fiscal year for such mandates included in the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report in an amount equal to or exceeding the direct costs of such mandate; or

(ii) the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report includes an authorization for appropriations in an amount equal to or exceeding the direct costs of such mandate; and

(B) the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report—

(i) identifies a specific dollar amount of the direct costs of such mandate for each year up to 10 years during which such mandate shall be in effect under the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, and such estimate is consistent with the estimate determined under subsection (e) for each fiscal year;

(ii) identifies any appropriation bill that is expected to provide for Federal funding of the direct cost referred to under clause (i); and

(iii)(I) provides that for any fiscal year the responsible Federal agency shall determine whether there are insufficient appropriations for that fiscal year to provide for the direct costs under clause (i) of such mandate, and shall (no later than 30 days after the beginning of the fiscal year) notify the appropriate authorizing committees of Congress of the determination and submit either—

(aa) a statement that the agency has determined, based on a re-estimate of the direct costs of such mandate, after consultation with State, local, and tribal governments, that the amount appropriated is sufficient to pay for the direct costs of such mandate; or

(bb) legislative recommendations for either implementing a less costly mandate or making such mandate ineffective for the fiscal year;

(II) provides for expedited procedures for the consideration of the statement or legislative recommendations referred to in subclause (I) by Congress no later than 30 days after the statement or recommendations are submitted to Congress; and

(III) provides that such mandate shall—

(aa) in the case of a statement referred to in subclause (I)(aa), cease to be effective 60 days after the statement is submitted unless Congress has approved the agency's determination by joint resolution during the 60-day period;

(bb) cease to be effective 60 days after the date the legislative recommendations of the responsible Federal agency are submitted to Congress under subclause (I)(bb) unless Congress provides otherwise by law; or

(cc) in the case that such mandate that has not yet taken effect, continue not to be effective unless Congress provides otherwise by law.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The provisions of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) shall not be construed to prohibit or otherwise restrict a State, local, or tribal government from voluntarily electing to remain subject to the original Federal intergovernmental mandate, complying with the programmatic or financial responsibilities of the original Federal intergovernmental mandate and providing the funding necessary consistent with the costs of Federal agency assistance, monitoring, and enforcement.

(c) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) APPLICATION.—The provisions of subsection (a)—

(A) shall not apply to any bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives; and

(B) shall apply to—

(i) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a Federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives;

(ii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a Federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any amendment offered to a bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives;

(iii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a Federal intergovernmental mandate in a conference report accompanying a bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and

(iv) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a Federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any amendments in disagreement between the two Houses to any bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives.

(2) CERTAIN PROVISIONS STRICKEN IN SENATE.—Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any provision listed in paragraph (1)(B), and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, such specific provision shall be deemed stricken from the bill, resolution, amendment, amendment in disagreement, or conference report and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF APPLICABILITY TO PENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this section, in the Senate, the presiding officer of the Senate shall consult with the Committee on Governmental Affairs, to the extent practicable, on questions concerning the applicability of this part to a pending bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report.

(e) DETERMINATIONS OF FEDERAL MANDATE LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, in the Senate, the levels of Federal mandates for a fiscal year shall be determined based on the estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(f) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 287. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASES IN FEDERAL SPENDING THAT ARE NOT OFFSET BY EQUIVALENT SPENDING CUTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that has the net effect of increasing direct spending by more than $5,000,000,000 for any applicable period described in paragraph (2).

(2) TIME PERIOD.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an applicable period shall be—

(A) the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023; and

(B) each of the 4 subsequent 10-fiscal-year periods.

(3) INCREASE IN DIRECT SPENDING.—For purposes of this subsection, the amount of any increase in direct spending for any applicable period shall be equal to the difference between—

(A) the total budget authority and outlays for such period that would result from enacting such legislation; and

(B) the total budget authority and outlays for such period as assumed in the most recent Congressional Budget Office Budget and Economic Outlook.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 288. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $79,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $83,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $88,154,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $93,179,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $98,490,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $104,103,000,000.

SA 289. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE SPIRIT OF TRANSPARENCY, RESPECT FOR BASIC HUMAN FREEDOMS, AND EFFECTIVE NONPROLIFERATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting reforms at the United Nations in the spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective nonproliferation, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 290. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROVIDING LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENTS ACCESS TO PRIVATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to a program or programs to serve low- and middle-income students by providing access to private elementary and secondary schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 291. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX INCREASES ON MIDDLE INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases taxes on middle income taxpayers for any year during the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) MIDDLE INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''middle income taxpayer'' means—

(A) any individuals filing jointly with an annual adjusted gross income of not greater than $450,000; or

(B) any individual who is not filing jointly with an annual adjusted gross income of not greater than $400,000.

(3) INCREASE IN TAXES.—For purposes of this subsection, a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report shall be deemed to have increased taxes for an applicable year if the projected total revenues for such year that would result from enacting such legislation exceed the total revenues for such year under current law, as assumed in the most recent Congressional Budget Office Budget and Economic Outlook.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 292. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) laws requiring parental notification or consent prior to an abortion, or in the alternative judicial waiver, are in effect in more than half of the States, but these laws are often circumvented by interstate activity in which minors travel or are transported across State lines to avoid laws requiring parental involvement;

(2) abortion providers use targeted advertising to minors across State lines, using avoidance of parental notification requirements as a selling point;

(3) when an abortion provider performs an abortion on a minor without parental notification, the provider is likely to lack the complete medical history of the minor, and parents of the minor are unaware of the need to watch for complications that may develop after the abortion when the minor is sent back to her State of residence, far from the provider; and

(4) parental notification and parental consent laws are supported by overwhelming majorities of the public in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a physician who performs or induces an abortion on a minor who is a resident of a State other than the State in which the abortion is performed should be required by

Federal law to provide, or cause an agent of the physician to provide, at least 24 hours advance notice to a parent of the minor before the abortion is performed;

(2) such a Federal requirement for interstate parental notification should not apply if —

(A) the minor declares in a signed written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent, and, before an abortion is performed on the minor, the physician notifies the authorities specified to receive reports of child abuse or neglect by the law of the State in which the minor resides of the known or suspected abuse or neglect;

(B) the abortion is necessary to save the life of a minor whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, provided that the attending physician or an agent of the physician notifies a parent of the minor in writing that an abortion was performed on the minor and of the circumstances of the abortion within 24 hours;

(C) the abortion is performed or induced in a State that has in force a law requiring parental involvement in the abortion decision of a minor and the physician complies with the requirements of that law;

(D) the physician is presented with documentation that shows with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the State of residence of the minor has authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion; or

(E) the minor is physically accompanied by a person who presents the physician or an agent of the physician with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that he or she is in fact a parent of that minor;

(3) a parent who suffers harm by a violation of the interstate notification requirement should be entitled to obtain appropriate relief in a civil action, unless that parent has committed an act of incest with the minor;

(4) whoever has committed an act of incest with a minor and knowingly transports the minor across a State line with the intent that the minor obtain an abortion should be subject to imprisonment of up to 1 year for such transportation, in addition to any other penalties; and

(5) Congress should enact S. 369, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA), to accomplish these purposes.

SA 293. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT COLLABORATES WITH WESTERN STATES TO PREVENT THE LISTING OF THE SAGE-GROUSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would improve the management of public land and natural resources, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 294. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONSIDERATION OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND REFORM PROPOSAL.

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) the President created the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform (in this section referred to as the ''Commission''), co-chaired by Erskine Bowles and Senator Alan Simpson, which proposed a balanced package of revenue and spending reforms to reduce projected Federal budget deficits and stabilize the Federal debt as a share of the national economy;

(2) while Members of Congress may not agree with every recommendation made by the Commission, in the absence of an agreed-upon concurrent budget resolution between the Senate and the House of Representatives, the proposal made by the Commission should be considered on the floor of the Senate with an open debate and amendment process; and

(3) it is critical that the United States reach a long-term solution that will get its fiscal house in order.

SA 295. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. _____. BUDGET SCORING RULE RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAM SPENDING.

In the Senate, a bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that includes a provision that reduces direct spending that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not be scored by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget as new negative budget authority if such provision does not result in net outlay savings over the total of the period of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

SA 296. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE RESOURCES GENERATED THROUGH MORE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE STAFF RIGHT-SIZING PROCESSES FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN EMBASSY AND DIPLOMATIC SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to permitting the Department of State to implement recommendations to reduce staffing inefficiencies overseas, including those contained in reports, such as Government Accountability Office Report 12-799 and the Fiscal Year 2012 Assessment of Management and Performance Challenges by the Inspector General for the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and to use the savings achieved from reducing such inefficiencies to improve embassy and diplomatic security, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 297. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COBURN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE TAX.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the House and the Senate, motions, or conference reports related to innovation, high quality manufacturing jobs, and economic growth, including the repeal of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit

over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 298. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF EMPLOYER MANDATE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the House and the Senate, motions, or conference reports related to job creation, reducing health insurance premiums, providing employees more health insurance choices, and expanding the economy, including but not limited to the repeal of the employer mandate to offer defined coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 299. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT ANY ATTEMPT TO GUT WELFARE REFORM AND TO REAUTHORIZE THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that prohibits the Obama Administration's unconstitutional attempt to gut welfare reform and provides for a 5-year reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program that honors the dignity of real work, assists current TANF clients through a ''work-first'' approach to becoming self-sufficient, continues to reduce the number of families that need welfare, improves State flexibility while increasing accountability and transparency in TANF spending, and ensures better coordination with other human services programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 300. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 19, strike '', by the amounts'' and insert the following: ''or the implementation of trade agreements under trade promotion authority (which may include a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement under trade promotion authority, a trade agreement between the United States and the European Union under trade promotion authority, or any other trade agreement under trade promotion authority), by the amounts''.

SA 301. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 18, strike ''or international'' and insert the following: ''protection of United States innovation and intellectual property interests (which may include establishing the position of Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, to have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate), or international''.

SA 302. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to the promotion of government efficiency, which may include reorganization of international trade agencies that reside outside the Executive Office of the President, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 303. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would increase access to health care providers for Medicare beneficiaries without raising revenue, which may include allowing Medicare providers to privately negotiate with Medicare beneficiaries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 304. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 83, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 84, line 2, and insert the following:

casting;

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(4) for the Indian Health Services and Indian Health Facilities accounts of the Indian Health Service.

SA 305. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may clarify that the amendments made by section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) shall not be construed as imposing any tax or as an exercise of any power of Congress enumerated in article I, section 8, clause 1 of, or the 16th amendment to, the Constitution without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 306. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2, and insert the following:

TITLE II—REDUCTION IN TOTAL REVENUES

SEC. 201. REDUCTION IN TOTAL REVENUES.

The levels in this resolution are amended by reducing total revenues by the following amounts:

(1) in 2014, $20,000,000,000;
(2) in 2015, $40,000,000,000;
(3) in 2016, $43,800,000,000;
(4) in 2017, $46,000,000,000;
(5) in 2018, $48,601,530,983;
(6) in 2019, $51,350,191,607;
(7) in 2020, $54,254,302,791;
(8) in 2021, $57,322,656,045;
(9) in 2022, $60,564,540,083; and
(10) in 2023, $63,989,768,942.

SA 307. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PERMANENTLY ELIMINATE THE FEDERAL ESTATE TAX.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may permanently eliminate the Federal estate tax without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 308. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BIENNIAL BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER BUDGET PROCESS REFORMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may establish biennial budgeting and appropriations and provide for a binding joint budget, which may include an enforcement mechanism to ensure completion of the budget process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 309. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by $495,000,000.
On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 4, increase the amount by $506,000,000.
On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 8, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 11, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 12, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 15, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 19, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 23, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 30, line 24, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 6, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 10, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $495,000,000.
On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $506,000,000.
On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

SA 310. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 4, increase the amount by $7,500,000.
On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 8, increase the amount by $9,800,000.
On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 12, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 16, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 28, line 23, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 6, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 14, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by $8,700,000.
On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $9,650,000.
On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by $12,150,000.
On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 41, line 14, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 41, line 22, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 41, line 23, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by $13,150,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $16,200,000.
On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $19,450,000.
On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $32,800,000.
On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $33,800,000.

SA 311. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING AND REFORMING THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the National Nuclear Security Administration, which may include strengthening and reforming that Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 312. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to support State and local law enforcement, which may include investing in State formula grants, to aid State and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems in implementing innovative, evidence-based approaches to crime prevention and control, including strategies such as specialty courts, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 313. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE WELL-BEING OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to programmatic improvements benefitting American Indian and Alaska Native individuals and families, which may include strengthening health services to largely underserved populations, supporting Indian and tribal health organizations that operate hospitals and clinics, or improving payment systems to better support the health needs of American Indian and Alaska Native individuals and families by closing the gap between claims filed with, and payments made by, the Indian Health Service for those purposes, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 314. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, line 25, insert after ''space'' the following: '', to include leases of major medical facilities,''.

SA 315. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, line 3, insert ''to an international tax system that addresses profit-shifting by United States multinational corporations,'' after ''exists,''.

SA 316. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to addressing prescription drug abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 317. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET CONTAINING NET INTEREST OUTLAYS IN EXCESS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE OUTLAYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year, or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon, that would provide for net interest outlays in excess of budget function 050 outlays in the same fiscal year for any year covered by the budget resolution.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 318. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, line 1, after the number ''$975,000,000,000'' insert the following: ''and sufficient to reduce outlays by $275,000,000,000''

SA 319. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $3,500,000.

On page 28, line 4, increase the amount by $3,500,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,500,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,500,000.

SA 320. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

SA 321. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STREAMLINING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming Bureau of Land Management regulations in a manner that would increase job creation, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 322. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND USE OF CERTAIN GUIDANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the regulation of nonnavigable waters, which may include preventing the implementation of guidance from any Federal agency, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Corps of Engineers, which may negatively impact economic growth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 323. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND MODERNIZATION OF UNITED STATES NUCLEAR FORCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and modernizing the deployment of United States nuclear forces at levels no lower than the maximum allowed for under the New START Treaty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 324. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FAILURE TO DISCLOSE TRUE COSTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill,

joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that is not deficit neutral, unless a statement prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of the budgetary effects of the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report has been made available that includes in the estimate of the budgetary effects of the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report costs relating to debt service.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 325. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE LEVEL OF PUBLIC DEBT IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels of public debt outlined in section 101(5) of this resolution are responsible, reasonable, and in a sustainable place; and

(2) increasing the public debt to $24,364,925,000,000 through fiscal year 2023 under section 101(5) of this resolution is good for our children and grandchildren.

SA 326. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. REDUCTION IN SPENDING ON HEALTH CARE THAT OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CANNOT AFFORD.

(a) MODIFICATION OF FUNCTIONAL LEVEL 550.—The levels for function 550 in this resolution are amended by—

(1) reducing the budget authority for each fiscal year by—

(A) $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
(B) $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(C) $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(D) $15,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(E) $18,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(F) $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
(G) $18,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(H) $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(I) $20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
(J) $21,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2023; and

(2) reducing the outlays for each fiscal year by—

(A) $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
(B) $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(C) $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(D) $15,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(E) $18,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(F) $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
(G) $18,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(H) $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(I) $20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2022;
(J) $21,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(b) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The levels for Federal revenues in this resolution are amended by reducing the level for each fiscal year by—

(1) $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
(2) $3,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(3) $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(4) $7,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(5) $8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(6) $8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
(7) $9,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(8) $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(9) $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
(10) $11,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

SA 327. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 34 line 2, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 34, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 34, line 10, decrease the amount by $4,400,000,000.
On page 34, line 11, decrease the amount by $4,400,000,000.
On page 34, line 14, decrease the amount by $7,700,000,000.
On page 34, line 15, decrease the amount by $7,700,000,000.
On page 34, line 18, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 34, line 19, decrease the amount by $9,900,000,000.
On page 34, line 22, decrease the amount by $11,700,000,000.
On page 34, line 23, decrease the amount by $11,700,000,000.
On page 35, line 2, decrease the amount by $13,900,000,000.
On page 35, line 3, decrease the amount by $13,900,000,000.

SA 328. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $286,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $309,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $335,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $362,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $376,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $390,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $405,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $266,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $295,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $307,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $320,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $333,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $374,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $402,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $266,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $295,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $307,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $320,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $333,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $374,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $402,000,000.
On page 29, line 24, decrease the amount by $286,000,000.
On page 29, line 25, decrease the amount by $266,000,000.
On page 30, line 3, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.
On page 30, line 4, decrease the amount by $295,000,000.
On page 30, line 7, decrease the amount by $309,000,000.
On page 30, line 8, decrease the amount by $307,000,000.
On page 30, line 11, decrease the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 30, line 12, decrease the amount by $320,000,000.
On page 30, line 15, decrease the amount by $335,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $333,000,000.
On page 30, line 19, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 30, line 20, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.
On page 30, line 23, decrease the amount by $362,000,000.
On page 30, line 24, decrease the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, decrease the amount by $376,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, decrease the amount by $374,000,000.
On page 31, line 6, decrease the amount by $390,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 31, line 10, decrease the amount by $405,000,000.
On page 31, line 11, decrease the amount by $402,000,000.

SA 329. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO BROADEN THE EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER, INCLUDING ALLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO DONATE A PORTION OF THEIR SALARIES TO CHARITY OR TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY DURING SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to broadening the impact of the sequester, which may include allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury if the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 330. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, line 15, after ''sections,'' insert ''which may include changes to the exempt status of accounts other than Social Security and net interest,''.

SA 331. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND THAT PERTAINS TO ANY LEGISLATION REDUCING THE 2017 FEDERAL MATCHING RATE IN MEDICAID FOR THE EXPANSION POPULATION IN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND CLARIFIES THAT STATES MAY OPT-OUT OF THE MEDICAID EXPANSION AT ANY TIME.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that pertains to any legislation relating to Medicaid expansion which may include but are not limited to reductions in the 2017 Federal matching rate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and clarifications of the State opt-out, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 332. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SEX-SELECTION ABORTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Women are a vital part of American society and culture and possess the same fundamental human rights and civil rights as men.

(2) United States law prohibits the dissimilar treatment of males and females who are similarly situated and prohibits sex discrimination in various contexts, including the provision of employment, education, housing, health insurance coverage, and athletics.

(3) Sex is an immutable characteristic ascertainable at the earliest stages of human development through existing medical technology and procedures commonly in use, including maternal-fetal bloodstream DNA sampling, amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling or ''CVS'', and obstetric ultrasound. In addition to medically assisted sex determination, a growing sex determination niche industry has developed and is marketing low-cost commercial products, widely advertised and available, that aid in the sex determination of an unborn child without the aid of medical professionals. Experts have demonstrated that the sex-selection industry is on the rise and predict that it will continue to be a growing trend in the United States. Sex determination is always a necessary step to the procurement of a sex-selection abortion.

(4) A ''sex-selection abortion'' is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child. Sex-selection abortion is barbaric, and described by scholars and civil rights advocates as an act of sex-based or gender-based violence, predicated on sex discrimination. Sex-selection abortions are typically late-term abortions performed in the 2nd or 3rd trimester of pregnancy, after the unborn child has developed sufficiently to feel pain. Substantial medical evidence proves that an unborn child can experience pain at 20 weeks after conception, and perhaps substantially earlier. By definition, sex-selection abortions do not implicate the health of the mother of the unborn, but instead are elective procedures motivated by sex or gender bias.

(5) The targeted victims of sex-selection abortions performed in the United States and worldwide are overwhelmingly female. The selective abortion of females is female infanticide, the intentional killing of unborn females, due to the preference for male offspring or ''son preference''. Son preference is reinforced by the low value associated, by some segments of the world community, with female offspring. Those segments tend to regard female offspring as financial burdens to a family over their lifetime due to their perceived inability to earn or provide financially for the family unit as can a male. In addition, due to social and legal convention, female offspring are less likely to carry on the family name. ''Son preference'' is one of the most evident manifestations of sex or gender discrimination in any society, undermining female equality, and fueling the elimination of females' right to exist in instances of sex-selection abortion.

(6) Sex-selection abortions are not expressly prohibited by United States law or the laws of 47 States. Sex-selection abortions are performed in the United States. In a March 2008 report published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Columbia University economists Douglas Almond and Lena Edlund examined the sex ratio of United States-born children and found ''evidence of sex selection, most likely at the prenatal stage''. The data revealed obvious ''son preference'' in the form of unnatural sex-ratio imbalances within certain segments of the United States population, primarily those segments tracing their ethnic or cultural origins to countries where sex-selection abortion is prevalent. The evidence strongly suggests that some Americans are exercising sex-selection abortion practices within the United States consistent with discriminatory practices common to their country of origin, or the country to which they trace their ancestry. While sex-selection abortions are more common outside the United States, the evidence reveals that female feticide is also occurring in the United States.

(7) The American public supports a prohibition of sex-selection abortion. In a March 2006 Zogby International poll, 86 percent of Americans agreed that sex-selection abortion should be illegal, yet only 3 States proscribe sex-selection abortion.

(8) Despite the failure of the United States to proscribe sex-selection abortion, the United States Congress has expressed repeatedly, through Congressional resolution, strong condemnation of policies promoting sex-selection abortion in the ''Communist Government of China''. Likewise, at the 2007 United Nation's Annual Meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, 51st Session, the United States delegation spearheaded a resolution calling on countries to condemn sex-selective abortion, a policy directly contradictory to the permissiveness of current United States law, which places no restriction on the practice of sex-selection abortion. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has urged governments of all nations ''to take necessary measures to prevent . . . prenatal sex selection''.

(9) A 1990 report by Harvard University economist Amartya Sen, estimated that more than 100 million women were ''demographically missing'' from the world as early as 1990 due to sexist practices, including sex-selection abortion. Many experts believe sex-selection abortion is the primary cause. Current estimates of women missing from the world range in the hundreds of millions.

(10) Countries with longstanding experience with sex-selection abortion such as the Republic of India, the United Kingdom, and the People's Republic of China, have enacted restrictions on sex-selection, and have steadily continued to strengthen prohibitions and penalties. The United States, by contrast,

has no law in place to restrict sex-selection abortion, establishing the United States as affording less protection from sex-based feticide than the Republic of India or the People's Republic of China, whose recent practices of sex-selection abortion were vehemently and repeatedly condemned by United States congressional resolutions and by the United States Ambassador to the Commission on the Status of Women. Public statements from within the medical community reveal that citizens of other countries come to the United States for sex-selection procedures that would be criminal in their country of origin. Because the United States permits abortion on the basis of sex, the United States may effectively function as a ''safe haven'' for those who seek to have American physicians do what would otherwise be criminal in their home countries—a sex-selection abortion, most likely late-term.

(11) The American medical community opposes sex-selection. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, commonly known as ''ACOG'', stated in its 2007 Ethics Committee Opinion, Number 360, that sex-selection is inappropriate because it ''ultimately supports sexist practices''. The American Society of Reproductive Medicine (commonly known as ''ASRM'') 2004 Ethics Committee Opinion on sex-selection notes that central to the controversy of sex-selection is the potential for ''inherent gender discrimination, . . . the risk of psychological harm to sex-selected offspring (i.e., by placing on them expectations that are too high), . . . and reinforcement of gender bias in society as a whole''. Embryo sex-selection, ASRM notes, remains ''vulnerable to the judgment that no matter what its basis, [the method] identifies gender as a reason to value one person over another, and it supports socially constructed stereotypes of what gender means''. In doing so, it not only ''reinforces possibilities of unfair discrimination, but may trivialize human reproduction by making it depend on the selection of nonessential features of offspring''. The ASRM ethics opinion continues, ''ongoing problems with the status of women in the United States make it necessary to take account of concerns for the impact of sex-selection on goals of gender equality''. The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization with hundreds of members—many of whom are former abortionists—makes the following declaration: ''Sex selection abortions are more graphic examples of the damage that abortion inflicts on women. In addition to increasing premature labor in subsequent pregnancies, increasing suicide and major depression, and increasing the risk of breast cancer in teens who abort their first pregnancy and delay childbearing, sex selection abortions are often targeted at fetuses simply because the fetus is female. As physicians who care for both the mother and her unborn child, the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists vigorously opposes aborting fetuses because of their gender.''. The President's Council on Bioethics published a Working Paper stating the council's belief that society's respect for reproductive freedom does not prohibit the regulation or prohibition of ''sex control'', defined as the use of various medical technologies to choose the sex of one's child. The publication expresses concern that ''sex control might lead to . . . dehumanization and a new eugenics''.

(12) Sex-selection abortion results in an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance. An unnatural sex-ratio imbalance is undesirable, due to the inability of the numerically predominant sex to find mates. Experts worldwide document that a significant sex-ratio imbalance in which males numerically predominate can be a cause of increased violence and militancy within a society. Likewise, an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance gives rise to the commoditization of humans in the form of human trafficking, and a consequent increase in kidnapping and other violent crime.

(13) Sex-selection abortions have the effect of diminishing the representation of women in the American population, and therefore, the American electorate.

(14) Sex-selection abortion reinforces sex discrimination and has no place in a civilized society.

(15) The history of the United States includes examples of sex discrimination. The people of the United States ultimately responded in the strongest possible legal terms by enacting a constitutional amendment correcting elements of such discrimination. Women, once subjected to sex discrimination that denied them the right to vote, now have suffrage guaranteed by the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The elimination of discriminatory practices has been and is among the highest priorities and greatest achievements of American history.

(16) Implicitly approving the discriminatory practice of sex-selection abortion by choosing not to prohibit them will reinforce these inherently discriminatory practices, and evidence a failure to protect a segment of certain unborn americans because those unborn are of a sex that is disfavored. Sex-selection abortions trivialize the value of the unborn on the basis of sex, reinforcing sex discrimination, and coarsening society to the humanity of all vulnerable and innocent human life, making it increasingly difficult to protect such life. Thus, Congress has a compelling interest in acting—indeed it must act—to prohibit sex-selection abortion.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress has power to prohibit sex selection abortions under the Commerce Clause; section 5 of the 14th amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on Government action denying equal protection of the laws; and section 8 of article I; and

(2) Congress should enact S. 138, the Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (PRENDA), to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that whoever knowingly performs an abortion knowing that such abortion is sought based on the sex or gender of the child; uses force or the threat of force to intentionally injure or intimidate any person for the purpose of coercing a sex-selection abortion; solicits or accepts funds for the performance of a sex-selection abortion; or transports a woman into the United States or across a State line for the purpose of obtaining a sex-selection abortion; or who attempts to do any of these things, may be fine or imprisoned up to five years under this title; and to allow for civil action by a woman on whom such an abortion was performed; provided, however, that nothing in such Act shall be construed to require that a healthcare provider has an affirmative duty to inquire as to the motivation for the abortion, absent the healthcare provider having knowledge or information that the abortion is being sought based on the sex or gender of the child.

SA 333. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO CLARIFY ELIGIBILITY FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to clarification of eligibility for the child tax credit, which may include requiring a taxpayer to provide a valid identification number, as defined in section 6428(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, on their tax return, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 334. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FROM GRANTING LEGAL STATUS TO INDIVIDUALS ILLEGALLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES BEFORE FULLY IMPLEMENTING THE INTEGRATED ENTRY AND EXIT DATA SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may—

(1) revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to restricting the grant of legal status to those illegally present within the United States until the Department of Homeland Security complies with certain Federal laws relating to the integrated entry and exit data system required under section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1365a) without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit during the 5-year period ending on September 30, 2018, or the 10-year period ending on September 30, 2023; and

(2) make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger during the 5-year and 10-year periods described in paragraph (1) to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is only used for deficit reduction.

(b) LIMITATION.—The adjustments authorized under subsection (a) shall be limited to the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 335. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT REQUIRE THE REGISTRATION OR TAXATION OF GUNS OWNED BY UNITED STATES CITIZENS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to preventing the funding of any international organization, agency, or entity (including the United Nations) that requires the registration of, or taxes a gun owned by a citizen of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 336. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.___. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO END AUTOMATIC PAY RAISES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levesl in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would achieve savings by ending the current system that provides members of Congress with automatic pay raises, to reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit recution achieved.

SA 337. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to border security, which may include provisions requiring that senders remitting money internationally show valid U.S. identification, or documentation that they are in the country legally, and to establish a fee with respect to international remittance transfers if the sender is unable to verify legal status in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 338. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENDING SUBSIDIES FOR MOBILE PHONE SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would prohibit the Universal Service Fund from subsidizing commercial mobile service, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 339. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DRUG TESTING AND DRUG TREATMENT FOR TANF RECIPIENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring States to operate a drug testing program as part of their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, provide treatment programs for TANF recipients who test positive for illegal drug use or are convicted of drug-related crime, to withhold TANF assistance for 2 years for any recipient who, after initially testing positive and having been offered treatment, again tests positive, and that would not reduce or deny TANF assistance allocated for dependents if the dependent's caretaker tests positive for drug use or is convicted of drug-related crime, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 340. Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE FINANCIAL REGULATORS TO CONDUCT RIGOROUS COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES ON ALL PROPOSED RULES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that relate to the finalization of rules with positive cost-benefit analyses promulgated by a financial regulator, including the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Financial Research, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 341. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FISH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish, without raising new revenue, by

the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 342. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHOOL CHOICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to allowing funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to follow children from low-income families to the school the children attend, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 343. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 344. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT TEACHER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would allow State and local educational agency compensation programs for teachers who have a demonstrated record of improving student academic achievement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 345. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW FOR STATE AND EMPLOYER INNOVATION IN REDUCING HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that waives title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act if the Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that States and employers can offer health insurance to their respective consumers at a lower premium, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 346. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM HIGH HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that delays any further implementation of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the Congressional Budget Office certifies that health insurance premiums have decreased by an average of $2,500, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 347. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MANDATE DECISION ON STATE MEDICAID WAIVER APPLICATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to complete review and decide on State Medicaid waiver applications within a timely manner to ensure States have the appropriate ability to manage their own annual budget processes and improve care for Medicaid patients, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 348. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT RESTRICTIONS TO PUBLIC ACCESS TO FISHING DOWNSTREAM OF DAMS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from restricting public access to waters downstream of a Corps of Engineers dam, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 349. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORKER, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT FUNDING FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ACTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to preventing the National Labor Relations Board from enforcing decisions or regulations issued by a majority whose quorum was constituted by invalid recess appointments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 350. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert ''including programs that encourage job training partnerships between businesses, educational institutions, and the workforce development system,'' after ''growth,''.

SA 351. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, line 22, insert ''increase access to dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools for low-income students, standardize financial aid award letters,'' after ''students,''.

SA 352. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 5, strike ''or improve the unemployment compensation program'' and insert ''improve the unemployment compensation program, or expand and expedite training opportunities for unemployed workers receiving unemployment compensation''.

SA 353. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, line 1, after ''telecommunications,'' insert ''including promoting investments in broadband infrastructure to expedite deployment of broadband to rural areas,''.

SA 354. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, line 9, strike ''or'' at the end.

On page 58, line 11, insert ''or'' after the semicolon at the end.

On page 58, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(10) the development of renewable-energy resources and energy efficiency on Indian land;

SA 355. Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Secretary of the Army from enforcing any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm, including an assembled or functional firearm, at a water resources development project, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 356. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR AMMUNITION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Department of Homeland Security ammunition procurement, which may include unobligated funds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 357. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $31,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $48,300,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $80,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $80,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $93,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $93,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $84,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $84,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $49,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $49,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $28,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $28,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $16,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $16,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $23,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $23,000,000,000.

SA 358. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 81, line 23, strike ''$50,000,000,000'' and insert ''$66,000,000,000 (of which $16,000,000,000 may only be for addressing the impacts on the Department of Defense incurred as a result of sequestration prior to a statute being enacted to replace sequestration)''.

SA 359. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 19, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 20, line 20, reduce the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 23, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 20, line 24, reduce the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 21, line 2, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 3, reduce the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 21, line 6, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 7, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 10, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 11, reduce the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 21, line 14, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 15, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 18, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 21, line 19, reduce the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 21, line 22, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 21, line 23, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 22, line 3, reduce the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 22, line 6, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 22, line 7, reduce the amount by $30,000,000.

SA 360. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PROHIBIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FIREARM REGISTRY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include a prohibition on the establishment of a national firearm registry, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 361. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

SA 362. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by $1,291,186,000.
On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by $1,291,186,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,291,186,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,291,186,000.

SA 363. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $2,279,000,000.
On page 17, line 4, increase the amount by $2,279,000,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,279,000,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,279,000,000.

SA 364. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT IRAN FROM ACCESSING THE TRANS-EUROPEAN AUTOMATED REALTIME GROSS SETTLEMENT EXPRESS TRANSFER SYSTEM AND ITS EURO-DENOMINATED FOREIGN EXCHANGE HOLDINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to Iran, which may include efforts to prevent Iran from directly or indirectly accessing the Trans-European Automated Realtime Gross Settlement Express Transfer System (commonly known as ''TARGET2'') of the European Central Bank or to prevent the Government of Iran from accessing its euro-denominated foreign exchange holdings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 365. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO BRING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference

reports that include tax provisions encouraging United States enterprises to relocate operations from overseas to within the United States, or discouraging United States enterprises from relocating United States operations to other countries, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 366. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, line 7, insert ''Federal and State'' before ''credentialing''.

SA 367. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDS FOR REGULATIONS THAT ARE NOT CONGRESSIONALLY AUTHORIZED.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provides funds for new Federal regulations and that does not prohibit such funds from being used to create any new regulation that has not been reviewed, modified, or specifically authorized by Congress in statute.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 368. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPLACING THE MEDICAID PROGRAM AND THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM WITH A BLOCK GRANT TO THE STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to replacing the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance program with a block grant to the States without raising new revenue by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 369. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ACHIEVE DOMESTIC ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports for legislation relating to the reform of the statutes governing domestic energy production, which may include but is not limited to increasing production to levels eliminating the need for energy imports from abroad, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 370. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, line 14, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 48, line 15, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 48, line 18, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 48, line 19, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 48, line 22, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 48, line 23, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 49, line 2, decrease the amount by $235,000,000.

On page 49, line 3, decrease the amount by $235,000,000.

On page 49, line 6, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 49, line 7, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 49, line 10, decrease the amount by $455,000,000.

On page 49, line 11, decrease the amount by $455,000,000.

On page 49, line 14, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 49, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 49, line 18, decrease the amount by $105,000,000.

On page 49, line 19, decrease the amount by $105,000,000.

SA 371. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, line 14, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 48, line 15, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 48, line 18, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 48, line 19, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 48, line 22, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 48, line 23, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 49, line 6, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 49, line 7, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 49, line 10, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 49, line 11, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 49, line 18, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 49, line 19, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

SA 372. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In paragraph (1) of section 307, strike ''and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production''.

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDED DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION AND ADVANCED ENERGY RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of the production of oil and natural gas on Federal land and waters and directing a share of the associated receipts to an advanced energy trust fund without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 373. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4___. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET PROVIDING OUTLAYS FOR INTEREST ON THE DEBT IN EXCESS OF OUTLAYS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that includes outlays for function 900 in any fiscal year that exceed outlays for function 050 in the same fiscal year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 374. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PHASE OUT THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that phase out the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 375. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE RESTRICTION OF DRONES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of drones in United States airspace, which may include a prohibition on the use of drones in domestic surveillance and a requirement that the government must obtain a warrant before using a drone in a surveillance capacity, except for border security or other exigent circumstances, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 376. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF MAJOR RULES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to enforcement of major rules, which may include a requirement for congressional approval of a major rule before it can be implemented, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 377. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR AVIATION SECURITY REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports related to reform of aviation security, which may include the privatization of the Transportation Security Administration, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018, or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 378. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF EGYPT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to assistance to the Government of Egypt, which may include requiring the President of Egypt to publicly declare, in English and Arabic, his intent to abide by the Camp David Accords, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 379. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE FOREIGN AID TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN UNTIL IT GRANTS THE RELEASE OF DR. SHAKIL AFRIDI.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to assistance which may include barring funds to the Government of Pakistan unless the President certifies to Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi has been released from prison in Pakistan, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 380. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) which may clarify that ''navigable waters'' means waters of the United States, including the territorial seas that are navigable-in-fact or permanent, standing, or continuously flowing bodies of water that form geographical features commonly known as streams, oceans, rivers, and lakes that are connected to waters that are navigable-in-fact, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 381. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 4, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 5, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $7,691,822,000.

SA 382. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, reduce the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 7, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 8, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 11, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 12, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 15, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 16, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 19, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 20, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 23, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 15, line 24, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 2, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 3, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 6, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 7, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 10, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 11, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 14, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 15, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 18, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 16, line 19, reduce the amount by $15,000,000,000.
On page 18, line 23, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 18, line 24, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 2, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 3, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 6, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 7, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 10, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 11, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 14, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 15, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 18, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 19, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 22, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 23, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 2, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 3, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 6, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 7, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 10, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 11, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 6, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 10, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 18, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.

SA 383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW DISCIPLINARY MEASURES AGAINST DEPARTMENT OF STATE EMPLOYEES WHOSE ACTIONS RESULT IN LOSS OF LIFE, SERIOUS INJURY, OR SIGNIFICANT DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY AT OR RELATED TO A UNITED STATES MISSION OVERSEAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would allow the Department of State to take disciplinary measures, up to and including termination, against senior officials found to provide unsatisfactory leadership with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States mission overseas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 384. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUYS AMERICAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to procurement contracts, which may include ensuring that the Federal Government prioritize United States companies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 385. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, strike lines 9 and 10 and insert the following:

(8) wildland fire management activities;
(9) Indian water settlements; or
(10) the restructure of the nuclear waste pro-

SA 386. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRIBAL HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tribal higher education, which may include establishing a deficit-neutral reserve fund for tribal higher education programs in the Department of the Interior for tribal scholarships, operating expenses, and other necessary purposes, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 387. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT EXPORT PROMOTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to supporting export promotion for small businesses, which may include educational programs, marketing services, or participation in foreign trade missions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such

legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 388. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING OVERSIGHT AND ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and reforming Federal offices of Inspectors General, reducing vacancies in offices of Inspectors General, and providing for improvements in the overall economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Inspectors General without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 389. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 390. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(3) the continuation of the limitation on increases in costs of enrollment fees, premiums, and pharmacy copayments for health care for uniformed services beneficiaries by a percentage greater than the percentage increase in uniformed services retired pay;

On page 59, line 20, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

On page 59, line 23, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

On page 60, line 1, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(6)''.

SA 391. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PREVENTING TERRORISTS FROM PURCHASING GUNS.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate finds that terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda continue to be a threat to Americans in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that law enforcement should be able to prevent known and suspected terrorists from purchasing firearms in the United States.

SA 392. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FIREARM POSSESSION.

It is the sense of the Senate that victims of domestic violence are at risk for further harm when convicted domestic abusers who are prohibited by law from possessing firearms continue to possess such weapons.

SA 393. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BACKGROUND CHECKS AT GUN SHOWS.

It is the sense of the Senate that background checks should be conducted on all firearms sales at gun shows.

SA 394. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page, 62, line 12, insert ''focus on chronic illness,'' after ''efficiency,''.

SA 395. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT VULNERABLE FAMILIES FROM UNNECESSARY INCREASES IN FUEL COSTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of 1 or more committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that clarify existing laws requiring that any new or amended rule or regulation increasing the cost of gasoline or diesel fuel be approved by each State governor prior to being enacted, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 396. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax

abuses used by large corporations, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 397. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT PENSION AND HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR RETIRED UMWA WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that protect the pension and health care benefits of past and present members of the United Mine Workers of America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 398. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 399. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, strike lines 20 through line 2 on page 50

The levels in this resolution are amended by—Reducing total revenues by the following amounts

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $4,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $4,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $5,100,00,000.

And reducing the amounts by which federal revenues should be changed by the following amounts

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $4,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $5,100,000,000.

SA 400. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE A PHOTOGRAPHIC ID FOR VOTING IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would create a system for requiring a valid government-issued photographs ID for voting in federal elections without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 401. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, insert ''or the reduction of duplicative Federal financial literacy programs,'' after ''property,''.

SA 402. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, after ''property,'' insert ''or the reduction of duplicative Federal housing assistance programs''.

SA 403. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, after ''property,'' insert ''or the reduction of duplicative Federal grant programs within the Department of Justice,''.

SA 404. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, insert ''or the reduction of duplicative Federal unmanned aircraft programs,'' after ''property,''.

SA 405. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, insert ''or the reduction of duplicative Federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs'' after ''property''.

SA 406. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 5, insert ''or prohibit millionaires from receiving unemployment compensation benefits,'' after ''program,''.

SA 407. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REDUCING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR MILLIONAIRES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming Social Security, which may include reducing Social Security benefits received by those earning over a $1,000,000 dollars annually, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 408. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM PROVIDING ENHANCED FUNDING FOR ANY STATE'S EXPANSION OF THE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the federal medical assistance percentages in Medicaid, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 409. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE STATE-WIDE BUDGET NEUTRALITY IN THE CALCULATION OF THE MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FLOOR.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would adjust Medicare outlays, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 410. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HSA-ELIGIBLE HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to health savings account-eligible high deductible health plans provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 411. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FURLOUGH FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX LIABILITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal employees, which may include measures addressing Federal employees with seriously delinquent tax liability, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 412. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 413. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth

the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE LIFELINE PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to reforming the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 414. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND CLOSING TAX EXPENDITURES FOR THE PGA TOUR, THE NFL, NASCAR, HOLLYWOOD, FISH TACKLE BOX MANUFACTURERS, AND WHALING CAPTAINS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 415. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 15, after ''initiatives,'' insert ''or eliminating and defunding any congressional committee that does not conduct oversight of the programs within its jurisdiction,''.

SA 416. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PREVENTION OF NON-DEFENSE RELATED SPENDING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the Department of Defense, which may include measures eliminating non-defense related programs at the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 417. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCE THE BURDEN ON TAXPAYER BY ELIMINATING SUBSIDIES TO WEALTHY AMERICANS FOR THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to health insurance subsidies, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 418. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ACHIEVING AT LEAST $630 IN HEALTH CARE SAVINGS, THE SAME LEVEL OF HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PROPOSED BY THE PRESIDENT'S BIPARTISAN FISCAL COMMISSION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving savings in health care, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 419. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING THE FDA FROM APPROVING PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO ABUSE WITHOUT REQUIRING ABUSE-DETERRENT FORMULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to certain drug formulation requirements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 420. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, insert the following: ''or reduce overlapping payments made by certain programs,'' after ''property,''.

SA 421. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth

the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, line 11, after ''families,'' insert ''or to reform the list of allowed purchases under the supplemental nutrition assistance program,''.

SA 422. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, after ''payments,'' insert ''or establishing an online database of all unclassified reports submitted to Congress,''.

SA 423. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 16, after ''payments,'' insert ''or prohibiting recipients of Federal grants from selling such grants,''.

SA 424. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 64, line 23, after ''programs'' insert ''(which may include livestock and specialty crop disaster assistance programs)''.

SA 425. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS, OR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding, enhancing, or otherwise improving science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or career and technical education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 426. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF ROBUST AND UNIFORM ACCOUNTABILITY GUIDELINES FOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide for the establishment of robust and uniform accountability guidelines for all United States foreign assistance programs, and to ensure full transparency of all United States foreign assistance programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 427. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11. decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 428. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING DRINKING WATER AND PROVIDING CLEAN WATER FOR COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to address water quality, protect drinking water supplies and wildlife habitat, reduce the risk of flooding, and provide clarity and transparency concerning those efforts, including to landowners, businesses, and others, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 429. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN LIVING ON FEDERAL PROPERTY AND INDIAN LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to general education, which may include fully funding the impact aid program under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) and supporting school programs for children living on Federal property and Indian land, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 430. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO END OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a

committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax abuses used by large corporations, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 431. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 432. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PROHIBITING MEDICARE VOUCHERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to access for Medicare beneficiaries, which may include legislation that provides beneficiary protections from voucher payments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 433. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

On page 2, beginning on line 1, strike ''1'' and all that follows through page 93, line 9, and insert the following:

1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050

Sec. 301. Long-term budgeting.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.
Sec. 402. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the reform of the 2010 health care laws.
Sec. 403. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.
Sec. 404. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.
Sec. 405. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
Sec. 406. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.
Sec. 407. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.
Sec. 408. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.
Sec. 409. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 501. Direct spending.

TITLE VI—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 601. Limitation on advance appropriations.
Sec. 602. Concepts and definitions.
Sec. 603. Adjustments of aggregates, allocations, and appropriate budgetary levels.
Sec. 604. Limitation on long-term spending.
Sec. 605. Budgetary treatment of certain transactions.
Sec. 606. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 607. Congressional Budget Office estimates.
Sec. 608. Transfers from the general fund of the treasury to the highway trust fund that increase public indebtedness.
Sec. 609. Separate allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.
Sec. 610. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE VII—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 701. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
Sec. 702. Policy statement on tax reform.
Sec. 703. Policy statement on Medicare.
Sec. 704. Policy statement on Social Security.
Sec. 705. Policy statement on higher education affordability.
Sec. 706. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
Sec. 707. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
Sec. 708. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the reduction of unnecessary and wasteful spending.
Sec. 709. Policy statement on unauthorized spending.

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

Sec. 801. Sense of the House on the importance of child support enforcement.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,270,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,606,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,903,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,028,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,149,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,284,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,457,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,650,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,832,145,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $0.
Fiscal year 2015: $0.
Fiscal year 2016: $0.
Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,769,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,681,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,857,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,988,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,104,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,281,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,414,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,540,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,681,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,768,151,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,815,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,736,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,850,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,958,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,079,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,231,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,374,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,495,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,667,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,722,071,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: -$544,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$130,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$71,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$54,947,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: -$50,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$82,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$89,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$38,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$16,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $110,073,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $17,776,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,086,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,343,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,635,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,938,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,267,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,608,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,900,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,162,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,319,503,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $12,849,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,069,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,225,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,362,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,485,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,648,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,836,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,992,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,154,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,210,984,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $579,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $41,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $47,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,030,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $28,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $32,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $33,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,344,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$147,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $38,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $36,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $38,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $39,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $39,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $40,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $39,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,382,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,859,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,000,000,000..
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$21,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,654,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $81,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $91,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $68,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $92,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $72,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $99,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,906,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $8,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $8,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $8,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $8,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $8,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $8,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $9,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $9,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $9,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,271,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $73,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $85,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $95,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $100,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $99,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,780,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $363,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $358,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $359,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $375,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $387,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $393,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $422,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $420,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $441,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $456,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,134,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $515,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $534,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $597,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $621,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $679,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $723,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $770,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $771,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $845,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $843,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $875,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $874,988,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $509,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $508,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $480,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $487,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $484,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $479,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $484,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $495,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $501,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $496,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $505,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $515,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $510,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,354,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $56,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $61,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,195,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,116,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $341,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $367,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $405,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $476,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $555,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $613,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $661,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $694,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $694,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $723,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $745,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $745,963,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$59,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$44,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$58,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$53,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$65,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$59,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$71,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$65,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$81,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$89,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$89,323,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings (930):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$17,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$11,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$13,555,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$99,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$99,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$109,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$109,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$115,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$115,049,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $93,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,694,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than _____, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(4) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(5) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(6) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(7) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050

SEC. 301. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of

fiscal years 2030, 2040, and 2050 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 0 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 0 percent.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 406. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under P.L. 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2014, the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, or the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending programs.

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget converts the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, indexed for inflation and population growth. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that has tied the hands of State governments. Instead, each State would have the freedom and flexibility to tailor a Medicaid program that fits the needs of its unique population. Moreover, this budget repeals the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of its crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget converts the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, increases in the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most. Additionally, it requires that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Those in or near retirement will see no changes, while future retirees would be given a choice of private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

TITLE VI—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 601. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Veterans Health Care Budget and Reform Transparency Act of 2009 provides advance appropriations for the following veteran medical care accounts: Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities.

(2) The President has yet to submit a budget request as required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, including the request for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for fiscal year 2014, hence the request

for veteran medical care advance appropriations for fiscal year 2015 is unavailable as of the writing of this concurrent resolution.

(3) This concurrent resolution reflects the most up-to-date estimate on veterans' health care needs included in the President's fiscal year 2013 request for fiscal year 2015.

(b) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (c), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (d)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations''.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $55,483,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

(C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 602. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly.

SEC. 603. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPLEMENT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND TO FUND VETERANS' PROGRAMS AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—(A) The President has not submitted a budget for fiscal year 2014 as required pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, by the date set forth in that section.

(B) In missing the statutory date by which the budget must be submitted, this will be the fourth time in five years the President has not complied with that deadline.

(C) This concurrent resolution reflects the levels of funding for veterans' medical programs as set forth in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(2) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

(3) REVISED CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE BASELINE.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical and economic assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through fiscal year 2023 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 604. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of $5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 605. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 606. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—(1) The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 604.

(2) Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation of new budget authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for that fiscal year to be exceeded or the sum of the limits on the security and non-security category in section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act as reduced pursuant to such section.

SEC. 607. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan guarantees are treated unequally in the budget. The Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal housing programs on the basis of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (''FCRA'').

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, cash-basis accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate risks such as prepayment and default risk.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $635 billion of loans and loan guarantees issued in 2013 alone would generate budgetary savings of $45 billion over their lifetime using FCRA accounting. However, these same loans and loan guarantees would have a lifetime cost of $11 billion under fair-value methodology.

(4) The majority of loans and guarantees issued in 2013 would show deficit reduction of $9.1 billion under FCRA methodology, but would increase the deficit by $4.7 billion using fair-value accounting.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the

Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(c) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a cost related to a housing or residential mortgage program under the FCRA, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such cost.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

SEC. 608. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 609. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2014. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2014, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 610. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 701. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the U.S. economy technically emerged from recession roughly four years ago, the recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound with the unemployment rate still elevated and real economic growth essentially flat in the final quarter of 2012.

(2) The enormous build-up of Government debt in the past four years has worsened the already unsustainable course of Federal finances and is an increasing drag on the U.S. economy.

(3) During the recession and early stages of recovery, the Government took a variety of measures to try to boost economic activity. Despite the fact that these stimulus measures added over $1 trillion to the debt, the economy continues to perform at a sub-par trend.

(4) Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation – and they act accordingly. It is this debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, that is weighing on U.S. growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Economists have found that the key to jump-starting U.S. economic growth and job creation is tangible action to rein in the growth of Government spending with the aim of getting debt under control.

(6) Stanford economist John Taylor has concluded that reducing Government spending now would ''reduce the threats of higher taxes, higher interest rates and a fiscal crisis'', and would therefore provide an immediate stimulus to the economy.

(7) Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has stated that putting in place a credible plan to reduce future deficits ''would not only enhance economic performance in the long run, but could also yield near-term benefits by leading to lower long-term interest rates and increased consumer and business confidence.''

(8) Lowering spending would boost market confidence and lessen uncertainty, leading to a spark in economic expansion, job creation, and higher wages and income.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of growing the economy and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 702. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The U.S. tax code fails on all three counts – it is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Since 2001 alone, there have been more than 3,250 changes to the code. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than $1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and very complex.

(3) These tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals. For instance, the top 1 percent of taxpayers reap about 3 times as much benefit from special tax credits and deductions (excluding refundable credits) than the middle class and 13 times as much benefit than the lowest income quintile.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base by as much as 50 percent. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) The National Taxpayer Advocate reports that taxpayers spent 6.1 billion hours in 2012 complying with tax requirements.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of U.S. active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a ''pass-through'' basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses in particular tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income reaches 44.6 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. The total Federal marginal tax rate on corporate income now reaches 55 percent, when including the shareholder-level tax on dividends and capital gains. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the U.S. corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The U.S. tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The ''worldwide'' structure of U.S. international taxation essentially taxes earnings of U.S. firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the U.S. tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of U.S. companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged 18 percent of the economy throughout modern American

history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 19.1 percent of the economy, and – if the spending restraints in this budget are enacted – this level is sufficient to fund Government operations over time.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy.

(15) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(16) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board – not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on the American people.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation during fiscal year 2014 that provides for a comprehensive reform of the U.S. tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through revenue-neutral fundamental tax reform, which should be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House not later than December 31, 2013, that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reduces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals, with a goal of achieving a top individual rate of 25 percent and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into two brackets with a first bracket of 10 percent;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate to 25 percent; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

SEC. 703. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2023 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.2 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to exceed 7 percent of GDP by 2040 and reach 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) The President's health care law created a new Federal agency called the Independent Payment Advisory Board (''IPAB'') empowered with unilateral authority to cut Medicare spending. As a result of that law—

(A) IPAB will be tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal Gross Domestic Product (GDP) plus one percentage point;

(B) the fifteen unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats of IPAB will make decisions that will reduce seniors access to care;

(C) the nonpartisan Office of the Medicare Chief Actuary estimates that the provider cuts already contained in the Affordable Care Act will force 15 percent of hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and home health agencies to close in 2019; and

(D) additional cuts from the IPAB board will force even more health care providers to close their doors, and the Board should be repealed.

(4) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

SEC. 704. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the ''three-legged stool'' of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.319 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by over 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 25 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees shall, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th-year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President shall promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House shall introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred shall report the bill which shall be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President shall—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

SEC. 705. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) More than 21 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the last decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate.

Between the 2001-2002 Academic Year and the 2011-2012 Academic Year:

(A) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 5.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(B) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.8 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(C) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at private four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(4) Over that same period, Federal financial aid has increased 140 percent beyond the rate of general inflation.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted that, ''We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money.''

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt nearly tripled between 2004 and 2012, and now stands at nearly $1 trillion. Student debt now has the second largest balance after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2015 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America's young people.

(b) POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at $5,645 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

SEC. 706. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the last available estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 707. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The House of Representatives cut budgets for Members of Congress, House committees, and leadership offices by 5 percent in 2011 and an additional 6.4 percent in 2012.

(2) The House of Representatives achieved savings of $36.5 million over three years by consolidating House operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

SEC. 708. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs ''could potentially save tens of billions of dollars.''

(3) In 2011 and 2012, the Government Accountability Office issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) 209 ''Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics'' (''STEM'') education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of $3 billion annually;

(B) 200 separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of $3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) 20 different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of $170 billion in 2010;

(D) 17 separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent $37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) 13 programs, 3 tax benefits, and one loan program to reduce diesel emissions; and

(F) 94 different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage ''green building'' in the private sector.

(4) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government's information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent – or $20 billion – of the Government's annual information technology budget.

(5) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(6) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(7) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2014, 42 laws will expire, possibly resulting in $685 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(8) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 709. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively. Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SA 434. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate

budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the inland waterways system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 435. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 15, increase the amount by $2,279,000,000.

On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by $2,279,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,279,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,279,000,000.

SA 436. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by $8,131,000.

On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by $8,131,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $8,131,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $8,131,000.

SA 437. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE RELIEF TO SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may define a large employer for purposes of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) as an employer with 50 or more full-time employees rather than considering full-time equivalent employees for such purposes without raising new revenue, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 438. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to women's access to health care, which may include the protection of basic primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, or employer-provided contraceptive coverage for women's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for these purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 439. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

On page 56, line 12, insert ''relief for low and middle income families'' after ''enterprises,''.

SA 440. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GLOBAL WARMING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the need to address global warming, which may include transforming energy systems from fossil fuels to energy efficiency and sustainable energy, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 441. Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE PROCESS OF ENACTING TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, which may include extending the ban on earmarks and creating a transparent, streamlined, merit-based, non-political process for considering amendments to that Schedule to temporarily suspend or reduce duties, under which the United States International Trade Commission may process initial requests for duty suspensions and reductions and propose legislation to Congress for consideration, and other recommended reforms, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 442. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to support State and local law enforcement, which may include investing in

State formula grants, to aid State and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems in implementing innovative, evidence-based approaches to crime prevention and control, including strategies such as specialty courts, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 443. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH REASONABLE DEADLINES FOR PROCESSES UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would establish reasonable deadlines for the rejection of environmental impact statements and environmental assessments under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 444. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 20, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,200,000.

On page 21, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

SA 445. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 20, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,200,000.

On page 21, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 21, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

On page 22, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,300,000.

SA 446. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END ALL ENERGY SUBSIDIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would prevent Federal agencies from providing direct funding or loan guarantees for energy projects to private entities without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 447. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF THE VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Visa Waiver Program, which may include efforts to expand the Program to include strong democratic allies, such as Poland, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 448. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 3 and insert the following:

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE-NEUTRAL PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a revenue structure that is more efficient for businesses, leads to a more competitive international business environment for United States enterprises, and may result in additional rate reductions without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of

fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

SA 449. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 3 and insert the following:

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE-NEUTRAL PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a revenue structure that is more efficient for individuals, and may result in additional rate reductions without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

SA 450. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $2,700,000,000

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $11,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $36,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $36,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $39,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $43,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $46,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $48,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $51,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $54,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $57,600,000,000.

SA 451. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $6,255,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $7,238,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $8,229,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $9,182,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $10,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $11,021,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $11,965,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $12,931,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $13,906,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $15,018,000,000.

SA 452. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION RELATING TO A GUN BAN TREATY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, resolution, or conference report relating to ratification or implementation of, or funding for, a treaty that would require the registration of firearms or implement any firearm ban.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 453. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62, line 13, insert ''improve overall population health, promote health equity or reduce health disparities,'' after ''nation,''.

SA 454. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following and renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

(8) international programs to export clean energy technologies and aid climate adaptation efforts, including those designed to reduce short-lived climate pollutants in the near term;

SA 455. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, advancing competitiveness, improving the speed and infrastructure with which small- and medium-sized enterprises and supply chains commercialize new processes and technologies, and informing industry-driven education and training, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 456. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR COMMONSENSE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION LIMITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the government contractor compensation benchmark, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 457. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES UNTIL CHINA, INDIA, AND RUSSIA IMPLEMENT AND ENFORCE SIMILAR MEASURES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report relating to the provision of appropriations for any of fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions, until the date on which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce certify in writing that each of the People's Republic of China, the Republic of India, and Russia have proposed, implemented, and enforced measures that require carbon dioxide emissions reductions that are substantially similar to carbon dioxide emission reductions proposed for the United States.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 458. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING FOR UNATTAINABLE EMISSIONS REGULATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL SCALE.—The term ''commercial scale'' means an electricity-generating unit that produces more than 100 megawatts of electricity.

(2) ECONOMICALLY VIABLE.—The term ''economically viable'', with respect to a technology, means a technology that does not result in more than a 40-percent increase in electricity production costs from the electricity-generating unit at which the technology is used.

(3) UNREALISTIC OR UNATTAINABLE.—The term ''unrealistic or unattainable'' means a standard that—

(A) relies on a technology that has not been demonstrated on a commercial scale;

(B) is not presently economically viable; or

(C) requires less than 1,700 pounds of carbon dioxide per megawatt hour.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide funding to implement or enforce any Federal regulation that establishes an unrealistic or unattainable standard for carbon dioxide emissions from new coal-fired electricity-generating units.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of ⅗ of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

SA 459. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR SENSIBLE REGULATORY REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for sensible regulatory reform, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 460. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE REPORT TO CONGRESS ON EPA COMPLIANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would require the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency to submit to Congress, not less frequently than twice each year, a report on whether the Environmental Protection Agency has met regulatory reporting and regulatory agenda-setting requirements by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013

through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 461. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ASSISTANCE TO STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would require the Environmental Protection Agency to provide technical assistance and data, modeling, or technical support to any State that requests it pursuant to the development of a State implementation plan under section 110 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410) by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 462. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AGENCY GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would amend the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) so that agency guidance documents are subject to resolutions of disapproval in the same manner as agency rules by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 463. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 18, after ''partnerships,'' insert ''proposals for reforming the use of guidance documents in agency rulemaking to consider their effect on manufacturing,''.

SA 464. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 18, after ''partnerships,'' insert ''proposals related to cooperative federalism with State agencies that issue permits to manufacturing facilities,''.

SA 465. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, line 15, after ''agencies,'' insert ''rulemaking (including regulatory agenda publishing),''.

SA 466. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 18, after ''partnerships'' insert '', proposals relating to improving transparency and reform at the Environmental Protection Agency,''.

SA 467. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROHIBITING DRONE KILLINGS OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES ON UNITED STATES SOIL, ABSENT AN IMMINENT THREAT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the use of drones, which may include a prohibition against using drones to kill citizens of the United States in the United States unless they present an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to another individual, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 468. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ELIMINATE CORPORATE WELFARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the elimination of corporate welfare, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 469. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHOICE-BASED SCHOLARSHIPS FOR LOW-INCOME CHILDREN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to school choice, which may include providing a portion of Department of Education funding to the States to allow for scholarships for low-income students in kindergarten through grade 12 to use at either a public or private school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 470. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LIMITING FEDERAL LAND HOLDINGS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to programs that discourage the Federal Government from owning or controlling more than a majority of the total land mass in any of the States, by the amounts provided in the legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 471. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT AND INCREASE FUNDING FOR AN EAST COAST MISSILE DEFENSE SHIELD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing foreign assistance to Egypt and increasing funding for the Missile Defense Agency to establish a land-based missile defense capability on the east coast of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 472. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO CHALLENGE COSTLY FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the establishment of a private right of action challenging Federal regulations where the costs of such regulation significantly exceed the benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 473. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT MILLIONAIRES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE FOR OR RECEIVING ANY MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PAYMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to welfare reform, which may include prohibiting millionaires from being eligible for or receiving any means-tested welfare payments without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 474. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASED USE OF AUDITING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the use of audits by Federal agencies (including independent regulatory agencies) to recover erroneous Government payments and using the money for deficit reduction, without rasing revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 475. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND ENSURE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MAY NOT CREATE OR COMPILE A NATIONAL REGISTRY OF FIREARMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that protect and uphold the right to bear arms under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include ensuring that the Department of Justice may not create or compile a national registry of firearms, without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 476. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 59, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 60, line 7, and insert the following:

space and maintenance of Department facilities;

(5) supporting the transition of servicemembers to the civilian workforce, including by expanding or improving education, job training, and workforce development benefits, or other programs for servicemembers or veterans, which may include streamlining the process associated with credentialing requirements; or

(6) providing resources to address privacy and safety for services to women veterans and members of the Armed Forces;

SA 477. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AUTHORIZE PROVISION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES TO DEPENDENTS OF HOMELESS VETERANS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between both Houses, motions, or conference reports related to care, services, or benefits for homeless veterans, which may include providing per diem payments for the furnishing of care for dependents of homeless veterans, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 478. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING ACCESS TO DUAL ENROLLMENT, CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT, OR EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOLS FOR LOW-INCOME STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing access to dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools for low-income students, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 479. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, line 22, insert ''standardize financial aid award letters,'' after ''students,''.

SA 480. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FROM CHANGING ITS POLICY REGARDING THE PROHIBITION AGAINST PASSENGERS CARRYING SMALL, NON-LOCKING KNIVES ONTO COMMERCIAL AIRPLANES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would prohibit the Transportation Security Administration from changing its policy regarding the prohibition against passengers carrying small, non-locking knives onto commercial airplanes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose if such legislation would not increase the deficit during—

(1) the 5-year period ending on September 30, 2018; or

(2) the 10-year period ending on September 30, 2023.

SA 481. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 28, line 12, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 28, line 16, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

SA 482. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, reduce the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 57, after line 25, insert the following:

(4) low-income weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs;

On page 58, line 1, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

On page 58, line 3, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(6)''.

On page 58, line 4, strike ''(6)'' and insert ''(7)''.

On page 58, line 7, strike ''(7)'' and insert ''(8)''.

On page 58, line 9, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

On page 58, line 10, strike ''(9)'' and insert ''(10)''.

SA 483. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING HARDROCK MINING REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include provisions relating to budget deficit reduction, establishment of a reclamation fund, imposition of a locatable mineral royalty, revenue sharing with States, and improvements to the permitting process, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal

years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 484. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING OR ELIMINATING THE LIFELINE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reform, increased efficiency, or elimination of the Lifeline program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 485. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST USING SAVINGS FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN DEFICIT REDUCTION OR INVESTMENT IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would allocate any savings achieved through spending cuts or new revenue that are not included in this resolution for any purpose other than deficit reduction or investment in the Nation's infrastructure.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 486. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 487. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING ADVANCED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing advanced appropriations for the Indian Health Service and Indian Health Facilities accounts of the Indian Health Service, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 488. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR FISHERY DISASTERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance for fishery disasters as declared by the Secretary of Commerce during calendar year 2012, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 489. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PHASE-IN ANY CHANGES TO INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE TAX SYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the phase-in of any changes to the individual or corporate tax systems, including any changes to individual or corporate income tax exclusions, exemptions, deductions, or credits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 490. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR LEGISLATION THAT REQUIRES EACH FEDERAL AGENCY TO IDENTIFY AND PRIORITIZE EACH OF ITS PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ACTIVITIES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to requiring each Federal agency to identify and prioritize each of its programs, projects, and activities by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 491. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND RESTORE MONEY IN ESTABLISHED, DEDICATED FUNDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting and restoring money in dedicated funds established as of the date of enactment of this resolution, such as trust funds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 492. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE PRESIDENTIAL EXEMPTION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels and reserve funds in this concurrent resolution assume in making appropriations and revenue decisions, the Senate supports the provision, to the Environmental Protection Agency, of adequate resources to enable the President to remain adequately informed and take prompt action to issue, on a case-by-case basis, Presidential exemptions for affected entities such as electric utility steam generating units under environmental laws such as section 112(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(i)(4)).

SA 493. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 6, increase the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by $937,000,000.

On page 26, line 10, increase the amount by $865,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by $1,241,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by $871,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by $1,392,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, increase the amount by $886,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by $1,492,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by $904,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by $1,553,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by $923,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $1,593,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by $943,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $1,623,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by $963,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $1,658,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by $988,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $1,693,000,000.

On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by $1,014,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $937,000,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $865,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,241,000,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $871,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,392,000,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $886,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,492,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $904,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,553,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $923,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,593,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $943,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,623,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $963,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,658,000,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $988,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,693,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,014,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,729,000,000.

SA 494. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROMOTION OF INVESTMENT AND JOB GROWTH IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING, OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION, AND REFINING SECTORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may result in strong growth in manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors of the economy through the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 495. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GENERATIONAL ACCOUNTING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that may provide for generational accounting to promote understanding of the fiscal and economic impacts that proposed policy changes would have on current and future generations without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 496. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, line 12, insert ''tax relief for victims of recent federally-declared major disasters,'' after ''United States enterprises,''

SA 497. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING FUNDS FOR FISHERY STOCK SURVEYS AND STOCK ASSESSMENTS TO SUPPORT, PROTECT, AND DEVELOP THE UNITED STATES FISHING ECONOMY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritizing funds for fishery stock surveys and stock assessments, without raising new revenue, to support, protect, and develop the United States fishing economy, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 498. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR FISHERIES FAILURES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for disaster assistance for commercial fisheries failures declared by the Secretary of Commerce during calendar year 2012, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 499. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT DOMESTIC ENERGY SOURCES CAN MEET EMISSIONS RULES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to the research, development, and demonstration necessary for domestically abundant energy sources and current energy technologies to comply with present and future greenhouse gas emissions rules while still remaining economically competitive, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 500. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(E) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates $8,175,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $850,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $850,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2014.

SA 501. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF CARBON TECHNOLOGIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of 1 or more committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the research, development, and demonstration projects necessary for the commercialization of fossil energy related technologies required for electric generating units (EGUs) and other energy conversion facilities to meet proposed and future emissions standards, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 502. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 13, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 13, line 18, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 13, line 22, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 13, line 26, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 503. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING FUNDING FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE TO PURCHASE A WEAPON.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that reduces funding for mental health services to individuals who are eligible to purchase a weapon.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 504. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth

the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 69, strike beginning with line 5 through line 24 and insert the following:

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that—

(1) achieve savings through—

(A) the use of performance data or scientifically rigorous evaluation methodologies for the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives;

(B) the reform of acquisition policy;

(C) the sale of Federal property;

(D) the purchase of products or services;

(E) a reduction of improper payments;

(F) an increase in the use of strategic sourcing;

(G) a reduction in the use of sole-source contracting;

(H) an increase in the use of fixed-price contracting;

(I) improved training and utilization of the acquisition workforce; or

(J) the removal of contracting preferences for Alaska Natives beyond those available to other participants in the program under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, such as the ability to receive sole-source contracts above threshold amounts; and

(2) reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 505. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR AMERICANS FROM DRONES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that provide privacy protections for individuals in the United States by addressing serious privacy concerns posed by the integration of unmanned aircraft in the national airspace, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 506. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 13, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 13, line 14, increase the amount by $60,520,000.

On page 13, line 17, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 13, line 18, increase the amount by $78,285,000.

On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $82,620,000.

On page 13, line 25, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 13, line 26, increase the amount by $83,640,000.

On page 14, line 3, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 4, increase the amount by $83,980,000.

On page 14, line 7, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 8, increase the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 14, line 11, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 12, increase the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 16, increase the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 14, line 19, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 20, increase the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 14, line 23, increase the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 14, line 24, increase the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $60,520,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $78,285,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $82,620,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

Pn page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $83,640,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $83,980,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $84,065,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $84,065,000.

SA 507. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE REGULATION OF FOOD AND BEVERAGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the regulation of food or beverages, which may include preventing the regulation of the size and quantity thereof, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 508. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE FEDERALISM IN LABOR REGULATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to restoring federalism with regard to regulation of labor relations, which may include establishing that it is the sole right of States to regulate labor relations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 509. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for

fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5 line 23, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $155,000,000.

SA 510. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 35, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, decrease the amount by $660,000.
On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 23, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 35, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 22, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 36, line 23, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by $330,000.
On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $780,000.
On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by $1,080,000.
On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $1,305,000.
On page 41, line 14, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 15, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 19, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 22, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 41, line 23, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by $1,500,000.
On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by $1,500,000.

SA 511. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE FIREARM VIOLENCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reduces firearm violence, which may include prohibiting persons who have committed a felony or crime of domestic violence in a foreign jurisdiction from possessing a firearm in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 512. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID of NV to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE UTILIZATION OF HIGH-CAPACITY AMMUNITION MAGAZINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On January 8, 2011, in Tuscon, Arizona, Jared Loughner went on a shooting rampage that claimed the lives of 6 people, severely injured former Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, and wounded 12 other individuals.

(2) Loughner was armed with a semi-automatic pistol utilizing a 33-round ammunition magazine.

(3) Testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate revealed that 9-year-

old Christina-Taylor Green was shot with the 13th, or subsequent, bullet.

(4) Loughner was tackled and subdued when he attempted to replace and reload his ammunition magazine.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that utilizing a high-capacity ammunition magazine increases the ability of an assailant to shoot many people in a fixed amount of time without pausing to reload.

SA 513. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOLS SERVING LOW-INCOME STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing infrastructure funds to high-performing public elementary schools and secondary schools, including high-performing public charter schools, that serve low-income students, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 514. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE PROMPT ACTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTION FOR MERCURY AND AIR TOXINS STANDARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that may allow the Environmental Protection Agency to enable the President to be adequately informed and take prompt action to issue, on a case-by-case basis, Presidential exemptions, which may include exemptions under section 112(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(i)(4)), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 515. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHOOL CHOICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the education of low-income children, which may include allowing funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to follow children from low-income families to the school the children attend, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 516. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX AND THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that are related to tax reform, which may include repealing the excise tax on medical devices or tax credit for the production of electricity from wind, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Department of Homeland Security at 10 Years: A Progress Report on Management.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 21, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m., to hold an East Asia and Pacific Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Rebalance to Asia: What Does It Mean for Democracy, Good Governance and Human Rights?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff on the Finance Committee have floor privileges for the 113th Congress: Freny Dessai and Ivy Dong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask on behalf of Senator MENENDEZ unanimous consent that Margaret Taylor, a State Department detailee to the Foreign Relations Committee, be given floor privileges during the debate on S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 540 and the

Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 540) to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MERKLEY. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 540) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, and any successor air route traffic control center at that location, shall be known and designated as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the air route traffic control center referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''.

PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 88, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 88) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 89, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 89) designating March 25, 2013, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of H. Con. Res. 18 which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of H. Con. Res. 19 which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 19) was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 649

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I understand that S. 649, introduced earlier today by Senator REID, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 649) to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

Mr. MERKLEY. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appoints the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276n, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: The Honorable MARK BEGICH of Alaska.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d–276g, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: The Honorable AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Chairman to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference for the 113th Congress: The Honorable TIM KAINE of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 2013

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9 a.m. on Friday, March 22, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MERKLEY. There will be six votes at 11 a.m., and the budget vote-arama is expected to begin at approximately 3 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:56 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 22, 2013, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

KEVIN A. OHLSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, VICE ANDREW S. EFFRON, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

CONSTANCE B. TOBIAS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE JAMES PHILIP TERRY, TERM EXPIRED.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

FRED P. HOCHBERG, OF NEW YORK, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ALLISON M. MACFARLANE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

MARILYN A. BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE TONY WEST.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

PATRICIA M. WALD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

CYNTHIA L. ATTWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

VICKI MILES–LAGRANGE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2015, VICE ROGER L. HUNT, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

RANEE RAMASWAMY, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2018, VICE MIGUEL CAMPANERIA, TERM EXPIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JULIE ANN KOENEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MARCIA MUSISI NKAMBWE, OF ARIZONA
MILES F. TODER, OF VIRGINIA
PETER E. YOUNG, OF TENNESSEE

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ELISE AYERS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SARAH DREYER, OF FLORIDA
LOUIS DUNCAN, OF FLORIDA
PAMELA L. FESSENDEN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
RONALD L. GLASS, OF FLORIDA
REBECCA A. HAMMEL, OF VIRGINIA
ZEINAH SALAHI, OF CONNECTICUT
CAROL JEAN WILSON, OF VIRGINIA
MARK C. WILT, OF MICHIGAN

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

PATRICIA LYNN ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD TODD ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA
SHARLENE MANPREET KAUR BAGGA–TAVES, OF MICHIGAN
TAHALIA J. BARRET, OF NEW YORK
ALDER BARTLETT, OF OREGON
THOMAS GARY BAYER, OF RHODE ISLAND
SARA A. CALVERT, OF MARYLAND
ANGELA ORNELAZ CARDENAS, OF TEXAS
JUDY CHEN, OF NEVADA
RICHARD X. CHEN, OF FLORIDA
ROBERT D. CLINK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DAVID COHEN, OF FLORIDA
ALICIA CONTRERAS, OF ILLINOIS
MATTHEW WILLIAM CORBIN, OF WASHINGTON
G. HEATH COSGROVE, OF ALABAMA
MOHAMED SANOUSSY DANSOKO, OF CALIFORNIA
DIANNA LYNN DARSNEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
EILEEN SIOBHAN DERBY, OF NEW YORK
JENNA MICHELE DIALLO, OF MARYLAND
KATHERINE JOY DOW, OF WASHINGTON
SIMONE DUNCAN, OF FLORIDA
MICHELLE SHANA DWORKIN, OF NEW YORK
JOHN AARON EDGAR, OF WEST VIRGINIA
JO JEAN ELENES, OF ARIZONA
IOLI FILMERIDIS, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH T. FOLTZ, OF MICHIGAN
AMANDA L. FONG, OF TEXAS
QING LUO FRANCIS, OF GEORGIA
EMILY GARDINER, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN GOGGIN GARRETT, OF VIRGINIA
THEODORE L. GLENN, OF CALIFORNIA
LUIS EDUARDO GUZMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
BRYAN HIGHFILL, OF TEXAS
W. CULLEN HUGHES, OF COLORADO
SHELBY PATRICK HUNT, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL L. JONES, OF NEW YORK
SHAWN ELIZABETH ALEXANDRIA JONES, OF NEVADA
ROOPA H. KARIA, OF OREGON
HAELEE KIM, OF NEW JERSEY
MARIA KIM, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRADLEY KLINGSPORN, OF WISCONSIN
KY TU LAM, OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT CHASE LAYNG, OF MAINE
LESLIE A. MACKEEN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
NORA MOON MADRIGAL, OF CALIFORNIA
LUIS ALFREDO MAES, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JERRY L. MARCUS, OF FLORIDA
ENILDA MARTIN, OF FLORIDA
DEBORAH R. MILLER, OF HAWAII
ANNE G. MURPHY, OF TEXAS
VERLA CLEOPATHRA LORETTA NATHANIEL, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
TIMOTHY ONG, OF CALIFORNIA
PHILLIP NEIL PALMER, OF NEW YORK
MANDY M. PARHAM, OF MARYLAND
ESTHER PARK, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN B. PARK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LORENZO PERDIGUERRA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHANLEY M. PINCHOTTI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH GEWURZ RAMIREZ, OF ILLINOIS
JILL RANDALL, OF NEW MEXICO
DAVID ALAN RATLIFF, OF CONNECTICUT
MICHAEL J. REILLY, OF MAINE
KATHERINE-ANN RENIERS, OF NEW YORK
ALEXANDRA L. RIBOUL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RYDER H. ROGERS, OF TEXAS
MARIELLA ELIZABETH RUIZ RODRIGUEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
KALONJI SAMUEL, OF NEW YORK
CHRISTOPHER N. SCHAFFER, OF TEXAS
AARON SCHUBERT, OF ALASKA
TARA TAYLOR SIMPSON, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER A. SLOTNICK, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG A. SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSHUA J. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELLE A. SPINARD, OF RHODE ISLAND
KARTIK SRINIVASAN, OF MICHIGAN
J. DAVID STOTT, OF FLORIDA
D. BENJAMIN SWARTLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEANNETTE ELIZABETH VAIL, OF OHIO
SARAH WERTH, OF WASHINGTON
BRANDY WITTHOFT, OF NEW YORK
BRIAN KEITH WOODY, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BEATA ANGELICA, OF CALIFORNIA
BELGIN JENNIFER VANDERPLOEG, OF CALIFORNIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ANTONIO GABRIELE AGNONE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLAYTON ALEXANDER ALDERMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
LEAH GRACE ALLEN, OF ARKANSAS
ERIC P. ANDERSEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NATHAN ANDERSON, OF TEXAS
ANDREA LYNNE AQUILLA, OF MARYLAND
EMILY M. ARMITAGE, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC TRANSFELDT ATKINS, OF WASHINGTON
MARK MADISON ATKISSON, OF NEW JERSEY
JOSEPH BAGGA-TAVES, OF MICHIGAN
BARRY MICHAEL BELKNAP, OF MINNESOTA
JEREMY R. BERNDT, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ELIZABETH J. BLUMENTHAL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DOUGLAS R. BOUDREAU, OF VIRGINIA
CHARITY L. BOYETTE, OF VIRGINIA
MEGHAN EILEEN BRADLEY, OF VIRGINIA
JODI R. BREISLER, OF MINNESOTA
ALAN Z. BRINKER, OF OHIO
JOHN S. BROWN, OF WASHINGTON
CIERA DAWN BURNETT, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARGARET CATHERINE CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA
LEANNE R. CANNON, OF VIRGINIA
NOAH T. CLARK, OF WASHINGTON
REBECCA MARIE DANIS, OF MISSOURI
GIANGHIA NAR DAO, OF CONNECTICUT
SANDYA LAKSHMI DAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHRISTOPHER A. DAVENPORT, OF VIRGINIA
ALISON EVANS DAVIS, OF MARYLAND
EUGENIA WALKER DAVIS, OF OHIO
ANDREA JO DE ARMENT, OF OHIO
GABRIEL DEL BOSQUE, OF TEXAS
DANIEL A. DEL CASTILLO, OF FLORIDA
JAMES BUTLER DEWEY, OF WASHINGTON
JUAN DOMENECH CLAR, OF PUERTO RICO
CHRISTOPHER M. DUMM, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS ELAND EDWARDSEN, OF WASHINGTON
BRETT ANDREW EGGLESTON, OF TEXAS
BENJAMIN HARRIS ELLIS, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH FARBEANN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PETER RICHARD FASNACHT, OF NEW JERSEY
T'ERRANCE ELLIOTT FAVORS, OF COLORADO
JOHN P. FER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSHUA N. FINCH, OF WYOMING
DOUGLAS L. FLITTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MICHAEL KENT FOGO, OF GEORGIA
TARA EILEEN FOLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARY FRANGAKIS, OF NEW YORK
NEIL STEVEN GIPSON, OF NEBRASKA
EMILY ANNE GODFREY, OF ARIZONA
RAFAEL ANCHETA GONZALEZ, OF TENNESSEE
EMILY R. GREEN, OF VIRGINIA
SARA D. GREENGRASS, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER M. GRELLER, OF WYOMING
TRAVIS A. GROUT, OF OHIO
TOMÁS ANDRÉS LEVY GUERRERO, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG ACTON HALBMAIER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ADAM C. HALVERSON, OF COLORADO
CHRISTOPHER THADDEUS WESTON HARTFIELD, OF GEORGIA
TIMOTHY F. HAYNES, JR., OF NEW YORK
LISA RAY HECHT–CRONSTEDT, OF FLORIDA
HOLLY M. HECKMAN, OF ALABAMA
NEIL HELBRAUN, OF ILLINOIS
ANTHONY J. HENDON, OF MICHIGAN
JACQUELINE BRETT HERNANDEZ, OF FLORIDA
MARK HERRUP, OF MARYLAND
SHANNON PIPER HILL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANA ELIZABETH HIMELIC, OF ARIZONA
AMY SERINA HIRSCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH A. HOLCOMBE, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL J. HORNING, OF OHIO
KRISTEN J. HUGHES, OF MICHIGAN
JASON RAY HUTCHISON, OF FLORIDA
BRANDON JOVAN JACKSON, OF FLORIDA
JINANSHU CHINMAY JAIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
HUGO A. JIMENEZ, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA JOHNSON MILLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARK RICHARD JORGENSEN, OF MINNESOTA
STEVEN COLLAT KAMENY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NAHAL KAZEMI, OF CALIFORNIA
JONATHON A. KENT, OF IOWA
SAMANTHA Y. KUO, OF CALIFORNIA
PAEBO KURIAN, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY L. LADENSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
CHRISTINA T. LE, OF TEXAS
ELEESHA M. LEWIS, OF VIRGINIA
LI PING LO, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA ITOGE MANALO, OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICK MARTINO, OF WISCONSIN
KUROSH MASSOUD ANSARI, OF VIRGINIA
AMIT MATHUR, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH LOSS MATHUR, OF VIRGINIA
CASH LEE MCCRACKEN, OF TENNESSEE
CHRISTOPHER PAUL MEADE, OF VIRGINIA

RACHEL SUZANNAH MIKESKA, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES THOMAS MOFFITT, OF NEW MEXICO
FARID ABBAS MOHAMED, OF MAINE
ERIN M. MOLNAR, OF NEW YORK
ANDREW R. MOORE, OF MICHIGAN
CATHERINE ELIZABETH MULLER, OF FLORIDA
NEAL SHAUN MURATA, OF HAWAII
STEPHEN JOHN MURPHY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
COURTNEY C. MUSSER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SELENA NELSON–SALCEDO, OF MINNESOTA
KATHLEEN M. NUTT, OF VIRGINIA
CHINWE OBIANWU, OF TEXAS
JOHN BURTON O'BRIEN, OF FLORIDA
MORGAN J. O'BRIEN III, OF NEW YORK
WILLIAM JOHN O'CONNOR, OF CALIFORNIA
KEVIN JAMES OGLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
AAMOD OMPRAKASH, OF NEW YORK
JEFFREY M. O'NEAL, OF TEXAS
KATHERINE IVES ORTIZ, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL OSE, OF IOWA
MATTHEW J. PASCHKE, OF OHIO
VIRSA Y. PERKINS, OF TENNESSEE
MATTHEW LAWRENCE PETIT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LANCE L. POSEY, OF TENNESSEE
ELIZABETH POWERS, OF MINNESOTA
ANDREW J. PUBLICOVER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL J. QUIGLEY, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE N. RAFANIELLO, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL RAKOVE, OF CALIFORNIA
ROSELYN Y. RAMOS, OF MARYLAND
JUDNEFERA A. RASAYON, OF VIRGINIA
PENNY SUE RECHKEMMER, OF IOWA
KATRINA ROSE REICHWEIN, OF TEXAS
WENDY A. REJAN, OF FLORIDA
JEREMY STEWART RICHART, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN P. ROGERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
EBONY ROSE ROSEMOND, OF MARYLAND
JESSICA ALEAH ROWLAND, OF FLORIDA
JOHNATHAN MICHAEL ROY, OF TEXAS
LURA ELIZABETH RUDISILL, OF NORTH CAROLINA
AMY UNANDER RULE, OF ILLINOIS
AMELIA R. RUNYON, OF OREGON
PRESTON RAPHAEL SAVARESE, OF WYOMING
EMILY ANNE SCHUBERT, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA L. SCHUMI JONES, OF FLORIDA
JOSHUA SHEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MONICA SHIE, OF NEW YORK
GURDIT SINGH, OF KANSAS
ANGIE SMITH, OF OHIO
JASON P. SPELLBERG, OF COLORADO
DANIEL SPOKOJNY, OF MICHIGAN
TAMARA N. STERNBERG, OF WYOMING
REBECCA L. STRUWE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN DAVID STUBBS, JR., OF NORTH CAROLINA
KATHRYN MICHELLE STUHLDREHER, OF TEXAS
TIMOTHY WILLIAM SWETT, OF ILLINOIS
SONIA SMYTHE TARANTOLO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSUP L. TAYLOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA
BEVERLY A. THACKER, OF OREGON
CHARLES ARTHUR THOMAS, OF TEXAS
TEDDE HOLDEN THOMPSON, OF FLORIDA
AQUEELAH S. TORRANCE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JUSTINE OVEN TREADWELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIN J. TRUHLER, OF MINNESOTA
LYNN MARIE VACCA, OF CALIFORNIA
CARLY NICOLE VAN ORMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSEPH WILLIAM WADE, OF UTAH
SHIRAZ U. WAHAJ, OF FLORIDA
ANNE WAN, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW DANIEL WARIN, OF VIRGINIA
BRIANA M. WARNER, OF MAINE
DAVID W. WARNER, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID AUSTIN WESTENHOFER, OF KENTUCKY
MARK THOMAS WHITEHEAD, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA TOLL WHITING, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC C. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
KIMBERLY ELIZABETH WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN E. WOLFINGTON, OF FLORIDA
MARK W. ZANOLLI, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KIMBERLY D. ZAPFEL, OF MINNESOTA
HOLLY HOPE ZARDUS, OF WASHINGTON
RACHAEL ZASPEL, OF TEXAS
THOMAS S. ZIA, OF FLORIDA
JEFFREY ERIC ZINSMEISTER, OF CALIFORNIA
ALEKS ZITTLE, OF FLORIDA
LINDSEY MICHELLE ZULUAGA, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JORGE ALBERTO ABUDEI BURGER, OF GEORGIA
DANIEL C. ACKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
MICHELLE L. ANDERSON, OF COLORADO
RAFAEL ANDRADE-RAVELO, OF PUERTO RICO
ALEX FRANCIS ANDREW, OF TENNESSEE
CYRUS A. ATTIA, OF VIRGINIA
ELENA CHRISTINA AUGUSTINE, OF WASHINGTON
JEFFREY SEAN BARRUS, OF UTAH
BENJAMIN JOSEPH BAUGHMAN, OF ILLINOIS
CHRISTOPHER BEALOR, OF VIRGINIA
BLAIRE E. BINGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN ELIZABETH BOLOGNA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHEN G. BOWEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH LAUREEN EVANS BRADY, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN L. BRENDLE, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW GARY BURTON, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH M. CARLSON, OF VIRGINIA
RANA KANAAN CASTEEL, OF VIRGINIA
RODERICK ZANE CHAMBERS, OF TEXAS
MOLLY PATRICIA CHINCHILLA, OF ALASKA
EVA COFFEY, OF TEXAS
STEPHANIE G. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW J. CONLEY, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER E. CONNELL, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN R. COOK, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY A. COSTELLO, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL C. COX, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES D. CRISP, OF VIRGINIA
ERIN I. CURTIS, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN M. DANATZKO, OF VIRGINIA
TINA KAREEMA DAUOD-AKGUC, OF DELAWARE
TUCKER D. DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
ZACHARY DEBORD, OF VIRGINIA
RAMON DELGADO, OF VIRGINIA
REQUEL A. DELL-ORSO, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN C. DENNEHY, OF CONNECTICUT
RISHI PRAFUL DESAI, OF WEST VIRGINIA
JOANNA L. DETAMORE, OF VIRGINIA
ZACHARY E. DOBOZE, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT ALAN DOLLINGER, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA DORCUS, OF VIRGINIA
M. DAVID DOWD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHANNA M. DUROCHER, OF VIRGINIA
BLAKE D. EDWARDS, OF FLORIDA
EDWARD ANTHONY EICHLER, OF MAINE
NELS H. ERICKSON, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER A. FALLON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KAREN S. FANG, OF MARYLAND
MELONY FLETCHER, OF MARYLAND
ERIC FONG, OF CALIFORNIA
WESLEY C. FREDERICKS, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT E. FULTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LILIANA GABRIEL, OF VIRGINIA
MARINA GALKINA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KEVIN P. GALLAGHER, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES S. GARDINER, OF TEXAS
KENNETH C. GARDNER, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA
MICHAEL R. GARNER, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW AARON GLENN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN A. GONZALES, OF VIRGINIA
PAMELA K. GREENLEAF, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB L. GUNSCHEL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
COLIN T. HALE, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB ANTHONY HALL, OF CALIFORNIA
RUSSELL C. HEADLEE, OF NEBRASKA
JOSEPHINE GIA HINMAN, OF NEW JERSEY
AMY E. HIRSCHAUER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW BLAYNE HOLTZ, OF NEW YORK
KATHERINE M. HOLTZ, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE HOOPS, OF MINNESOTA
STEPHANIE JEAN HOOSTAL, OF MINNESOTA
CHRISTOPHER B. HULICK, OF VIRGINIA
HEATHER YANG HWALEK, OF MAINE
TEUTA IDRIZI, OF VIRGINIA
OWEN JOHNS, OF ARIZONA
TIMOTHY NILS JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL NICHOLAS KANIGAN, OF UTAH
SEAN KEITH, OF OREGON
ELAINE VICTORIA KELLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATHERINE A. KERR, OF OHIO
ELIZABETH E. KEVERN, OF VIRGINIA
HYEJU J. KIM, OF VIRGINIA
JOYCE KIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRANIGAN M. KNOWLTON, OF UTAH
KEVIN A. KRIMM, OF VIRGINIA
SANJAI KUMAR, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES P. LACEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ERIK A. LARSEN, OF VIRGINIA
AMY FULING LEE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOY LEE, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT A. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
GRIFFIN PATRICK LENOIR, OF TEXAS
AMELIA M. LIEBHOLD, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC R. LITTLE, OF VIRGINIA
MEGHAN HEALY LUECKE, OF CALIFORNIA
BENTON S. LUSK, OF VIRGINIA
MOHINI A. MADGAVKAR, OF TEXAS
CHARLES MALINAK, OF NEW YORK
RUBY VERGARA MARCELO, OF MARYLAND
AMBER L. MAREZ, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL E. MARTIN, OF MARYLAND
CHARLES ALBERT MATACK, OF CALIFORNIA
COURTNEY M. MAZZONE, OF NEW YORK
JERMEL K.L. MCGASKEY, OF VIRGINIA
CONOR MCNAMARA, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER MERRIMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES MIKULEC, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELLE ABREU MILARDO, OF NEW YORK
CHRIS R. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT MIRANDA, JR., OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER MARK MOHRMAN, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL A. NALEPA, OF VIRGINIA
ROSS EDWARD NEADING, OF COLORADO
LISA LYNN NESSELROAD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIFFANY M. NEWMAN, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW YOONTAK NHO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLARE E. NICHOLSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
HELEN YOUNG NO, OF CALIFORNIA
MARK D. NORRIS, OF VIRGINIA
MARTIN C. OH, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTIAN R. OLSEN, OF MARYLAND
CINDY L. OTIS, OF VIRGINIA
MARK STEVEN PADGETT, JR., OF VIRGINIA
KRISTI H. PATTON, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD C. PERRY, OF TEXAS
NORMAN R. PFLANZ, OF NEBRASKA
VIRGINIA B. PIERSON II, OF VIRGINIA
ERICA M. PINERO, OF VIRGINIA
JAMISON FRANK PIXLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMY C. POLISHUK FUCHS, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER M. POTHOVEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANSSI I. PULKKINEN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH M. PURCELL, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN JEFFREY PURNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CYRUS PYUN, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM K. RASMUSSEN, OF VIRGINIA
LUIS E. REINOSO, OF VIRGINIA
LAKESHIA M. ROBINSON, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB ROCCA, OF MINNESOTA
CATHERINE ANN RODEN, OF ALABAMA
JAMES C. ROSS, OF COLORADO
GLENN R. RUDOPLH, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA W. RUSS, OF CALIFORNIA
SARITAH SABB, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH FRANK SAHID, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER NICOLE SANOW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NATHAN R. SCHMIDT, OF VIRGINIA
ETAN SCHWARTZ, OF NEW JERSEY
DONALD SCOTT, OF VIRGINIA
EILA M. SEPULVEDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAYAL SHAH, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA SHIPP, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HOLLY R. SISK, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH L. SMYTHERS, OF VIRGINIA
ELISABETH SOCOLOW, OF NEW YORK
LATHDA SOULATHA, OF HAWAII
LISA A. SPINK, OF VIRGINIA
MARIA STAVROPOULOS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
PAUL STILLEY, OF ARIZONA
CHARLES A. STINGER, OF MARYLAND
ROCHELLE STOCK, OF VIRGINIA
JAY M. STROHM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIC JOSEPH SULLIVAN, OF FLORIDA
JAMIE L. SUTTER, OF OHIO
ERIC S. SWINN, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN W. TEPLICA, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA THEISSEN, OF MISSOURI
JEFFREY A. TISINGER, OF VIRGINIA
CODY GLEN TITENSOR, OF OREGON
JONATHAN TO, OF ARKANSAS
CHRISTIAN EDWARD TORRES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LINDA TOTH, OF VIRGINIA
VANESSA TOUFAILY, OF TEXAS
MARK TROCINSKI, OF COLORADO
RITA E. TROTTER, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS PATRICK TRUXES, OF VIRGINIA
ADRIENNE M. TYGENHOF, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BELGIN JENNIFER VANDERPLOEG, OF CALIFORNIA
SHAWN R. VASQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN ANDREW VOIGHT, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID WACKER, OF COLORADO
ALEXANDER TED PUHK WALD, OF CONNECTICUT
PAULETTA M. WALSH, OF CALIFORNIA
JERUSHA C. WALZER, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN G. WARD, OF VIRGINIA
ALLISON R. WELCH, OF CALIFORNIA
LAUREN PATRICIA WELCH, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL M. WILDMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JARED E. WOLFE, OF ILLINOIS
KAREN E. WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY WRIGHT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAUREN M. WYGANT, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH YACKLEY, OF ILLINOIS
SUE H. YEH, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY VALENTINE ZEEBERG, OF NEW YORK
RICHARD H. ZIELINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
W. GREY ZIMMERMAN, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2012:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DANIEL MENCO HIRSCH, OF MARYLAND
BENJAMIN BEARDSLEY DILLE, OF MINNESOTA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRET J. MUILENBURG

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING FARMEDHERE ON THEIR GRAND OPENING

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize FarmedHere, a revolutionary vertical farming facility in Bedford Park, IL, that celebrates its Grand Opening this week.

Envisioned as an sustainable solution to growing fresh produce in an urban environment, Steve Dennenberg, Paul Hardej, Paul Suder, Jolanta Hardej, and Mark Weglarz came together to found and operate FarmedHere. Designed to bring food closer to the consumer, FarmedHere is located in a formerly unoccupied warehouse in Bedford Park. The facility uses cutting-edge technological advances in aquaponics, aeroponics, and vertical farming to make urban agricultural production a possibility. While many types of produce travel thousands of miles to reach the plates of Chicagoland residents, FarmedHere products save money and energy by keeping the growing and distribution processes local in the Chicagoland area.

Beyond being economically efficient and ecologically-minded, FarmedHere also gives back to the local community. FarmedHere has partnered with the Chicago Botanic Garden to teach students about aquaponics and the future of urban farming. This partnership teaches students how to be leaders in this exciting new industry that will create jobs now and in the future.

Residents of the Greater Chicago Area now have access to fresh local basil, arugula, and salad dressing produced sustainably by their own neighbors thanks to FarmedHere. Eventually, this business will grow and begin selling fresh fish and more energy-intensive fruits and vegetables. The founders of FarmedHere also hope to someday move entirely ''off the grid'' by using cutting edge technologies to produce their own energy, fertilizer, and output—all under one roof.

FarmedHere and vertical farms like it are good for the economy and the environment, and I am proud that this one-of-a-kind facility is located in the 3rd District of Illinois. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the entire FarmedHere family on their successful launch and to wish many years of continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. HORACE PERRY JONES

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Dr. Horace Perry Jones, a legendary figure in the history of the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM). Dr. Jones taught history at ULM for nearly five decades, from 1965 until his retirement in May of last year. During that span, he touched the lives of tens of thousands of students, each of whom walked away from his class with much more than just lessons in history. Dr. Jones passed away on Tuesday, March 19, 2013, at the age of 83.

Dr. Jones's passion for life was evident to all who encountered him and who knew his remarkable story. A native of North Carolina, Dr. Jones served in the U.S. Marine Corps and fought in the Korean War under the revered general, Lewis ''Chesty'' Puller. His adventures did not end after leaving the Marines, and he carried his ''Semper Fi'' spirit with him for the rest of his life. In addition to vigorously pursuing his extensive education in history, Dr. Jones hitchhiked across the globe, traveling through Europe, the Middle East, Southwest Asia, India, the Far East, and through the Panama Canal. He taught at the American School in London before eventually returning to the U.S. After earning his Ph.D. from the University of Mississippi, in 1965 he accepted a position with Northeast Louisiana State College—today known as the University of Louisiana at Monroe, a school Dr. Jones came to love as much as it loved him.

For the next 47 years he dazzled his students and community with a magical combination of history, humor, and unreserved passion for life. Outside the classroom, Dr. Jones was a local icon. He could easily be spotted driving his antique yellow Volkswagen on campus and across town. It was not an unusual sight to see Dr. Jones standing under a campus tree's canopy, beneath his mounted boar's head, reciting his poetry to a crowd of mesmerized students. On days of home football games, he was often spotted wandering the Grove among tailgaters, carrying a large can labeled with unmentionable motivational language. Even the Stubbs Hall office he occupied was celebrated—cramped with bizarre artifacts, classroom props, and hundreds of books he had read cover to cover.

But for all he was recognized for outside the classroom, most will remember Dr. Jones for his role inside the classroom. There he brought history to life, and brought life into perspective. He was well known to have a few students carry him into class in a coffin, only for him to suddenly jump out and surprise his perplexed audience. It was not unusual for him to show up to class wearing a weathered graduation cap and gown, or excessively baggy and faddish ''Jnco'' blue jeans, or a ''Rage Against the Machine'' T-shirt. In his classes he would leap off desks, swing yardsticks as swords, scream, cry, laugh, and teach the most passionate lessons of history imaginable.

As exciting as his classes could be, he was a very serious teacher. His lessons were strategically emphasized with props, chalkboard drawings, and his massive Cold War era fabric map, which he hauled from class to class for decades and draped across his classroom walls. His book reports and handwritten tests could be challenging, but not nearly as much as his notorious ''map tests,'' on which students were required to label each country and sea in the world.

Perhaps the most special moments of his classes were on the final class of each semester, when Dr. Jones would weave the poetry of Robert Frost's ''The Road Not Taken'' in with his incredible story of his trek across the planet. After that class, if a student had not already recognized it before, he realized that he was a fortunate soul to have had the unique privilege to study from this extraordinary man, who not only taught history, but lived it, and who not only lived, but redefined how life should be lived.

Dr. Jones will undoubtedly be missed by the many who knew and loved him. But though his life on Earth is now over, his spirit, legend, and legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of the untold thousands whose lives he touched.

IN MEMORY OF PATRICK SELLERS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud veteran from my district who served his country well, loved his family and friends and epitomized generosity and selflessness.

As a proud soldier, Patrick Sellers earned his jump wings at Fort Benning before joining the Special Forces as an Intelligence Analyst. He was proud of his military service with good reason. In addition to those coveted Airborne wings, Staff Sergeant Sellers earned a Meritorious Service Medal, an Army Commendation Medal, an Army Achievement Medal, a Joint Services Achievement Medal, a German Armed Forces Badge for Military Proficiency, a Non Commissioned Officers Development Ribbon, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Army Service Medal. He capped off his military service working in the Counter Terrorism Unit at the National Security Agency.

But Patrick was more than just a soldier, he was a husband, a son, a brother, an uncle and most importantly, a dad. His wife of 20 years, Tamatha and their 12 year old son William Cade are deeply feeling his sudden loss. So are his extended family, friends, and coworkers, who will remember Patrick for his quick and decisive wit, his ability to relate to anyone in any circumstance and his uncanny ability to disarm people with an exceptional impersonation. Underneath his tough soldier ''get it done'' exterior was a love of life, of family and of football. His passion for NFL Football was evident in his competitive fantasy league. I'm sure there are coaches in the NFL who could have benefitted from his knowledge of the game.

To Tamatha, William Cade, his parents Terry and Eulata Sellers, his sister Sharon,

niece Katrina and nephew Bryce, as long as you all continue to keep Patrick's spirit alive, the pain of his loss eases a little more. America is grateful for his selfless service and a better place for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 85 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the successful reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, it is important that we continue to bring awareness to the serious issue of domestic violence. It is a problem that affects one in every four women, and it is one that cannot be resolved by legislation alone.

That is why I commend the efforts of Mayor Mike Rawlings, City of Dallas, for his own efforts at the local level to increase awareness and rally our fellow Texans against domestic violence. This weekend, Mayor Rawlings will lead a "Men Against Abuse" rally in front of Dallas City Hall in a show of unified support for victims of domestic violence. During this rally, Mayor Rawlings hopes to publicly challenge the moral character of any individual who believes it is acceptable to commit domestic abuse.

Raising awareness has been a vital component of a comprehensive strategy to address this issue, and Mayor Rawlings' efforts are another step in the right direction. Domestic violence is one of the most underreported crimes, and speaking out will help victims to not only identify their circumstances, but also empower these individuals to stand up against their abusers and seek outside help.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is a problem that transcends race, age, and socioeconomic status, making the issue that much more important as we tear down boundaries across communities to stand up against domestic violence. While the Violence Against Women Act has historically provided effective tools to combat domestic violence for almost two decades, increased awareness is absolutely critical if we are to bring these lifesaving measures into the homes of victims of violence who would otherwise remain silent in the face of cruelty.

HONORING DEKE TOMPKINS

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the departure of a valued member of my team, Mr. Deke Tompkins.

A proud native of the Great Lakes State and a graduate of Michigan State University, Deke began working in my Washington, DC office as a staff assistant in 2006. Sitting in the front office, he quickly distinguished himself as a welcoming face to all who walked through the door. He was a great resource to those calling the office and made everyone he spoke with know that their voices were being heard.

Deke worked his way up to legislative assistant, working on projects in the district and managing a broad legislative portfolio, including: national security, foreign policy, law enforcement, immigration, and labor issues, to name a few. But above all, Deke was a passionate advocate for Michigan's military service members, veterans, and their families, as well as our local farmers and the Great Lakes.

Deke has been an invaluable member of our office—a team player who was always willing to pitch in wherever help was needed and a friend to us all. His enthusiasm in the office was contagious; his intense love for all things Michigan State unmatched. A hard-working, humble, and selfless person, Deke made a lasting impact in the lives of many, which is what public service is all about. Our team will not be the same without him.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Deke Tompkins and his outstanding service to the folks of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors and know that he will continue on to do great things. Go Green!

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF U.S. ARMY CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER BRYAN HENDERSON

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember U.S. Army Chief Warrant Officer Bryan Henderson for his selfless and valiant service to our nation. On March 11, 2013, our country lost a soldier and the 5th Congressional District lost a native son when his helicopter went down in southern Afghanistan.

As long as the Stars and Stripes continue to soar, Henderson's contributions to protecting the freedoms we hold so dear will never be forgotten. In a generation where so many men and women have answered the call to duty, his example of heroism and devotion embody what has truly made America the great nation it is today.

Today, our words seem futile in comparison to Henderson's service, but as written in 2 Corinthians 1:3, our prayer is "that the God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our tribulations, may be able to comfort those in troubling times."

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to U.S. Army Chief Warrant Officer Bryan Henderson and extending thanks on behalf of a grateful nation. Countless lives have been changed for the better by his efforts, and he will remain in the hearts of Louisianians forever.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 2013, I was unavoidably absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the CBC Budget Substitute to H. Con. Res. 25 because it provides for serious deficit reduction, job creation, and promotes pragmatic economic growth. In a word: this budget puts America back in the black.

I wish to thank Chairwoman FUDGE of the CBC and Congressman SCOTT of Virginia, a Member of the CBC who helps to drive our budget, and Congresswoman GWEN MOORE who sits on the Budget Committee; Members who have taken the lead in steering our job-creating, morally righteous, and deficit-reducing budget to the House Floor.

The Members of this body have some very serious ideological differences that have manifested themselves in the respective budgets that the American people will hear over the course of the next few days. But at the end of the day we have to produce for the American people—and budget means that we must do just that—and do so by addressing both sides of the ledger.

That means tough, bedrock decisions about spending but also about revenue. My colleagues in the CBC have taken on this task in earnest and I believe produced a serious, pragmatic Fiscal Year 2014 budget alternative.

The FY 2014 CBC Budget entitled, "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America," contains $2.8 trillion in deficit reduction relative to current law, which would put debt on a downward path after the expiration of short-term stimulus spending. Debt is projected to fall from 78.8 percent of GDP in 2014 to 66.2 percent of GDP in 2023.

We include a lowering of the threshold for the tax cuts extended in the American Taxpayer Relief Act from $450K to $250K, a concept which I strongly supported in 2010, 2011, and 2012; taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income, and enacting a financial transactions tax.

The CBC Substitute also cancels the harmful sequestration, enacts a permanent "doc fix", and includes $862 billion in jobs measures and long-term investments. Revenue

would rise to 20.5 percent of GDP by 2023 in the CBC's budget, compared to 19.1 percent under current policy. Spending would fall to 22.3 percent of GDP by 2023 under current policy, and would fall to the same level under the CBC's budget though with a great deal of short-term stimulus measures.

The CBC Budget protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, TANF and other vital safety net programs that save millions of families from poverty.

The CBC Budget creates jobs and opportunity via new infrastructure investments, outlined below:

Maintenance and repair for public transit, highways, airports, ports, railroads, bridges and other infrastructure investments. ($230 billion);

Workforce development programs such as the Workforce Investment Act Adult Program, the Dislocated Workers Program, Job Corps and other employment and training services. ($13 billion);

Providing relief to states to preserve teacher, law enforcement and first responder jobs. ($50 billion);

Neighborhood stabilization programs that provide affordable housing development, infrastructure improvements and other community development needs. ($50 billion);

Veterans programs that honor our commitment to help our nation's soldiers after they come back from serving our country. (Increased by $50 billion).

The CBC Budget also calls for significant tax reform measures that would enhance revenues over the next decade by $2.7 trillion. Economic history has demonstrated that you cannot starve the government of revenues. To achieve our revenue goals, the CBC Budget outlines approximately $4.2 trillion in revenue enhancements that Congress could use to achieve this goal, including:

Ending special tax breaks and closing tax loopholes. ($1 trillion over 10 years);

Limiting tax preferences for Corporate Debt. ($1.151 trillion over 10 years);

Enacting the ''Buffet Rule'' and a surcharge for millionaires. ($460 billion over 10 years);

Reduce the ''tax gap'' through better tax enforcement. ($107 billion over 10-years);

Ending the mortgage deduction for vacation homes and yachts. ($10 billion over 10 years);

The CBC Budget addresses health disparities by fully funding the Affordable Care Act and providing strong support of the National Institute of Health. In contrast, the Republican Budget attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, while using the revenues to help achieve balance.

The elephant in the room is entitlement policy. Unlike discretionary spending, mandatory spending grew rapidly from 5 percent of GDP in 1962 to a range of 9 percent to 10.5 percent of GDP from 1975 to 2007, peaking in recession years because of automatic stabilizers. The American people spoke last year and their collective voice clearly said no to haphazard, immoral, and arbitrary cuts to their hard-earned benefits; and the Supreme Court raised its voice when it upheld the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. It is the law of the land.

I am here to say that any type of entitlement reform will not be done on the backs of Seniors in the 18th District of Texas—and I am prepared to ''stand in the gap'' to protect their benefits.

And speaking of Texas, two years ago, my hometown of Houston, Texas was forced to lay off nearly one thousand municipal employees. When these employees are put on the unemployment line, libraries close, schools cut back on essential after-school programs, community centers lose personnel, police hours are trimmed, and the truly destitute become an afterthought.

Those tough budget decisions had a human cost and I hear from my constituents every day about them, and frankly, I don't want tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of jobs for people in Texas.

Nonetheless, I stand here today and declare that the federal budget is a moral document, with meaning, fiber, and a unique texture; and the budget we craft, and what we do here today in the hallowed halls of Congress is really about the American people and the impact that our budget and fiscal policy decisions will have on them.

The Democratic Budget Alternatives stands in clear contrast to the budget that our Republican colleagues have put forward. This budget will reduce the deficit in a balanced and credible way, making difficult choices while providing investments that help create jobs now and build an even stronger economy for the future. But unlike the Republican budget—which ends the Medicare guarantee while providing tax breaks to millionaires—we ask the very wealthy and special interests to share responsibility for reducing the deficit. It is a shared American sacrifice.

This budget demonstrates that we can put our fiscal house in order without blindly slashing investments and breaking our promises to seniors, low-income kids, and individuals with disabilities. We will preserve the Medicare guarantee and work to strengthen it, along with Medicaid, and not ending it. We will provide tax relief for working families, not a tax windfall to millionaires and corporations that is financed by middle-income Americans. And we will protect the promise and opportunity of the American Dream for all, instead of leaving future generations behind.

Mr. Chair, let's roll-up our sleeves and get to work on a pro-growth, pro-people, and pro-American budget.

SUPPORTING THE MARCH FOR MARRIAGE

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for the March for Marriage. Next week, individuals from across the country will travel to Washington, D.C., in order to participate in the March for Marriage and to highlight the fact that the institution of marriage is worth protecting through the Defense of Marriage Act.

Marriage is the sacred union between a man and a woman. On September 23, 1972, I was blessed to marry the former Sandra Jordan of Orlando, and this year we will celebrate 41 years of marriage.

Marriage is a vital part of the foundation upon which a strong and prosperous society must be built. It is the institution through which new life is formed, and it provides children with mothers and fathers. Marriage plays an important role in children's development and success.

Marriage and strong families are indispensable contributors to the prosperity of our nation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MS. BARBARA GELLER

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Barbara Geller, who sadly passed away this past weekend.

Barbara was a committed and active volunteer in her community, serving a number of leadership roles over the years with local civic organizations. She was someone who believed strongly in the value of political participation and civic engagement to build a better Washington.

Barbara was a strong leader who many, including myself, came to rely on for advice and support. She demonstrated a great ability to bring people together around a common cause to make a difference in her community.

I was fortunate to have known Barbara and to have worked with her. She impressed me with her passion and devotion to whatever issue, project or person she decided to help or work on behalf of. She was committed to the democratic process and the positive change that could happen when people came together, organized and stood up for what they believed in.

She will be missed by all of us who valued her calm, wise, and elegant way of working with others. My thoughts and prayers go to her husband Arthur, her children Randy and Betsy, and the rest of her family.

HONORING DR. BERNARD EICHOLD, 2012 MOBILIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, many times this House honors outstanding and influential Americans who have given of themselves to make a difference in the lives of their fellow citizens. However, it is not often that we shine the spotlight on individuals who literally have safeguarded the health and well-being of hundreds of thousands. Dr. Bernard Eichold is one such example and I'm proud to pay tribute to him today as the 2012 Mobilian of the Year.

Born and raised in Mobile, Dr. Bert Eichold was taught early the importance of serving others. Through his parents, Dr. Samuel and Charlotte Eichold, he gained an understanding of the vital role that proper medical care and preventative educational outreach programs play in the well-being of a community. For this reason, it is not surprising that he chose to follow in his father's footsteps by becoming a doctor himself.

Bert attended his father's alma mater, Tulane University, where he obtained his Bachelor of Science Degree, Master of Public

Health Degree, Medical Doctor Degree, and his Doctorate of Public Health Degree. Like his father, he also served honorably in the United States Navy, rising to the rank of Captain before pursuing a full-time career in medicine at home in Mobile.

A long-time physician, Bert touched many lives with his caring approach to health care. But like his father before him, he didn't limit his contributions to the confines of his medical practice. In 1990, he stepped forward to take on the role as health care advocate for the entire county. As the Health Officer for Mobile County, he is responsible for safeguarding the health and the environment for over 400 thousand people.

After nearly a quarter century of his proactive leadership, the Mobile County Health Department has effectively doubled the number of patients to over 140,000 a year. His dedication to the health education and prevention also helped to place him as Area Health Officer for Public Health Area XI for the State of Alabama Department of Public Health.

Also like his father, Bert took on highly respected teaching roles at the University of South Alabama. He is Adjunct Professor in the Department of Medicine where he has served as the Co-Course Director of Public Health and Epidemiology. He is also science advisor to the NASA DEVELOP National Program which extends NASA Earth Science research to the community through the volunteer work of local college students. In 2012, he was presented NASA's Exceptional Public Achievement Medal for this work in support of NASA DEVELOP in South Alabama since 2003.

His dedication to public health and education is matched by his involvement in the local community. He is currently serving as Chairman of the Board of the Community Foundation of South Alabama. He is an active member of the Alabama Public Health Association, Mobile United, and the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce. His philanthropy and volunteer efforts have also touched more than 50 organizations in South Alabama.

And finally, Bert carries on the proud tradition of his father who was named the 1989 Mobilian of the Year.

On behalf of the Cottage Hill Civitan Club and the people of Mobile, I would like to extend congratulations to Dr. Bert Eichold on being named the 2012 Mobilian of the Year.

IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Women's History Month. Recently, we have witnessed history being made for women in the armed forces. In a long overdue decision, former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta lifted the ban on women serving in combat roles. This decision opens up every position for advancement within the military to women.

Dating back to the American Revolutionary War, women have proudly served in the Armed Forces. Their roles may have varied throughout history but they have always answered the call to action for their country. During the Civil War, Clara Barton became a household name because of her service as a nurse and later as the founder of the American Red Cross. In the World War II era, the iconic image of Rosie the Riveter represents the women who stepped up to help their country in a time of need. Under the Obama Administration, Michale Flournoy was the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the third-highest-ranking woman in the Pentagon's history.

For more than a decade now, America has been engaging in a new method of warfare. With the ever-increasing use of technology, our military is now at a place where gender differences are less important. As the recent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have shown, the ban on women in combat roles was mostly theoretical because women served and continue to serve in de facto combat roles every day.

Women have had the opportunity to serve in combat roles in other countries for years. It is long past time that the U.S. gives this opportunity to their female soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I am extremely pleased that our military made history by looking at this outdated policy and made the long overdue decision to reverse the ban on women in combat.

IN RECOGNITION OF DIVINA GROSSMAN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Divina Grossman on her appointment as the Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

Dr. Grossman grew up in a family of teachers and has proudly carried that legacy to the pinnacle of her profession. Her dual career in nursing and education provides a window into her character: compassionate, dedicated, and eager to apply her skills to the benefit of others. After earning her degree in Nursing from the University of Santo Tomas, Dr. Grossman departed her home country of the Philippines to continue to hone her academic prowess. She would go on to earn her Masters in Nursing at the University of Miami and a Doctorate at the University of Pennsylvania.

An outstanding tenure at Florida International University led to her appointment as Director of the School of Nursing, followed by promotion to Dean. She subsequently served as Dean for the University's College of Nursing and Health Sciences. As Dean, Dr. Grossman further developed the nursing program, strengthened partnerships with public and private institutions, raised funds for scholarships and lab facilities, and greatly expanded the College's endowment. She also oversaw the opening of Florida International's College of Medicine and pioneered a program to deploy medical students into local neighborhoods. As the founding Vice President of Engagement at Florida International, Dr. Grossman worked tirelessly to better connect the University to local communities and global issues. She is an ideal fit for UMass Dartmouth, and I am certain that the University's many years of academic excellence will only continue under her guidance and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to recognize Dr. Divina Grossman as the seventh Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. I have no doubt that her decades of experience and robust record of leadership will make a positive, lasting impact on the UMass Dartmouth community. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Dr. Grossman and thank her for her outstanding contributions to both medicine and academia.

MICHAEL RILEY—A PATRIOT WHO NEVER TOOK ''NO'' FOR AN ANSWER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Michael Riley, an American patriot, exemplifies that through dedication and determination, one can achieve great things in our country. Faced with adversity from a young age, Michael was no stranger to obstacles. He wasn't brought up by the most encouraging family. Instead of being surrounded by love and support, he was laughed at and ridiculed by his family members for wanting to serve and represent his country.

Michael was always small in stature, in comparison to others his age, and he was told he would fail at his dream for that very reason. Despite these hardships, he was determined to succeed. Michael had his eyes set on his goal, and there was no turning back for him. On his own, he enlisted himself in the Marines just one week after turning 18. He chose the Marines, the toughest branch, because he wanted to prove wrong everybody that tried to tell him he couldn't do it. Before long, Michael surpassed everyone's expectations, or lack thereof. It didn't take much time for Michael to impress his superiors with his work ethic and determination, eventually earning the rank of Chief Warrant Officer 4, a remarkable achievement.

Every day, Michael was out there serving his country in full force. He recalled the days that he experienced conflicts many others hadn't at his age. One day, his squad was ambushed and surrounded by their enemy. Adrenaline was pumping, but you could still smell some fear in the air. In the attack, his squad leader became wounded, and his lieutenant was killed. It wasn't the outcome they had hoped for, but the fight had to go on. When he was only 19, Michael led a squad of Marines in combat, a task that not many would be able to accomplish at such a young age.

Throughout his service, Michael served in several conflicts, including Vietnam, Cuba, and Iraq. But despite his service overseas, he says he is most proud of his service securing our nation's borders. When his service in the Marines was over, Michael joined the United States Coast Guard. During the devastating aftermath of September 11, 2001, he was appointed Task Force Leader to design and implement the Sea Marshal Program, a security measure that, to this day, has provided safety and security for the Port of Houston. The program, which Michael oversaw from start until finished, was launched to prevent terrorism in a given port. Michael and his armed protection teams boarded ships and guarded them for their voyage through the Houston Ship Channel.

For his involvement in the Sea Marshal Program, Michael Riley was awarded the 9/11 medal by the United States Department of Transportation. This is a very highly regarded honor that recognizes civilians or military men and women who made significant and heroic accomplishments after the September 11, 2011, terrorist attacks on our country. Overall, Michael has received 20 medals and ribbons throughout his illustrious career, the highest one being the 9/11 medal.

Michael exemplifies a true American patriot who never let anyone or anything stand in his way. I've met Michael several times. He's never been someone to boast about his prestigious accomplishments being the humble person he is. However, today, I would like to thank him and recognize him for his dedication to keeping America the ''land of the free and the home of the brave.'' Despite the hardships, he faced when he was young, and everyone that told him he couldn't do it, he served our country and he served it well. It takes a very special kind of person to accomplish everything that Michael did throughout his service to America.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE NORTHWEST INDIANA BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY HALL OF FAME'S CLASS OF 2013

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect and admiration that I rise to commend five exceptional leaders from Indiana who were recently honored as the Northwest Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame's Class of 2013. Created by The Times and BusINess magazine, induction into the Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame is determined by a panel of local civic and business leaders. While there were many deserving nominees, the individuals selected as the 2013 Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame inductees include: former Senator Richard Lugar, Tom Collins Sr., Danita Johnson Hughes, Tom Sourlis, and Steve Teibel. For their many contributions to the enhancement of Northwest Indiana, these honorees will be recognized at a ceremony at the Radisson Hotel at Star Plaza in Merrillville, Indiana, on Friday, March 22, 2013.

Former Senator Richard Lugar, from Indianapolis, is the Lifetime Achievement Award recipient for 2013. Richard Lugar's first elected office was on the Indianapolis Public Schools Board of Commissioners, where he served from 1964 until 1967. He was then elected mayor of Indianapolis in 1967, and under his leadership the city and Marion County governments merged through Unigov. After serving two terms as mayor, Richard Lugar was elected to the United States Senate in 1976. During his 36 years in office, Senator Lugar proved to be a noteworthy leader, extending a positive influence upon urban policy, American agricultural policy, and foreign policy. He is an activist for American energy independence, strong national security, U.S. leadership in the world, and economic growth. Senator Richard Lugar and Senator Sam Nunn were nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2000 for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which reduced the nuclear threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union. Currently, Richard Lugar is working with Indiana University as a distinguished scholar and professor of practice in the university's new School of Global and International Studies. He also co-chairs the new Indiana University International Advisory Committee with former U.S. Representative Lee Hamilton. Senator Lugar is worthy of the honors bestowed upon him and we are truly blessed as a nation for his extraordinary career in American government.

Tom Collins Sr., of Valparaiso, is the chief executive officer of Luke Oil, a family owned and operated business that was founded in 1967 by Tom's father-in-law, Ralph Luke, in Hobart, Indiana. Currently, the company distributes more than 300 million gallons of fuel annually in the Midwest. Luke Oil's sales reached the $1 billion mark last year and their volume has grown 20 percent each year for the past five years. In 2005, the company bought County Line Orchard, in Hobart, where they have held numerous fundraisers to benefit charities including the Food Bank of Northwest Indiana and various veterans' organizations. For his exemplary leadership skills, and his dedication to supporting charitable organizations, Tom Collins is to be commended.

Danita Johnson Hughes is the president and chief executive officer of Edgewater Systems for Balanced Living in Gary. Edgewater is an organization that provides behavioral healthcare services to individuals and families in the community of Gary and throughout the region. Under Danita's remarkable leadership, the organization has become a respected resource for those in need, and through its services, Edgewater touches the lives of more than 100,000 people each year. Danita continues to give back to the community and dedicates much of her time to the One Region, One Vision initiative and the Northwest Indiana Forum.

Tom Sourlis is the founder and chairman of Mortar Net Solutions, in Burns Harbor. Mortar Net, a product invented by Tom, prevents mortar droppings from clogging weepholes designed to allow water to exit a building wall. Mortar Net is a hugely successful product and is currently used on cavity wall construction throughout North America. In addition to his successful business, Tom devotes much of his time, efforts, and support to charitable organizations throughout Northwest Indiana, including Tradewinds, the Crisis Center, Parents as Teachers, and the Porter County Community Foundation. For his passionate devotion to such causes, Tom is worthy of the highest praise.

Steven Teibel is the third generation of his family to own and operate Teibel's Family Restaurant, in Schererville, which originally opened in 1929. Due to Steven's tremendous leadership skills and excellent customer service, Teibel's continues to succeed and remains a staple in Northwest Indiana. Steven also dedicates much of his time and efforts to serving those in need and is very active in numerous community organizations, including Meals on Wheels, the Hammond YMCA, the American Heart Association, and the Shrine of Christ's Passion. For his commitment to community service, Steven is to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, the lives of every citizen living in Northwest Indiana has been enriched because of the selfless good work of these five extraordinary individuals. I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these outstanding leaders on their induction into the Northwest Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame. These individuals are most deserving of this honor, and for their leadership and commitment to the Northwest Indiana community, each of them is worthy of our respect and admiration.

AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 933

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I had been able to offer an amendment to the Continuing Resolution, H.R. 933 I was prepared to offer the following:

AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 933 OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING:

SEC.——. None of the funds made available in 3 this Act may be used—(1) to carry out any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), or the amendments made by such Act, title, or subtitle; or (2) for rulemaking under such Act, title, or subtitle.

HONORING STEVEN FIRESTEIN AND THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN CANCER FUND FOR CHILDREN AND KIDS CANCER CONNECTION

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American Cancer Fund for Children and Kids Cancer Connection on the occasion of their 20th anniversary, and to recognize them for their invaluable contributions to the cancer community.

The City of Thousand Oaks, in my Congressional district of Ventura County, has proclaimed April 13–20 as ''Childhood Cancer Awareness Week.'' I am pleased to join Mayor Claudia Bill-de-La Pena in thanking Steven Firestein, the founder of American Cancer Fund for Children and its sister organization, Kids Cancer Connection, for his dedication and compassion, which has helped thousands of children living with this terrible disease.

The American Cancer Fund for Children and the Kids Cancer Connection provide vital psychosocial services for children undergoing cancer treatment at Children's Hospital Los Angeles, Los Angeles County; University of Southern California Medical Center; Mattel Children's Hospital at Ronald Reagan–University of California Los Angeles Medical Center, and other hospitals across the United States.

Over the past twenty years, the American Cancer Fund for Children has given over 40,000 handmade, decorated hats and caps to

young cancer patients who have lost their hair from chemotherapy and radiation. Initiatives like the Magical Caps for Kids program help lift the spirits and boost the self-esteem of children undergoing exhaustive and painful courses of treatment. The American Cancer Fund for Children also sponsors the Courageous Kid Award, which organizes ceremonies and hospital celebrations to recognize a child's bravery and determination in fighting the battle against childhood cancer.

Kids Cancer Connection provides educational resources to the public and strives to raise public awareness about childhood cancer.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Steven Firestein for his remarkable efforts on behalf of the thousands of children and families affected by childhood cancer.

COLUMBIA COUNTY BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Columbia County of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which will celebrate its bicentennial anniversary on March 22, 2013.

On March 22, 1813, Columbia County separated from Northumberland County. The area was named for Columbia, a popular poetic name for America at the time and one that alludes to Christopher Columbus and his discovery of our great nation. In 1870, Bloomsburg was named as the County Seat and is still considered to be the only ''incorporated'' town in Pennsylvania. Today, about 66,000 Americans call Columbia County home. They contribute to our nation by working hard for a living and caring for their families. Many of them are earning an education at Bloomsburg University, working at Geisinger-Bloomsburg Hospital or tending to family-owned farms or businesses.

The County is noted for its natural beauty and historic sites. The Susquehanna River and several tributaries flow through the region which also has rolling farmlands, State game lands, State forests, and nature preserves. Notable architectural sites are the Catawissa Friends Meetinghouse constructed in 1789, the Columbia County Courthouse built in 1848, the Berwick Armory constructed in 1922, Bloomsburg Historic District, and 23 covered bridges, the third largest concentration of covered bridges in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, for two hundred years Columbia County has been an integral part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and our great nation. Therefore, I commend all those citizens who have lived and worked for two centuries in this beautiful and historic area.

HONORING MR. ROD TAYLOR ON HIS SELECTION TO THE NAFCU BOARD

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rod Taylor on his recent selection to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, NAFCU.

Mr. Taylor has been President and CEO of Barksdale Federal Credit Union in Bossier City since 2008. Barksdale FCU is the largest member-owned credit union in Louisiana. Mr. Taylor previously served as Barksdale Federal Credit Union's Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer, a post he held for over sixteen years.

Mr. Taylor served in the U.S. Coast Guard from 1973–1977 and received his MBA from Oregon State University before he started working in the financial industry with US National Bank of Oregon in 1983.

Mr. Taylor also brings experience as a board member of other businesses, and he will bring a tremendous amount of expertise to the NAFCU Board. I wish Mr. Taylor the best of luck in his new role on the NAFCU Board and look forward to working with him in this capacity. I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Rod Taylor on this achievement.

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN PAGE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Benjamin Page for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Benjamin Page is the Director of the Des Moines Park and Recreation Department, where he manages a $15.8 million budget that includes 76 parks, 42 miles of trails, five aquatic centers, three public golf courses, and the Prinicpal Riverwalk. Benjamin's role also tasks him with overseeing well known local landmarks such as the Greater Des Moines Botanical Garden, Blank Park Zoo and Principal Park, home of the Iowa Cubs, while serving as a liaison for each location's respective foundations. When he's not in the office, Mr. Page serves on a number of boards including the Greater Des Moines Convention and Visitors Bureau Sports Commission, First Tee of Greater Des Moines, and the Blank Park Zoo Foundation. Ben is also a proud recipient of the Governor's Award for Outstanding Service to Iowa's Children in the Area of Environmental Awareness. Outside of his official commitments, Ben loves spending time with his wife Kim, and their children Sophia and Bryce. Together they enjoy participating in several activities of the city's recreational programming. In all facets of his life, Benjamin is an example of hard work and service that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Benjamin in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Page for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Benjamin on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SCREEN ACT FOR 113TH CONGRESS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the month of March is national colorectal cancer awareness month. I introduce today the Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now (SCREEN) Act. This legislation removes barriers in colon cancer screening, one of the most effective preventive health screenings available. The bill helps save lives, improve quality of care, while also reducing Medicare costs in the process. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The statistics surrounding colon cancer are startling. Over 50,000 people will die this year from this disease according to the American Cancer Society. Colon cancer is the number two cancer killer in the United States for both men and women. Many of us in this chamber have had friends, family members, and associates affected by this terrible disease.

Thankfully, colorectal cancer is highly preventable with appropriate screening. According to an important study recently published in the New England Journal of Medicine, colorectal cancer deaths may be reduced by over 50 percent by removing precancerous polyps during the screening colonoscopy. Colon cancer screening is a unique preventive service as pre-cancerous polyps are removed during the same encounter, thus preventing cancer from developing, as opposed to other cancer screenings where early detection is the goal. That is one reason why the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force provides an ''A'' rating for CRC screenings.

Unfortunately, only half of the Medicare population is being screened, despite the availability of a Medicare colon cancer screening benefit. According to CMS and the American Cancer Society, Medicare claims indicate that only 55–58 percent of beneficiaries have had a colonoscopy or any colorectal cancer test. Screening rates among minority populations are especially low despite the fact that incidences of colon cancer are higher in these populations. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) concludes that 1,000 additional colorectal cancer deaths will be prevented each year if screening rates reached 70 percent.

In addition to saving lives, colorectal cancer screening has been demonstrated to save Medicare long-term costs as noted by the New England Journal of Medicine in a recent article. The direct costs of treating colorectal cancer in 2010 reached $4 billion. These costs can be partially avoided with proper screening.

Congress can and should help increase the number of individuals receiving colorectal cancer screenings. The SCREEN Act takes several much-needed steps to increase access to life-saving colorectal cancer screenings for Medicare beneficiaries.

The SCREEN Act waives all Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing for colorectal cancer screenings where polyps are removed during the examination. Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for any colorectal cancer screening recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. However, should the beneficiary have a precancerous polyp removed, the procedure is no longer considered a ''screening'' for Medicare purposes. The unintended consequence of this is that the beneficiary is obligated to pay the Medicare coinsurance. This is an unexpected and unwelcome ''sticker shock'' that does nothing to promote screening or improve patient care. The Administration announced in February 2013 that private insurers participating in state-based health insurance exchanges must remove all cost sharing for colon cancer screenings where a polyp was removed. We must have a similar policy in the Medicare program.

The SCREEN Act also provides incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries so that our Medicare beneficiaries are in fact receiving the quality screening they deserve. Congress and other organizations can look to the SCREEN Act as a model for Medicare reimbursement reform as the bill reimburses providers in a budget neutral manner based on the quality of the procedure and not on the quantity of services.

Lastly, the SCREEN Act would allow a Medicare beneficiary to sit down and discuss the screening with a physician before undergoing the procedure. The federal government and patient advocacy groups have concluded that the ''fear of the procedure'' is a major impediment to increasing colorectal cancer screening rates. This pre-procedure visit is good clinical practice and would help improve screening utilization. The patient plays an integral role in colon cancer screening aside from just showing up for the procedure. This role dictates the quality of the screening itself. Medicare should recognize this and provide coverage for a pre-screening visit to review the preparation and procedure itself. There is no reason why a Medicare beneficiary sees the physician for the first time right before being sedated for the procedure.

Promoting access to colorectal cancer screening is good policy. It will save lives and reduce costs to families and the health care system. Please join with me in the fight against colorectal cancer by cosponsoring this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE YOUTH PROMISE ACT

HON. ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. JONES, to introduce the ''Youth Prison Reduction through Mentoring, Intervention, Support and Education Act'', or ''Youth PROMISE Act'' (YPA), a bill we believe will greatly reduce crime and its associated costs and losses. Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana and Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania have indicated their intent to file companion YPA legislation in the Senate.

The Youth PROMISE Act implements the best policy recommendations from crime policy makers, researchers, practitioners, analysts, and law enforcement officials from across the political spectrum concerning evidence- and research-based strategies to reduce gang violence and crime. Under the Youth PROMISE Act, communities facing the greatest youth gang and crime challenges will be able to enact a comprehensive, coordinated response and intervention that includes the active involvement of representatives from law enforcement, court services, schools, social service organizations, health and mental health care providers, the business community, and other public and private community-based service organizations, including faith-based organizations. These key players will form a council to develop a comprehensive plan for implementing evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies for young people who are involved, or at risk of becoming involved, in gangs, delinquency, or the juvenile or criminal justice system to redirect them toward productive and law-abiding alternatives.

Title I: Federal Coordination of Local and Tribal Juvenile Justice Information and Efforts. Sec. 101 creates a PROMISE Advisory Panel. This Panel will assist the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in selecting PROMISE community grantees. The Panel will also develop standards for the evaluation of juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention approaches carried out under the PROMISE Act. Sec. 102 provides for specific data collection in each designated geographic area to assess the needs and existing resources for juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention. This data will then facilitate the strategic geographic allocation of resources provided under the Act to areas of greatest need for assistance.

Title II: PROMISE Grants. Sec. 202 establishes grants to enable local and tribal communities, via PROMISE Coordinating Councils (PCCs) (Sec. 203), to conduct an objective assessment (Sec. 204) regarding juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity and resource needs and strengths in the community. The assessment will include an estimate of the total amount spent in the previous year by the community and other entities for the incarceration of offenders who committed offenses in the community. Based upon the assessment, the PCCs will then develop plans that include a broad array of evidence-based prevention and intervention programs. These programs will be responsive to the needs and strengths of the community, account for the community's cultural and linguistic needs, and utilize approaches that have been proven to be effective in reducing involvement in or continuing involvement in delinquent conduct or criminal street gang activity. The PCCs can then apply for federal funds, on the basis of greatest need, to implement their PROMISE plans (Sec. 211–213). In addition, each PCC will be required to identify cost savings sustained from investing in prevention and intervention practices and explain how those savings will be reinvested in the continuing implementation of the PROMISE Plan (Sec. 212). Title II also provides for national evaluation of PROMISE programs and activities (Sec. 223) based on performance standards developed by the PROMISE Advisory Panel.

Title III: PROMISE Research Center. Sec. 301 establishes a National Research Center for Proven Juvenile Justice Practices. This Center will collect and disseminate information to PROMISE Coordinating Councils and the public on current research and other information about evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity and intervention. Sec. 302 provides for regional academic research partners to assist PCCs in developing their assessments and plans.

During my more than 30 years of public service, I have learned that when it comes to crime policy, we have a choice—we can reduce crime, or we can play politics. For far too long, Congress has chosen to play politics by enacting so-called ''tough on crime'' slogans such as ''three strikes and you're out'', ''mandatory minimum sentencing'', ''life without parole'', ''abolish parole'' or ''you do the adult crime, you do the adult time''. My personal favorite is ''no cable TV in prisons.'' You can imagine the cable guy disconnecting the cable and then waiting for the crime rate to drop. As appealing as these policies may sound, their impacts range from a negligible reduction in crime to an increase in crime.

In spite of the counterproductive nature of these ''tough on crime'' laws, over the past two decades, Congress has continued to enact slogan-based sentencing policies. As a result, the United States now has the highest average incarceration rate of any nation in the world. At over 700 persons incarcerated for every 100,000 in the population, the U.S. far exceeds the world average incarceration rate of about 100 per 100,000. Russia is the next closest in rate of incarceration with about 600 per 100,000 citizens. No other nation is even close. Among countries most comparable to the U.S., Great Britain is 153 per 100,000, Australia is 129, Canada is 116, Germany is 95, France is 89, and Japan is 63. India, the world's largest Democracy, is 33 per 100,000 and China, the world's largest country by population, is 119 per 100,000. Since 1970, the number of individuals incarcerated in the U.S. has risen from approximately 300,000 to over 2 million.

This increase in incarceration does not come for free. Since 1980, the cost of corrections in this country has risen from about $7 billion annually to over $68 billion a year.

And the U.S. has some of the world's most severe punishments for crime, including for juveniles. Of the more than 2400 juveniles now serving sentences of life without parole, ALL are in the U.S. Some were given their sentence as first-time offenders under circumstances such as being a passenger in a car from which there was a drive-by shooting.

The impact of all this focus on tough law enforcement approaches falls disproportionately on minorities, particularly Blacks and Hispanics. While the incarceration rate in the United States is approximately 700 per 100,000, for Blacks the average rate is over 2200 per 100,000, and the rate in some jurisdictions exceeds 4,000 per 100,000 Blacks, a rate 40 times the international average. For Black boys being born today, the Sentencing

Project estimates that one in every three will end up incarcerated in their lifetime without an appropriate intervention. These children are on what the Children's Defense Fund has described as a ''cradle-to-prison pipeline.''

Despite all of our concentration on being tough on crime, the problem persists, and reports suggest that it is growing in some jurisdictions. While nothing in the Youth PROMISE Act eliminates any of the current tough on crime laws, and while it is understood that law enforcement will still continue to enforce those laws, research and analysis, as well as common sense, tells us that no matter how tough we are on the people we prosecute today, unless we are addressing the underlying reasons for why they develop into serious criminals, nothing will change. The next wave of offenders will simply replace the ones we incarcerate, and the crimes continue. So, just continuing to be ''tough'' will have little long term impact on crime.

There is now overwhelming evidence to show that it is entirely feasible to move children from a cradle to prison pipeline to a cradle to college and career pipeline. All the credible research and evidence shows that a continuum of evidenced-based prevention and intervention programs for youth identified as being at risk of involvement in delinquent behavior, and those already involved, will greatly reduce crime and save much more than they cost when compared to the avoided law enforcement and social welfare expenditures. There are programs for teen pregnancy prevention, prenatal care, new parent training, nurse home visits, Head Start, quality education, after-school programs, summer recreation and jobs, guaranteed college scholarships, and job-training that have been scientifically proven to cost-effectively reduce crime. And the research reveals that these programs are most effective when provided in the context of a coordinated, collaborative local strategy involving law enforcement, social services and other local public and private entities working with children identified as at risk of involvement in the criminal justice system. This is what the Youth PROMISE Act supports.

Aside from reducing crime and providing better results in the lives of our youth, many of these programs funded under the Youth PROMISE Act will save more money than they cost. We know this because it has already been done at the state level. For example, the state of Pennsylvania implemented similar type programs in 100 communities across the state using a process very similar to the one provided for in the Youth PROMISE Act. The state invested $60 million over a ten year period, and as a result of the programs implemented, the state yielded a savings of $300 million. In other words, the state found that it saved, on average, $5 for every $1 spent during the study period.

The bill is supported by 53 original co-sponsors and a coalition of over 250 national, state and local government, professional, civil rights, education and religious organizations listed below, a list that continues to grow. We know how to reduce crime, and we know that we can do it in a way that saves much more money than it costs. Our children, victims of crime, taxpayers and our economy can no longer afford for us to delay adoption of the Youth PROMISE Act. So, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and seeing to it that it is quickly enacted into law.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE YOUTH PROMISE ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

African American Ministers in Action; Afterschool Alliance; Alliance for Children and Families; American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP); American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); American Correctional Association; American Council of Chief Defenders; American Federation of School Administrators, AFL-CIO; American Federation of Teachers (AFT); American Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American Jewish Congress; American Probation and Parole Association; American Psychological Association; Asian American Justice Center; ASPIRA, Inc.; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Boy Scouts of America; Boys and Girls Clubs of America; Campaign for Youth Justice.

Catholic Charities USA; Center for Children's Law and Policy; Child Welfare League of America; Children's Defense Fund; Coalition for Juvenile Justice; Coalition on Human Needs; Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL); Correctional Education Association; Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth; Council for Opportunity in Education; Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (CJCA); Democrats for Education Reform; Family Justice; Federal CURE; Fight Crime: Invest in Kids; First Five Years Fund; First Focus Campaign for Children; Girls Inc.; Immigrant Justice Network; Institute for Community Peace.

Justice Policy Institute; Juvenile Justice Trainers Association; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; League of Young Voters; Legal Action Center; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mennonite Central Committee Washington Office; Mental Health America; Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund (MALDEF); National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National African-American Drug Policy Coalition, Inc.; National Alliance of Black School Educators; National Alliance to End Homelessness; National Alliance for Faith and Justice; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice; National Association of Counties (NACo); National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

National Association of Juvenile Correctional Agencies; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials (NBC-LEO); National Black Police Association; National Center for Youth Law; National Consortium of TASC (Treatment Accountability for Safer Communities) Programs; National Council for Community Behavioral Health National Council of La Raza; National Council on Crime and Delinquency; National Council on Educating Black Children; National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ); National Council for Urban (Formations) Peace, Justice and Empowerment; National Education Association; National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health; National Head Start Association; National Hire Network; National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild.

National Juvenile Defender Center; National Juvenile Detention Association; National Juvenile Justice Network; National Network for Youth; National Organization of Black Law Enforcement (NOBLE); National Organization of Concerned Black Men, Inc.; National Partnership for Juvenile Services; National Parent Teacher Association (PTA); National Trust for the Development of African-American Men; National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; Open Society Policy Center; The Peace Alliance; Penal Reform International; pre[k]now; Presbyterian Church (USA), Washington Office; Prison Legal News; Prisons Foundation; Restorative Community Foundation.

Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; Southern Poverty Law Center; Students for Sensible Drug Policy; The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Law and Policy Section; The Rebecca Project for Human Rights; The School Social Work Association of America; The Sentencing Project; The Student Peace Alliance; Therapeutic Communities of America (TCA); Time Dollar Youth Court; TimeBanks USA; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; United Neighborhood Centers of America; U.S. Conference of Mayors; U.S. Dream Academy; U.S. Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association (USPRA); VOICES for America's Children; W. Haywood Burns Institute; Washington Office on Latin America; Youth Law Center; Youth Matter America.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama: Alabama Youth Justice Coalition; Equal Justice Initiative; Southern Juvenile Defender Center; Southern Poverty Law Center; VOICES for Alabama's Children; Parents, Youth, Children and Family Training Institute. Arizona: Children's Action Alliance. California: Alturas Mas Altas; Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Office of Restorative Justice; Asian Law Caucus; Barrios Unidos—Santa Cruz Chapter; California Public Defenders Association City and County of San Francisco; City of Los Angeles; City of Pasadena; Contra Costa County Public Defender's Office; Everychild Foundation; Faith Communities for Families and Children; Homies Unidos; Juvenile Court Judges of California; Juvenile Probation Commission of San Francisco, L.A. Unified School District; L.A. Youth Justice Coalition; Leaders in Community Alternatives, Inc.; Pacific Juvenile Defender Center; San Francisco Youth Commission. Colorado: The Pendulum Foundation. Connecticut: Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance; Families Moving Forward; The Poor People's Alliance, Connecticut Chapter. Delaware: Delaware Center for Justice (DE). District of Columbia: Young America Works Public Charter School; Columbia Heights Shaw Family Collaborative; DC Alliance of Youth Advocates; DC NAACP Youth Council; Facilitating Leadership in Youth (FLY); Justice for DC Youth; Latin American Youth Center; Life Pieces to Masterpieces, Inc. Florida: Children's Campaign, Inc.; Florida Public Defender Association, Inc.; Florida Public Defender, Fourth Judicial Circuit; Florida Families for Fair Sentences; Miami-Dade Public Defender's Office. Illinois: ACLU of Illinois; Chicago Area Project; John Howard Association of Illinois, Juvenile Justice Initiative of Illinois, Midwest Juvenile Defender Center, PTA of Illinois, United in Peace, Inc. Kansas: H.O.P.E., Inc. Kansas CURE. Louisiana: Families & Friends of La.'s Incarcerated Children; Juvenile Justice Project of Louisiana. Maryland: Advocates for Children and Youth; CASA of Maryland, Inc.; Fusion Partnerships, Inc.; Identity, Inc.; Law Office of Anthony J. Keber; Maryland CURE; Maryland Department of Juvenile Services; Maryland Juvenile Justice Coalition; Maryland Office of the Public Defender; Public Justice Center. Massachusetts: Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race & Justice; Citizens for Juvenile Justice; Youth Advocacy Project of the Committee for Public Counsel Services. Michigan: Michigan After-School Partnership; Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Minnesota: Minnesota Juvenile Justice Coalition. Mississippi: Mississippi CURE; Mississippi Youth Justice Project. Nebraska: VOICES for Children in Nebraska. New Hampshire: New Hampshire Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. New Jersey: New Jersey Association on Correction. New Mexico: County of Santa Fe; New Mexico Council on Crime and Delinquency; New Mexico Criminal Defense Lawyers Association. New York: Center for Community Alternatives; Central American Legal Assistance; City of New York; City of New York Department of Juvenile Justice; Correctional Association of New York; The Fortune Society; Juvenile Justice Center of Suffolk University Law School; Quad A For KIDS / A Rochester Area Community Foundation Initiative. North Carolina: ACLU of North Carolina; Action for Children North Carolina; Council for Children's Rights; UNC Juvenile Justice Clinic, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Law. Ohio: ACLU of Ohio; Franklin County Public Defender; Hispanic Urban Minority Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Outreach Program; Juvenile Justice Coalition; Peace in the Hood; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; VOICES for Ohio's Children. Oregon: Partnership for Safety and Justice. Pennsylvania: Mental Health Association in Pennsylvania; Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. Puerto Rico: Puerto Rico Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. Rhode Island: The Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence. South Carolina: Alston Wilkes Society; The Children's Trust of South Carolina. South Dakota: Parents Who Care Coalition. Tennessee: Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth. Texas: Texas Criminal Justice Coalition. Utah: Utah Commission on Criminal Justice and Juvenile Justice. Virginia: Barrios Unidos—Virginia Chapter; Families & Allies of Virginia's Youth; JustChildren; Keeping Our Kids Safe: The Newport News Violence Prevention Network; Mid-Atlantic Juvenile Defender Center, Juvenile Law and Policy Clinic, University of Richmond School of Law; Richmond Peace Education Center; The Center for Community Development, Inc.; The Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project (S.T.O.P.); The S.T.O.P. Family Investment Center at Oakmont North; Virginia Coalition for Juvenile Justice; Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education; Virginia Commonwealth University Center for School-Community Collaboration; Virginia CURE (VA); Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice. Washington: Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; Washington Defender Association; Washington Defender Association's Immigration Project. Wisconsin: ATTIC Correctional Services, Inc.; Wisconsin Council on Children and Families.

LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

City of East Cleveland (OH); City of Hampton (VA); City of Los Angeles (CA); City of New York (NY); City of Newport News (VA); City of Norfolk (VA); City of Pasadena (CA); City of Philadelphia (PA); City of Pittsburgh (PA); City of Portsmouth (VA); City of Richmond (VA); City of San Francisco (CA); City and County of San Francisco (CA); County of Santa Fe (NM);

ELECTED OFFICIALS AND ACADEMICS

Leroy D. Baca, Sheriff, County of Los Angeles (CA); Donna M. Bishop, Northeastern University (MA); Susan J. Carstens, Psy.D., L.P. Juvenile Specialist, Crystal Police Dept. (MN); The Honorable Toni Harp, Connecticut State Senator; The Honorable Alice L. Bordsen, North Carolina State Representatives; Jolanta Juszkiewicz, Ph.D., American University (D.C.); The Honorable Kelvin Roldán, Connecticut State Representative; Tony Roshan Samara, George Mason University (VA); Earle Williams, Psy.D. Hampton University, (VA); Aaron Kupchik, Ph.D., University of Delaware.

TRIBUTE TO NICK RENKOSKI

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Nick Renkoski for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Nick Renkoski is the Director of Marketing and Communications at the Des Moines Metro Opera. In this role, Nick utilizes his love of the arts and his talents of writing, directing, and acting to develop innovative ways to draw in new audiences to the opera and challenge preconceived notions. His video series, We Live Opera, has received attention from opera companies across the country for doing just that. Both in and out of the opera, Renkoski has contributed to the crucial role the arts have played in the city's revitalization efforts through his involvement as a committee member of the Des Moines Art Center's Gala and Fashion Week and his performances in several Des Moines Social Club productions. Originally a Des Moines native and a graduate of the University of Missouri, Nick now resides in downtown Des Moines with his wife Liz, who is a member of the 2012 Forty Under 40 class. In all aspects of his life, Nick is an example of hard work and service that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Nick in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Renkoski for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Nick on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK APRIL 1–7 2013

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, since 1995 the first full week of April was declared National Public Health Week (NPHW) to recognize the contributions of public health and to highlight issues that are important to improving it. Public health improves the conditions and behaviors that affect the health of each and every one of us. Public health ensures that we have safe, healthy communities. This is why I hope that all Americans will join me in observing National Public Health Week April 1–7, 2013.

This year's National Public Health Week theme is "Public Health is ROI: Save Lives, Save money." It highlights the value of prevention and the importance of well-supported public health systems in preventing disease, saving lives and curbing health care spending. Much like the business world, ROI indicates the return on investments. Investing just $10 per person each year in proven community-based public health efforts could save the Nation more than 16 billion within five years. That's a $5.60 return for every $1 invested. America spends more than twice what most other industrialized nations spend on health care and we still have poor health outcomes. A major reason for this startling fact is that we spend only 3 percent of our health care dollars on preventing diseases as opposed to treating them, when 75 percent of our health care costs are related to preventable conditions.

I was a proud sponsor of the health care reform law which was enacted on March 23, 2010. I feel passionate about uninsured Americans who suffer from chronic conditions such as heart disease and diabetes. The Affordable Care Act, as it is commonly called, ensures that more Americans than ever before will have insurance coverage for mounting medical expenses. Also included in this bill is the creation of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, a new mandatory fund for prevention and public health. The Fund is intended to provide a stable and increased investment in activities that will enable communities to stay healthy in the first place.

Thanks to the great work of the American Public Health Association (APHA) which serves as the organizer of National Public Health Week and the efforts of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, great strides have been made to raise awareness about public health and prevention.

However, our work is far from done. In Congress, I will continue to support reliable funding of public health and stand-up for the Prevention and Public Health Fund which helps to provide funding for community-based prevention activities and programs that reduce deaths due to preventable causes. Our current and future generations must not be deprived of the opportunity to live long, healthy lives. Working together, I am optimistic that we can achieve this outcome.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''PREPARE ALL KIDS ACT'' OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the "Prepare All Kids Act," which would assist states in providing at least one year of high quality, full-day pre-kindergarten education to all children, specifically targeting children from low-income families.

Introduced in the Senate by my colleague on the Joint Economic Committee, Sen. CASEY of Pennsylvania, I am happy to be introducing this House companion bill along with my colleague Rep. ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Children are our nation's greatest resource and providing them with high-quality early education is a critical step in ensuring that they are put on a path to success from an early age. The ''Prepare All Kids Act'' is not only the right thing to do for our children; it's a wise investment in our future. Long-term scientific research has proven the benefits of investing in early childhood education. Children who attend high-quality prekindergarten are often more successful in school, more productive adults, and greater contributors to our economy and society.

That is why President Obama expressed support for pre-kindergarten education for all children during his State of the Union speech and why I am introducing this bill now. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

RECOGNIZING MARCH AS RED CROSS MONTH

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Red Cross and the amazing work they do in my Congressional District, across North Carolina, and around the country and to highlight that the month of March is Red Cross Month.

My Congressional District is served by eight local Red Cross chapters including the Greater Albemarle Chapter in Elizabeth City; Frederick E. Turnage Chapter in Rocky Mount; Wayne County Chapter in Goldsboro; Lenoir County Chapter in Kinston; Greater Pamlico Chapter in Washington; Pitt County Chapter in Greenville; Triangle Chapter in Raleigh; and the Central NC Chapter in Durham.

At a moment's notice, these local chapters can deploy staff and volunteers to respond to a crisis situation. Many across North Carolina and the east coast remember the devastation of Hurricane Floyd in 1999 that killed nearly 60 people. When the destructive tornadoes in April 2011 leveled some 450 homes across Halifax, Northampton, and Wilson Counties; and most recently, when Super Storm Sandy ravaged the east coast and destroyed homes and businesses along the North Carolina coast and inland, the Red Cross responded in each instance.

Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross plays a vital role in disaster response and their contribution to helping Americans recover from life-changing events cannot be overstated. I ask my colleagues to join with me in thanking the American Red Cross for their tireless work on behalf of all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN RUAN IV

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize John Ruan IV for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

John Ruan IV is the Vice President of Financial Institutions at Bankers Trust Company, where he is responsible for a loan portfolio of more than $90 million in assets. A Des Moines native, John worked in Chicago from 2002 to 2007 after receiving his law degree from the University of Iowa. As his family life grew however, he knew Iowa was where he wanted to be. Today, John carries on the family tradition of hard work and selfless service through his involvement in numerous civic organizations. Mr. Ruan is board member of several Des Moines area organizations, including the Des Moines Symphony, Junior Achievement of Central Iowa, and the Riverfront YMCA. John is also a member of the Blank Park Zoo Capital Campaign committee and serves on the legislative committee of the Iowa Bankers Association. Among John's numerous responsibilities, his top priority remains being the best husband and father he can be to his wife Alison and their three children. In all facets of his life, Mr. Ruan continues to make his state proud while extending and expanding his family's tremendous legacy.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like John in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Ruan for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating John on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

INTRODUCING THE STUDENT LOAN FAIRNESS ACT TO COMBAT STUDENT DEBT

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Student Loan Fairness Act to address the crippling issue of student loan debt and the debilitating impact that this debt is having on American students and their ability to contribute to the growth of the United States economy.

As you may know, total outstanding student loan debt in America has surpassed the $1 trillion mark. It has outpaced credit card debt, auto debt, and is second only to mortgage debt in America. In fact, a recent study shows that student loan debt is the only type of consumer debt in America that has actually increased during the ''Great Recession'' and the problem only continues to worsen. As a result of these debts, millions of Americans are not buying cars, purchasing homes, starting businesses, or otherwise realizing the American Dream.

We need a fair and simple federal student loan repayment system which seeks to alleviate the financial burden of student loan debt on college graduates and support them as they begin their careers and lives.

That is why I rise today to introduce the Student Loan Fairness Act. This new legislation combines two bills from the 112th Congress: Rep. Hansen Clarke's Student Loan Forgiveness Act (H.R. 4170), as well as my own Graduate Success Act (H.R. 5895).

The Student Loan Fairness Act creates a new ''10–10'' standard for student loan repayment and establishes it as the new standard repayment plan for students taking out federal loans. This bill also combats the crushing interest rates of public and private loans, sends a lifeline to student borrowers who have fallen on difficult times, and promotes financial responsibility in higher education. In addition, our bill permanently caps the interest rate for all federal student loans at 3.4%, which will ultimately eliminate the need to enact temporary measures every year to prevent rates from doubling. This gives students more certainty and the comfort of knowing their interest rates will not go up every year.

Congress needs to act now to help our students. The longer we wait to take action, the more we undermine their future and prevent students from becoming the people they dream of being and the workforce our economy needs.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FINANCIAL COMPETITIVE ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the Financial Competitive Act of 2013. My legislation simply requires the Financial Stability Oversight Committee to conduct a study of the impact of implementation of the Credit Valuation Adjustment (CVA) capital requirement on U.S. consumers, end users, and U.S. financial institutions.

European Basel III rules are being finalized and would provide a significant exemption from CVA market risk Risk-Weighted Assets (RWA) for EU banks.

EU banks would be exempt from CVA RWA requirements for transactions with sovereign pension funds and corporate counterparties, which are also exempt from clearing obligations. It is interesting to note that the EU did there due diligence and determined the risk factors merited an exemption.

My legislation is simply asking for due diligence in determining if U.S. financial institutions will be competitively disadvantaged. To me, this exemption will provide a significant advantage to European banks, European customers, and European end users.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is in a fragile state, any hurdle, fee, or foreign advantage, will cost the U.S. economy valuable jobs. This decision by the European regulators disregards the Basel III international agreement

and will have lasting consequences for U.S. and international markets. U.S. financial institutions will be competitively disadvantaged that will affect how these institutions serve consumers in the derivative business as well as the commercial loan business.

Further, end-users will see a significant impact through limited competition which affects pricing and services.

My legislation will clarify the impact Basel III CVA RWA exemption for EU financial institutions will have on the U.S. economy. We can't afford to wait while Europe takes valuable market share away from U.S. companies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the Financial Competitive Act of 2013 in order to ensure the law of unintended consequences doesn't place and U.S. consumers, end users, and financial institutions are not put at a disadvantage.

HONORING MIKE JACKSON

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Jackson, a distinguished wrestling coach from Ozark High School, who was recently inducted into the Missouri Wrestling Association Hall of Fame.

Mike established Ozark's wrestling program and coached there for 26 years before he retired in 2012. During the course of his tenure, Mike amassed an impressive 210–59 record, including 10 conference championships and eight district titles. His teams produced 157 state qualifiers and 49 state medalists.

Mike developed such a strong program because he instilled in his wrestlers a strong sense of character on the mat, in the classroom, and in the community. He prided himself on these qualities. During his final year of coaching, for example, he and his squad raised $2,500 for breast cancer awareness.

The Ozark community is lucky to have had a coach, teacher, and mentor like Mike Jackson, and I am proud to recognize his accomplishments and induction into the Missouri Wrestling Hall of Fame.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL ROWLEY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Rachel Rowley for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Rachel Rowley is a partner at the BrownWinick law firm where she practices litigation and transactional work. Before attaining her law degree from the University of Denver in Colorado, Rachel received her bachelor's degree in music education from Iowa State University. She still utilizes her passion for music through serving on the board of trustees for the Des Moines Symphony, including the audit, fundraising, and education advisory committees. Ms. Rowley also has been a volunteer for the Make-A-Wish Foundation's art festival booth since 2010 and a member of the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. Of course, Rachel's top priority is the care of her two children, Luke and Anna, who both attend the Bergman Academy in Des Moines, where Ms. Rowley serves as a board member and legal counsel. In all facets of her life, Rachel is an example of hard work and service that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Rachel in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Rowley for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Rachel on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN SUPPORT OF CATCHING UP TO 1968 ACT OF 2013

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, these statements and findings are made in support of the ''Catching Up to 1968 Act of 2013.''

In determining that it is time to raise the minimum wage to $10.50 per hour and index it to inflation, Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1968, the minimum wage has lost nearly one-third of its value. Had it kept pace with inflation since then, the federal minimum wage would be $10.67 today.

(2) Given that the minimum wage has not kept pace with inflation, more than thirty million low-wage workers are making less today than low-wage workers did 45 years ago in 1968.

(3) As the cost of living increased in the past several decades, the reduced purchasing power of the minimum wage has made it more difficult for low-wage workers to pay for basic necessities such as housing, transportation, food, and healthcare.

(I) Housing prices have nearly doubled; the median value of owner-occupied properties has increased by about 80 percent between 1970 and 2009.

(II) The cost of a gallon of motor vehicle gasoline has increased more than 60 percent from 1978 to 2012 according to U.S. Energy Information data.

(III) The average cost of health insurance premiums has skyrocketed. According to U.S. Census figures, from 1990 to 2009, health insurance costs per capita have more than doubled, increasing 102 percent. The average annual cost of employer-sponsored family health insurance premiums increased 89 percent from 1999 to 2011. Workers bore more of that load, with the average worker contribution toward employer-sponsored health insurance increasing by 94 percent. On top of this, an increasing number of medical expenses and services are not paid for by health insurance, resulting in dramatically increasing out-of-pocket expenses—27 percent from 1996 to 2009—for families.

(IV) Since just 1994, the average cost for a family of four to provide food for the family has increased about 10 percent, according to figures from the USDA's monthly estimates of food plans.

(4) The current federal minimum wage of $7.25 per hour, $15,080 annually, does not even meet the U.S. Census Bureau's poverty threshold for a family of two or the Department of Health and Human Service's poverty guidelines for a family of two, both of which are above $15,000 per year.

(5) Worker productivity has more than doubled since the 1960s, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics' data, yet all that low-wage workers have received for their effort is the declining value of the minimum wage.

(6) The failure of Congress to make sure that the minimum wage keeps pace with inflation has exacerbated income inequality in this country and placed the American Dream out of reach for many hard-working low-wage workers in this country. At the same time that the minimum wage has lost nearly one-third of its value, the average income of the top 1 percent of taxpayers has skyrocketed. The threshold for a family's annual income to be considered in the top 1 percent of taxpayers increased from about $75,000 in 1968 to over $1 million in 2011. Adjusting for inflation, the annual income of the top one percent has more than doubled in that time, increasing 110 percent. Just before the recent financial crisis, the incomes of the top one percent had nearly tripled from 1968 to 2007, increasing by 196 percent.

(7) The top 100 highest paid CEOs all made over $15 million last year. The highest paid CEO made over $131 million in 2012, the equivalent of almost $63,000 per hour—$10,000 more than the median annual household income in the United States.

(8) Though the United States economy has begun to recover from the recent financial crisis, the unemployment rate is still 7.7 percent and there still remain 28.6 million unemployed or underemployed. Raising the minimum wage would help stimulate the economy and create jobs.

(I) Raising the minimum wage to $10.50 per hour would give a raise to more than 30 million workers, add a net increase of over $30 billion in economic activity, and create more than 140,000 new jobs.

(II) According to a Chicago Federal Reserve study, for every dollar increase to the hourly pay of a minimum wage worker, the result is $2,800 in new spending from that worker's household over the year.

(9) Two-thirds of low-wage workers are employed by large, profitable corporations.

(10) Many large, multi-national corporations pay higher minimum wages in Canada and Europe, and still remain profitable.

(11) Without raising the minimum wage and indexing it to inflation, it becomes more likely

that low-wage workers will fall further into poverty and be more reliant on government services like food stamps, Medicaid, welfare, and the earned income tax credit. These government services are paid for by the taxpayers and other small businesses. In this sense, many small businesses that already pay their employees more than the federal minimum wage end up subsidizing the profitability of their large corporate competitors. This is a perversion of capitalism. Raising the minimum wage would not put small businesses like this at a competitive disadvantage, but could in fact help them. For instance, according to the MO Healthnet Employer Report, in Missouri during the first quarter of 2011 (the most recent data) the total cost to the state of the 50 employers whose employees rely most heavily on Medicaid was about $43.5 million. According to data from the state Department of Job and Family Services, the State of Ohio paid $111.5 million in 2007 for Medicaid costs for workers and their dependents at 50 employers statewide.

(12) Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women. A greater proportion of minimum wage workers are black (15 percent) or Hispanic (20.2 percent) than of the population as a whole (13.1 percent black, and 16.7 percent Hispanic).

(13) The United States has one of the lowest minimum wages when compared with other Western, industrialized countries. Australia's minimum wage is more than double the minimum wage in the United States—at about $16 per hour. Of ten countries with minimum wages higher than the United States', eight of them have unemployment rates lower than ours, based on the most recent data available.

(14) Poll after poll has shown that about 70 percent of the American public supports increasing the minimum wage.

HONORING NEWBRIDGE SERVICES

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor NewBridge Services in Pompton Plains, Morris County, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 50th Anniversary in 2013.

In the latter portion of 1962, local ministers were taken aback by the exponential increase in counseling requests within the Pequannock Valley area. This prompted a group of concerned citizens to meet and discuss mental health needs of the people in their surrounding areas. From this meeting the Northeast Morris County Guidance Center was founded under Reverend Donner B. Atwood of the First Reformed Church of Pompton Plains. The name of the facility was soon changed to the Pequannock Valley Mental Health Center, which began serving on December 23rd, 1963. This center was initially intended to carry out mental health services for adults and children in Butler, Kinnelon, Lincoln Park, Montville, Pequannock, and Riverdale. Rapid growth over the next decade extended the programs to the areas of Boonton, Boonton Township, East Hanover, and Mountain Lakes.

In 1977, due to the addition of several new programs, the Health Center nearly tripled in size. These new programs included the Transitional Care Program, which was able to provide the Day Treatment Center with full time help for psychiatric emergencies, boarding home services, and counseling for at-risk clients. The Youth Services Bureau was also created to meet the ever-growing mental health needs of adolescents in the servicing towns.

In 1980, the Outreach Program, designed to help additional at-risk clients, was established alongside Project 70001, and the Youth Employment Program, intended to help troubled children and adults obtain jobs. Moreover, in 1986 the center expanded further by adding the Project Families Youth-In-Touch program and the Adolescent Partial Care program in 1987, aimed at helping troubled members of young society become more aware of their problems in order to overcome them. Finally, in June of 1998 the name of center was changed to NewBridge, effectively becoming responsible for almost all public mental health service in the upper portion of Passaic County.

NewBridge's goal has always been to provide children, individuals and families with substance abuse treatment and outpatient counseling. They also seek to empower the children, parents, teachers, and communities they serve to coordinate their own efforts in assisting those who are struggling with substance abuse and mental health issues. NewBridge is able to continually be effective through its 175 trained professionals that serve throughout the 16 municipalities in Morris and Passaic Counties. These professionals include adolescent and clinical nurse specialists, addiction and domestic violence professionals, care managers, and therapists concentrated in marriage and family problems. NewBridge also employs highly trained nutritionists, psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers.

By means of services, facilities, and employees dedicated to consistently helping members of the community, NewBridge has impacted the Morris and Passaic areas through state-of-the-art constructive methods of support and personal education. Children and adults can now receive the proper care and advice they deserve. This assistance has made these 16 municipalities happier and healthier places to live.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and your colleagues to join me in congratulating NewBridge Services as it celebrates its 50th Anniversary.

HONORING THE GREEK ORTHODOX YOUTH OF AMERICA OF ST. GEORGE

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. VAN. HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize the Greek Orthodox Youth of America, GOYA, of St. George in Bethesda, Maryland for their outstanding accomplishment in the GOYA tournament that was held in Baltimore, Maryland this past weekend.

Both the young men and women of the youth group won their respective championships in hard-fought games teeming with sportsmanship and Christian fellowship. In spirited competition, these young men and women represented their community with pride. Although both teams—trailed in their semi-final and championship games, every player battled back with heart and outstanding sportsmanship and won not only the competition but the respect of their fellow teammates and their opponents.

I am proud of the St. George GOYA and look forward to their continued leadership in serving our community, excelling on the basketball court, and working hard in their academic, personal and spiritual pursuits.

HONORING THE ONE CAMPUS CHAPTER AT UTEP

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the ONE Campus chapter at the University of Texas at El Paso, UTEP.

This spirited group of college students competed in the ONE Campus' Valentine's Day challenge, which encouraged students across the country to write to their elected representatives urging them to support international poverty-fighting programs.

ONE Campus is under the ONE organization umbrella. With 300 million members around the world, this organization was founded to combat extreme poverty and preventable diseases.

The UTEP chapter won the "To Washington With Love" challenge after collecting more than 120 handwritten letters and over 500 petition signatures and new member signups. Those messages were personally delivered to my office where my office and I got the message loud and clear about the importance of preserving these lifesaving programs.

I could not be more proud of these students. Go Miners for winning the challenge and taking such an active role in the democratic process!

TRIBUTE TO KEEGAN KAUTZKY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Keegan Kautzky for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Keegan Kautzky serves as the Director of National Education Programs of the World

Food Prize Foundation, where he continues to fulfill the world-changing vision of famed agronomist Dr. Norman Borlaug. In this role, Mr. Kautzky establishes programs for high school and college students that provide insights into poverty and hunger across the globe. He has led the foundation's national expansion by attracting more than $3 million in investments and matching funds for critical training programs for high school students and teachers. Keegan also has advised the National Council on Agricultural Education and the National FFA Organization in developing the first global strategy for agricultural education in the United States. Outside of work, Keegan is the founder and chairman of the student-run charity, Pages of Promise, which collects reading materials throughout the country and provides them to those in sub-Saharan Africa. In all facets of his life, Keegan is testament to Dr. Borlaug's legacy by actively changing the world for the better through his time, talents, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Keegan in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Kautzky for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Keegan on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HOUSE RESOLUTION URGING TURKEY TO RESPECT THE RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Today, I am introducing, with my colleague Congressman GUS BILIRAKIS, legislation urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

In 1993, the European Union defined the membership criteria for accession to the European Union at the Copenhagen European Council, obligating candidate countries to have achieved certain levels of reform, including stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, and human rights, and respect for and protection of minorities. Since accession negotiations with the EU began in 2005, Turkey has failed to recognize the Ecumenical Patriarchate's international status as the spiritual home of the world's oldest and second largest Christian Church that includes more than 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide.

Moreover, the Government of Turkey has limited the candidates available to the Holy Synod of the Greek Orthodox Church for selection as the Ecumenical Patriarchate to Turkish nationals and reneged on its agreement to reopen the Theological School at Halki, thus impeding training for the Orthodox clergy in that country.

This resolution calls on Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by granting it the right to train clergy of all nationalities, not just Turkish nationals, and respecting the human rights and property rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Additionally, the resolution encourages Turkey to continue the processes and programs to modernize and democratize its own society and prove that it is ready to meet the criteria set forth by the Copenhagen European Council prior to its accession into the EU.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE FRY SCHOLARSHIP

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to improve the Marine Gunnery Sgt. John David Fry Scholarship.

Since 9/11, over 6,500 of our brave men and women in uniform have given their lives to protect our freedom. That number is tragic enough. But left behind by many of these soldiers is a family: wives, husbands, sons, and daughters. I think we all agree that we should do everything we can to help these families after their loved one makes the ultimate sacrifice.

My wife, Beverly, and I have come to know many of these families. We have visited with them at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center. We have been to the funerals. It especially breaks our hearts to think about the children.

In 2009 the Fry Scholarship signed into law as a part of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–32). The clear purpose of this measure was to promise Post-9/11 GI Bill educational benefits to the children of soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Unfortunately, due to a technicality in the law that restricts eligibility to the child of a soldier who "dies in line of duty while serving on active duty," some children of fallen soldiers have not been able to qualify for the scholarship.

During the early days of the War Against Terror, many active duty service members who suffered mortal injuries were medically retired to veteran status on the battlefield. The Department of Veterans' Affairs has informed me that despite the intent of the law, the children of these soldiers are technically ineligible for the scholarship.

The definition under current law is confusing for families and even for the VA. I have been made aware of instances where a child was able to receive scholarship money, and then was later asked by the VA to pay those benefits back.

My legislation clarifies that the children of a soldier who dies "as a result of a service-connected disability" is eligible for the Fry Scholarship.

This is a small change in the law that could make a big difference for the children we will help go to college. It is my hope that we can work together on this issue to get this fix signed into law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote number 79 on Ordering the Previous Question regarding the "Providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) Congressional Budget, 2014; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress; and for other purposes" (H. Res 122). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

I missed rollcall vote number 80 on Agreeing to the Resolution regarding the "Providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) Congressional Budget, 2014; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress; and for other purposes" (H. Res 122). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

I missed rollcall vote number 81 regarding the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

I missed rollcall vote number 82 regarding the "Providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress" (H. Res. 115). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

COMMEMORATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Women's History Month. This celebration is so important because it provides us with an opportunity to recall the many ways in which women have shaped our Nation's history. It provides a time to reflect on their fight to achieve equality but also the work that remains to ensure that we are a society where our daughters have the same opportunities as our sons. During this month, I can't help but to be reminded of the countless women who have had an indelible impact on our Nation's history.

My home state of Florida was the beneficiary of the tireless work of one such woman, Marjory Stoneman Douglas. A writer, journalist, environmentalist, and feminist, Ms. Douglas lived a life of purpose and resolve until she died at the age of one-hundred and eight.

Among her many worthy endeavors, was her tireless advocacy for the Everglades. With her seminal work, The Everglades: River of Grass, Ms. Douglas transformed the public's perception of the Everglades from that of an inhabitable swamp, to a vital facet of South Florida's ecosystem and a true national treasure.

Her work as an advocate for the less fortunate and for the Everglades continues to reverberate throughout Florida and the nation.

It is women like Ms. Douglas who make the United States what it is today. Their commitment to their communities and to their country continues to bring our Nation closer to realizing the ideals on which it was founded.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the women who have shaped our history, I remind my colleagues that while the month of March may come to an end, the fight for equality continues for our daughters, sisters, and mothers.

TRIBUTE TO ZACHARIAH JOHN McDOWELL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Urbandale police officer Zachariah McDowell for his lifesaving efforts in the line of duty.

On Sunday evening, March 10th, 2013, Officer McDowell was on a routine patrol of Urbandale, Iowa when he responded to a report of a burning car in the parking lot of a nearby church. As Zac approached the car to investigate, he could make out only a human hand amid the consuming smoke that filled the vehicle. Officer McDowell wasted no time smashing in the passenger side window with his metal baton, entering the burning vehicle, and dragging the young accident victim to safety. There is no doubt that Officer McDowell's quick thinking and heroic actions saved a young man's life that snowy night.

Officer McDowell's entire professional life has been one of service and sacrifice. He began his law enforcement career by serving in the Iowa Army National Guard where he was recognized as the Iowa Soldier of the Year in 2006. Officer McDowell was honorably discharged from the military as a Staff Sergeant in 2011, after 12 years of service and two separate deployments to Kosovo in 2003 and Iraq in 2007. Today, Zac is a model member of the Urbandale Police Department and resides in Urbandale with his wife of seven years, Nichole, and their two children, Wesley and Maggie.

Mr. Speaker, Officer McDowell's instinct and brave actions to save a fellow Iowan embody the selfless attributes we all should strive for. His extraordinary display of heroism should give us all pause as we offer gratitude to the police officers across the country who put their own welfare at risk to make our streets and neighborhoods safer. It is a great honor to represent Officer McDowell and the City of Urbandale in the United States Congress, and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating and thanking Officer McDowell for his outstanding performance and courage when it truly mattered most.

MARKING 192 YEARS OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 192nd anniversary of Greek independence. I am proud to join the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues in saluting the Greek people for their valiant struggle in winning independence for their nation 192 years ago and in re-affirming the bonds between our two great nations and people.

On March 25, we mark the anniversary of the revolution that liberated Greece from the Ottoman Empire. As we do so, we honor the struggle and perseverance of those Greeks who believed in their right to govern themselves and willingly laid their lives on the line as they fought for democracy. The proud democratic traditions and philosophies of Ancient Greek civilization have served as a light of inspiration to many people and nations throughout history, including our own nation's founders.

For centuries, America and Greece have built an enduring partnership based on shared values. The countless contributions of the Greek people, both to their own country and as immigrants to the United States, and in my home state of New York, continue to leave an indelible mark on our two nations.

As with our own Independence Day, this anniversary of the birth of modern Greece reminds us of the sacrifices made by those who risk—and sometimes lose—everything in pursuit of the ideals and ways of life they hold most dear.

Today, in solidarity with Greece, we reaffirm those values and ideals and honor our freedom, democracy, and friendship with the Greek people.

INTRODUCING THE MARCH FOR MILITARY WOMEN ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Military Access to Reproductive Care and Health, MARCH, for Military Women Act, legislation that will help our servicewomen gain the same access to reproductive health services as all other American women. It is deeply unfair that women who put their lives on the line for this country are denied the rights of the Constitution that they honorably defend.

Recent changes in policy have brought the treatment of military women more in line with the rest of women in America by allowing insurance coverage of abortion in the case of rape or incest. However, servicewomen are still not permitted to pay privately—using their own personal funds—for an abortion under any other circumstances. This policy is discriminatory, denying women in the military a Constitutionally protected right. Furthermore, it endangers the health of our servicewomen, who depend on their base hospitals for medical care, especially in countries where local facilities are inadequate or unavailable. More than 200,000 women (active service members, spouses, and dependents of military personnel) live on military bases overseas and rely on military hospitals for their health care.

Prohibiting access to abortions on military bases means that servicewomen may be forced to rely on unsafe local facilities. Failing that, a servicewoman would need to request permission from her supervisor to leave her combat mission and return to the United States. This impairs the readiness of our forces who are quite literally on the front lines, and it should not be allowed to continue. Our servicewomen deserve the right to determine their own destiny, without risking their health unnecessarily.

I want to be clear that if this bill became law, no taxpayer dollars would be spent for abortion care at overseas military facilities, and the military's current "conscience clauses" would remain intact so that no doctor would be forced to provide abortion care against their will. Passage of this bill would simply mean that our military women have the same rights as all other American women when it comes to reproductive health services. It is an issue of equality and fairness.

Our servicewomen deserve to be treated as full equals, and to have the same access to safe reproductive health care as any other American woman. I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support the MARCH for Military Women Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 55 I missed the vote due to an illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

KEN SIMPSON—A NORTH CAROLINA AND AMERICAN HERO

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, if somehow America could combine in one human being all the qualities we admire in our fighting men—bravery, strength, skill, determination, loyalty, patriotism, and compassion for his fellow soldier—since the middle of the 20th century—its name would have been Kenneth Walton Simpson of North Carolina.

The list of men and women to whom America owes a debt of gratitude is long indeed, and prominent on that list is Kenneth Simpson.

This is a small expression of that gratitude to this honest-to-goodness American fighting man who, now an octogenarian, spent 23 years serving this country as a soldier, who performed his duties gallantly and with remarkable heroism, then retired without the array of military decorations that perhaps should have adorned the last uniform he wore.

The essence of this fighting man has been captured in a new book, Warrior: From Grenades to Greeting Cards, the True Story of an American Fighting Man, by North Carolina author Wilt Browning. Wilt is my constituent and friend and a noted journalist and author.

Simpson's story is the stuff of heroism, American style. It is as though he was from childhood destined to be a fighting man, and in his post-military career his fighting spirit remarkably wound up shaping an American industry in the second half of the century.

Ken once was perhaps the youngest American fighting man since the Civil War. At the age of just 14, he talked his way into the fight when World War II was raging. When the Navy found out that this seaman assigned to the destroyer escort USS *Edwin A. Howard* was far younger than he had claimed, they put him ashore in the Philippines. He spent two months hitch-hiking his way back to North Carolina in something of a Huckleberry Finn odyssey. He still calls that journey the greatest adventure of his life. ''What young boy wouldn't love an adventure like that?'' he still asks today, puzzled that most of us would find such a challenge daunting indeed.

Ken wasn't about to let a little thing like age keep him from serving his country, and when he turned 18 he legally signed on once again, this time in the Army. His fighting days had only just begun. He rose through the ranks as an enlisted man and then an officer, a man's man in charge of men. It was during the Korean Conflict that the rare commitment and courage of this man was most remarkable. Again and again, he led his men into battle and never lost a one though he on several occasions personally braved enemy fire to return to the battlefield to rescue wounded fallen comrades. Once wounded himself, he was ordered by doctors to recuperate far from the sounds of battle. He refused to leave his men, and returned to the front lines once again and to more battles.

To this day, Ken carries in his aging body the shrapnel from twice having been blown up by grenades, and he bears the scars that testify to the fact that he has faced and survived many battles.

He served our country for all those years as a military man, and then he served his fellow Americans as something of a rogue in the greeting card industry. And he did that so well that his efforts saved two major national companies from disappearing prematurely at the hands of corporate raiders and kept hundreds of Americans at work for years in the greeting card industry.

Simpson lives a quiet life now in a home atop Walker Bald, a tall mountain in western North Carolina, which he shares with his wife Laura. Though his steps have slowed and his hearing is no longer as keen as it once was—despite the concussions of nearby exploding grenades of the past—he remains the epitome of an American fighting man.

And America owes Kenneth Walton Simpson and fighting men such as him our sincere appreciation. On behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, I am proud to bring his story to light through this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to highlight Wilt Browning's outstanding book about an outstanding North Carolina and American hero.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER SOMA

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jennifer Soma for being named a 2013 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2013 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Jennifer Soma oversees product development and new initiatives in the individual disability insurance business for Principal Financial Group Inc. In this role, Jennifer serves as a liaison between the operations, quality assurance and information technology facets of the business. Outside of the office, Jennifer spends nearly 30 hours a week in various volunteer roles to make her community better. One of Ms. Soma's biggest passions is her dedication to animal welfare. Before working for Principal, Jennifer worked for the Animal Rescue League of Iowa in numerous roles including major rescue efforts in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and Iowa flooding. Ms. Soma certainly takes her causes home with her as she shares her Ankeny home with her four senior rescue dogs and continues to advocate for animals through her efforts at Iowa Voters for Companion Animals/Iowa Friends of Companion Animals. Also a big supporter and alumnus of Drake University, Jennifer currently chairs Drake's Graduate Student Advisory Council. Last year, Jennifer's numerous volunteer efforts earned her the recognition of the U.S. Presidential Volunteer Service Award—Gold Level for volunteering more than 1,000 hours of her time. In all facets of her life, Jennifer is an example of hard work and service that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jennifer in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Soma for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jennifer on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING THE INTERNATIONAL CENTENNIAL PLANNING CONFERENCE PREPARING FOR THE ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD WAR I

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to welcome and acknowledge our national and international visitors to the International Centennial Planning Conference. The conference is being hosted by the National World War I Museum, located in Missouri's Fifth District, on March 22–24, 2013. With the recent enactment of Public Law 112–272 to establish a World War I Centennial Commission, it is vital that the exchange with our historical counterparts begin.

This was the first global war, declared on July 28, 1914, after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The United States entered the war in 1917 and concluded with the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918. The world would never be the same as the ramifications changed nations, warfare and technology. The reality of war comes with the understanding of its effects, not only geographically but on the military and all of the people who endured the suffering of war.

Representatives and scholars from the allied nations of Australia, France, Canada, Germany, United Kingdom, and Belgium will join representatives from the United States to exchange ideas on international planning for the Centennial. This workshop will foster coordination of commemorating these historical events and rediscovery of our combined involvement in World War I. The lessons of war will be discussed and viewed through an international prism to obtain a better understanding of how the ''War to End All Wars'' impacted and changed the course of history.

In Kansas City, we have progressed as a city under the flame of the Liberty Memorial. The Liberty Memorial stands as a testimonial to the past and a quest for our world living in peace. Since my time as Mayor of Kansas City, I have considered the Liberty Memorial and now the National World War I Museum a treasure worth fighting to protect and preserve.

As the World War I Centennial Commission's twelve members meet to plan for the commemorative events across our nation, it will do so under the flame of the Liberty Memorial and benefit from the work garnered from this planning conference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues in the House join me in wishing the participants of the International Centennial Planning Conference success in their collaboration. There is a lot of work to do in honoring and commemorating the history from our first global war.

ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the anniversary of Greek Independence Day, in recognition of the courageous revolution that freed the people of Greece from the Ottoman Empire and established the modern Hellenic Republic. We come together to recognize Greek Independence in advance this year because the U.S. Congress will not be in session on March 25th.

There is no doubt that Greece's struggle for freedom from the Ottoman Empire is one which inspired the world. Carrying out a bold and inspired revolution, the people of Greece set an example for others in the region and globally. Their commitment to genuine self-determination made it possible for millions to determine their own future rather than continue a pattern of subjugation.

And, since establishing diplomatic relations with the United States, Greece has joined our own country in many cooperative endeavors, including during World War II in the fight against fascism. Today, the United States and Greece are not only partners in commerce,

but have forged international alliances in many areas, including business, tourism and international security.

Greece has also been a source of immigrant communities that have helped build the United States, and Greek-Americans proudly contribute to our society in the arts, sciences, business, politics and sports.

There can be no doubt that Greece faces tough times. The economic downturn has created difficult and ongoing challenges and hardships. Yet, the spirit of Greek Independence is alive and well in Greece and throughout the diaspora. I have no doubt that Greece is going to come back stronger than ever. I am proud to call Greece and the Greek people friends and allies, and the United States cherishes a continued friendship based on mutual values and trust.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, April 10th will mark the 34th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, legislation designed to ''help maintain peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific'' and promote the ''continuation of commercial, cultural, and other relations'' between the American and Taiwanese people.

Since this legislation's passage, Taiwan has become an economic powerhouse and a beacon of democracy in Southeast Asia. Taiwan is also a major consumer of American products—importing over $267 million in goods from my home state of North Carolina in 2011. In addition to being our 9th largest trading partner, Taiwan is the largest per capita importer of U.S. farm products in the world.

I am therefore pleased that trade talks between the United States and Taiwan, as part of the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, began recently after a six-year hiatus. My hope is that these discussions will bear fruit and help strengthen our vibrant commercial partnership with Taiwan.

For these reasons, and many others, it seems appropriate to mark this occasion and highlight my sincere hope that the American and Taiwanese people will continue to work together in friendship to promote shared prosperity and further our mutual interests.

HONORING MILDRED MANNING, ANGEL OF CORREGIDOR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the legacy of a great American woman, Mildred Manning, a World War II Veteran, POW, and nurse in the Army Nurse Corps. Ms. Manning was the last survivor of the 66 nurses who were taken into captivity by the Japanese in May of 1942 on the island of Corregidor.

Ms. Manning was born in rural Georgia on July 11, 1914. She graduated from the Grady Memorial Hospital School of Nursing in Atlanta and was head nurse at Grady before entering military service when she enlisted in the Army Nurse Corps in 1939.

Ms. Manning was stationed in the Philippines at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. She spent the first five months of the war treating servicemen at field hospitals in the Philippines, most notably during the retreat to the Bataan Peninsula, and then on Corregidor. After the U.S. surrender at Corregidor, Ms. Manning was taken prisoner.

She spent the next 33 months under guard at an internment camp, where she faced near-starvation and disease while treating nearly 4,000 men, women, and children. In the winter of 1945, Ms. Manning and the other nurses were finally liberated. For her service to this Nation, Ms. Manning received a Bronze Star and a message of gratitude from President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Two weeks ago, on March 8, 2013, Ms. Manning passed away in Hopewell, NJ at the age of 98. She is survived by her son, James Manning, and daughter, March Price, five grandchildren and a great-grandson. Her husband, Arthur Brewster Manning, died in 1994 and their youngest son, William D. Manning, died in 2006.

Ms. Manning once said of her internment, ''I came out so much better than many of my friends, I have never been bitter, and I have always known that if I could survive that, I could survive anything.''

Mr. Speaker, how privileged I am to be able to honor her life and pay tribute to her outstanding service to this nation.

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act.''

I authored this legislation to authorize and improve the Transportation Security Administration's, TSA, Wounded Warrior/Military Severely Injured Joint Support Operations Program, which facilitates and expedites the passenger screening process for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

Customer service at airport checkpoints is an issue that evokes passionate reactions from constituents across the Nation. As a representative from Hawaii, one of the country's foremost vacation destinations, I have a special interest in ensuring that the screening experience is as effective and smooth as possible. Unfortunately, too often, we hear stories from our constituents and visitors about time-consuming, inconvenient, and invasive TSA checkpoint searches. For wounded members of the Armed Forces and veterans, however, this ordeal can be a particularly difficult experience due to the nature of both their injuries and disabilities and TSA's strict screening requirements.

Recognizing the need to improve customer service for all passengers, particularly those with a disability or hindering medical condition, TSA has, in recent years, established several alternative methods of screening, including TSA's Wounded Warrior Screening Program.

Under the Wounded Warrior Screening Program, a severely injured or disabled service member, veteran, or family member contacts the program's Operation Center at TSA before a flight to arrange expedited screening. An officer at the Operations Center then notifies the appropriate personnel at the involved airports to ensure that screening is conducted in such a way as to make the screening experience as simple as possible.

The establishment of the Wounded Warrior Screening Program is a positive step. However, through my work on the Committee on Homeland Security, I have spoken with advocates of members of the Armed Forces and veterans and have come to learn that the program could be improved. In particular, as implemented in the field, there is a lack of consistency that needs to be addressed. Some wounded warriors have reported a lack of sensitivity and respect for privacy during the screening experience. Certainly, active engagement with advocate organizations would improve the program and help ensure that it accomplishes its goal.

To improve the program, the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act'' requires:

TSA to develop a process to expedite screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and veterans that protects the privacy of the individual being screened; requires TSA to consult with advocacy organizations to ensure that TSA is addressing the needs of wounded warriors to the best of their ability; mandates training of Transportation Security Officers on the expedited screening process protocols; requires TSA to maintain an operations center that severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and veterans can contact for assistance in advance of flying; and requires TSA to report to Congress on its progress in implementing the screening our Nation's wounded warriors and veterans deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act'' is an important, bipartisan bill, crafted in consultation with advocacy organizations.

It comes in response to documented grievances associated with airport checkpoints and represents an important step we can take in acknowledging the service of our Nation's heroes.

Just this week, we got reports of the difficulty a Marine at Phoenix's Sky Harbor airport had during the screening process.

The ''Helping Heroes Fly Act'' will ensure TSA establishes the policies that will allow them to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act'' so that we can ease the screening process for my fellow service members and show them the respect and honor they have earned.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN RECOGNITION OF AMERICAN RED CROSS MONTH

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of March as American Red Cross Month. For over 130 years the American Red

Cross has been helping people in need. Now is an excellent time to recognize not only the Red Cross, but each member of the community who contributes to this great organization through volunteering, giving blood, taking life saving classes or providing financial support.

The local Red Cross in Kansas City, Missouri, in my district, serves a population of more than 2.6 million people. Last year they financially assisted more than 1,000 families with local disasters such as home fires. The Kansas City Red Cross served the U.S. Military by providing 2,350 Services to the Armed Forces cases. More than 23,000 attended Red Cross community presentations, most of them being on how to prepare for disasters. Within the region, 38,372 people took Red Cross courses. Most of those were for CPR and first aid.

There are 70,000 disasters that the American Red Cross responds to each year in this country alone, ranging from home fires affecting one family to hurricanes affecting tens of thousands. This past year the Red Cross played a vital role in disaster relief during super storm Sandy, the Colorado Wildfires and Hurricane Isaac. It also released a series of free apps to aid in disaster preparedness, ranging from addressing tornado and hurricane threats to providing first aid advice and assistance in locating Red Cross Shelters.

An average of 150,000 military families and veterans receive assistance from the Red Cross annually. Support for wounded soldiers, resiliency training, linking military families during an emergency and connecting families with local community resources are a few of the ways the Red Cross assists the U.S. Military and its veterans.

Nearly 4 million people donate blood each year, providing more than 40% of America's blood supply, making the American Red Cross the single largest supplier of blood in the U.S. It is also the nation's leader in providing health and safety classes such as CPR, First Aid and Lifeguard training that more than 9 million American's participate in. Such education is vital in preparing citizens to help others in an emergency.

The American Red Cross provides a plethora of supportive programs for not only citizens of my district, and districts around this country, but also for people all over the world. International services provided by the Red Cross reach out to communities in over 80 developing countries. More than one billion children have been vaccinated thanks to the Measles and Rubella Initiative that was launched in 2001. Countless families torn apart by war or disaster from as far back as World War II have been reunited through the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that this Congress pay tribute to the Red Cross and the millions of Americans who lend their efforts to its success. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of American Red Cross Month and honor all that this organization has done for our great country.

HONORING DR. THOMAS C. ROSENTHAL UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Dr. Thomas C. Rosenthal upon the occasion of his retirement from the University at Buffalo's Department of Family Medicine. As Chair of the department for twenty years, Dr. Rosenthal has made significant contributions to the field of public health in both academic research and patient practice, committed to improving the quality of health in the most underserved populations.

Beginning his career in rural medicine in 1978, Dr. Rosenthal's love of research led to his position at the University at Buffalo. Dr. Rosenthal's prolific research publications demonstrate his comprehensive expertise in his field. His published work spans from articles in chemistry journals to topics in primary care, such as cancer screening and Alzheimer's disease. He is board-certified in Family Medicine and Geriatrics, and holds membership on the esteemed Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education's Residency Review Committee for Family Medicine.

During his time at the University at Buffalo, Dr. Rosenthal has educated thousands of students, practitioners, and community members about public health. His passion for rural health motivated him to create the Buffalo Family Medicine residency program's Rural Health Campus in Olean, New York. Only the second such training model in the country, the Rural Health Campus allows students to gain firsthand knowledge of the unique healthcare needs of our nation's rural communities.

A trusted figure in his field, Dr. Rosenthal serves as the lead editor of the textbook Office Care Geriatrics, and as a reviewer for nine other journals. From 2006 to 2009, he edited The Journal of Rural Health. Throughout his illustrious career, he has sat on numerous national and statewide panels, including: the New York Rural Health Council, the Association of American Medical College Task Force on Rural Education, the New York State Academy of Family Physicians Education Committee, the policy board of the National Rural Health Association, and the Bioterrorism Task Force of the Medical Society of New York State.

Dr. Rosenthal pioneered an interdisciplinary approach to public health, combining real-world practice with academic study, dedicated to bettering the quality of health in underserved communities. His health services research, which includes rural health, medical training, health care organization and workforce development, informs his patient practice, and vice versa.

Dr. Rosenthal is known as much for compassionate practice as for his impressive academic career. He has drastically increased awareness of the dire public health crisis in medically underserved communities, and passionately strives to improve quality of health in the community's most suffering areas. He continues to see patients in the Jefferson Family Medicine Center, located in a poor neighborhood on Buffalo's East Side.

In 1998, Dr. Rosenthal became the Founding Director of the New York State Area Health Education Center, AHEC, System. Today, he continues to serve as statewide Medical Director. This truly revolutionary organization strives towards Dr. Rosenthal's goal to improve access to quality health care in medically underserved communities on local, regional, and statewide levels, by encouraging both patients and practitioners to work together. The AHEC System joins with pre-existing institutions to bring dedicated healthcare professionals to communities in need, and educate community members about personal health care. By engaging devoted practitioners and empowering patients, the AHEC System has made enormous strides in combating our public health crisis.

Mr. Speaker, please join my colleagues and I in honoring Dr. Thomas C. Rosenthal as he retires from the University at Buffalo's Department of Family Medicine. I admire his compassionate and visionary approach to public health, and wish him Godspeed in all of his future endeavors.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1278, THE NONDISPARAGEMENT OF NATIVE AMERICAN PERSONS OR PEOPLES IN TRADEMARK REGISTRATION ACT OF 2013

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues and with the American people a particular issue that has been a source of humiliation for our Native American people—the use of the word ''redskin,'' which I will refer to as the ''R-word.'' This derogatory and racist term is rooted in state-sponsored genocide efforts when colonies paid individuals for the skins of dead Indians. The Native American community has never accepted the ''R-word'' as anything more than a hurtful, disparaging label that is a reminder of the maltreatment they have endured.

Some may argue that the ''R-word'' is no longer disparaging towards Native Americans. However, over the course of my tenure as a Congressman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, and as a member of the Congressional Native American Caucus, I have received an increasing flow of calls and letters from Native American individuals, tribes, and organizations who abhor this denigrating term. It is their opinion that the ''R-word'' is a racial stereotype that causes harm to the collective self-esteem of the American Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, this term has no place in our modern American society. It is akin to the ''N-word'' which reflects the history of prejudice and persecution that our African American brothers and sisters endured. Can you imagine the public outcry that would result if a Pro-Football team was named the ''N-word?''

In 1933, the District of Columbia's professional football team adopted the ''R-word'' as its name and mascot. In 1967, the United States Patent and Trademark Office, PTO, granted the team a federally registered trademark for the ''R-word.'' This action is contrary to the mandates of the Trademark Act of 1946 (Lanham Act) which requires the PTO to

refuse to register any trademark that "[c]onsists of or comprises . . . matter which may disparage . . . persons, living or dead . . . or bring them into contempt, or disrepute." 15 U.S.C. 1502(a). The PTO has denied registration of trademarks using the "R-word" on four separate occasions on grounds of disparagement—three times in 1996 and once in 2002.

In 1992, seven prominent Native American leaders petitioned the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, TTAB, to cancel the federal registrations over six trademarks using the "R-word." The TTAB in 1999 ruled that the "R-word" may, in fact, disparage American Indians, and cancelled the registrations. On appeal, a federal court reversed the TTAB's decision, holding that the petitioners waited too long after coming of age to file their petition. A new group of young Native Americans petitioned the TTAB to cancel the registrations of the offending trademarks in 2006. The TTAB held a hearing on March 7, 2013. A final decision is pending.

Mr. Speaker, despite the indigenous community's efforts before administrative agencies and the courts, the "R-word" remains protected as a federally registered trademark. Since the federal government made the mistake in registering the disparaging trademark, it is now up to Congress to correct that mistake. Now is the time to end this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 1278, the "Non-Disparagement of Native American Persons or Peoples in Trademark Registration Act of 2013." I want to thank the following members for their support as original cosponsors of this historic legislation: TOM COLE (R–OK), BETTY MCCOLLUM (D–MN), ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON (D–DC), RAÚL Grijalva (D–AZ), KAREN BASS (D–CA), GWEN MOORE (D–WI), JOHN LEWIS (D–GA), MICHAEL HONDA (D–CA), and DONNA CHRISTENSEN (D–VI).

H.R. 1278 is also endorsed by the following organizations: National Congress of American Indians, NCAI, Morning Star Institute, International Indian Treaty Council, Native American Rights Fund, American Indian Movement—West, American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Americans for Indian Opportunity, Capitol Area Indian Resources, Inc., American Indian Studies—University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Program on Information Justice and Intellectual Property—American University, Alianza Indigena Sin Fronteras (Indigenous Alliance Without Borders), National Indian Education Association, Native American Finance Officers Association, and Tulsa Indian Coalition Against Racism. These organizations have indicated in letters of support for H.R. 1278 that the "R-word" continues to have damaging effects in the Native American community.

H.R. 1278 would cancel existing federal registrations for trademarks using the "R-word." It would also deny registration for new trademarks incorporating the "R-word." As in the decision made by TTAB in 1999, it ruled, in fact, that the "R-word" was a disparaging term.

As an avid sports fan, I applaud the excellence in athleticism and leadership demonstrated by our professional athletes both on and off the field. I am also very proud of the many Samoans and Pacific Islanders who have had much success in sports, particularly in the NFL. While I acknowledge the D.C. professional football team's many achievements, I have grave reservations concerning their name.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that H.R. 1278 is not an attempt to censor or remove the freedom of the D.C. professional football team to use the "R-word" in its franchise. Rather, this legislation seeks to reinforce governing law that prohibits federal registration for disparaging terms, like the "R-word." It is unfortunate that the federal government, which has a special trust relationship with Native Americans, continues to protect this racial slur.

It is my hope that H.R. 1278 will advance the dialogue regarding the "R-word" among our legislators. I also invite those with a vested interest in this issue, including the owner of the D.C. professional football team, to bring their concerns to the table.

RECOGNIZING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHILD CARE CENTER WITH THE 2012 EMPLOYEE EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Chief Administrative Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives is recognizing the House of Representatives Child Care Center, HRCCC, team with the 2012 Employee Excellence Award, which is sponsored by the Officers and Inspector General of the U.S. House of Representatives. The award recognizes employees from each entity who have provided outstanding performance to their employer and who have demonstrated a superior attitude and demeanor in service to the House over the period of the last year.

The employees of the HRCCC have demonstrated a high level of drive, determination and commitment over the past year. They are dedicated not only to the children, but also to their parents, the CAO and the House community at-large.

While we recognize the HRCCC as a team I would also like to recognize each teacher and staff member individually today.

Ladonya Allen
Monica Barnabae
Paige Beatty
Sherleen Boyde
Erica Doody
Suzette Drexel-Carpenter
Shamorrow Hall
Contrinia Hemphill
Suzanne Hite
Michelle Jones
Nicole Price
Jennifer Sekhar
Sharon Steele
Ann Vogel
Kathleen Williams
Fareen Wu

Congratulations to the House of Representatives Child Care Center team.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 192ND ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 192nd anniversary of Greek Independence. On this day, we honor the memory and sacrifice of those who fought and died to free their nation from occupation. The revolution brought independence to the Greece and confidence to other oppressed peoples around the world who also yearned for freedom. The message the Greek people sent out to the world in 1821 continues to reverberate today as a beacon of hope to those who seek the right of self-determination. When we recognize Greek Independence Day we reaffirm the ideals and values that inspired Thomas Jefferson to say that Americans owe the ancient Greeks a great debt for showing us the light and helping to lead us out of darkness. Each year that we honor Greek Independence, we acknowledge that debt, and by our example, let oppressed people know that we stand with them in their quest for freedom.

RECOGNIZING MRS. EVELYN L. PORTEUS ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of Mrs. Evelyn L. Porteus, who will be turning 100 years old on April 26, 2013.

Evelyn was a resident of Schoharie, NY for 50 years, where she worked one of her favorite jobs as a docent at the Old Stone Fort—originally a church turned into a fort during the American Revolutionary War. Prior to that, Evelyn was a former graduate (class of 1933) of and teacher at Oneonta Normal School in New York.

She lovingly raised a family of four children, and has six grandchildren, including one great-grandchild. She now lives at the Wesley Health Care Center in Saratoga Springs, NY, where she has resided for the past 12 years.

Evelyn has witnessed momentous changes in our nation's history. Her life reflects a contribution to that history. I hope her century of memories brings much pride and joy to herself and family members.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Evelyn on this remarkable milestone. I wish her a special day shared in the company of her family and friends and all the best in the years ahead.

RECOGNIZING RUSSELL J. SALVATORE AS EXECUTIVE OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Russell J. Salvatore as the Buffalo Niagara Sales & Marketing Executives' choice for their 2012 Executive of the Year. Russ is a talented businessman, food service visionary and generous philanthropist, who is truly inspired by his love of the people of Western New York.

From an early age, Russ saw the great potential for service through entrepreneurship through his father, Joseph Salvatore. Joseph owned Salvatore's Restaurant, a family eatery on Buffalo's East Side. Growing up his father's restaurant, Russ developed a passion for service, tireless work ethic, and an appreciation for the value of a warm meal.

Joseph passed the family business down to Russ and his brother in 1967. Shortly after, Russ pursued his own endeavors, purchasing a small hot dog stand on Transit Road and transforming it into Salvatore's Italian Gardens. For nearly forty years, Russ lived and breathed Salvatore's. His tireless work turned Salvatore's Italian Gardens into a renowned restaurant and banquet center, winner of countless awards and national recognition. By 1995, Salvatore's had become a destination in its own right, allowing Russ to open an attached hotel, Salvatore's Garden Palace. Russ truly enjoyed every aspect of his daily work, and although he signed over the business to his son Joseph in 2003, he remained closely involved until 2006, when he chose to retire.

Russ's passion for serving Western New York drew him out of retirement before long. He returned to work at age 75, opening Russell's Steaks, Chops, and More, in November 2008. Russell's quickly became one of our region's most prominent steakhouses. The month after, Russ opened Salvatore's Grand Hotel next to his new restaurant, creating another successful combination of a well-regarded hotel and fine dining establishment.

Russ's philanthropic efforts are as renowned as his business endeavors. He is a public supporter of countless charities, events, scholarships, and causes. To encourage students pursuing careers in food service and hospitality, he formed a partnership with Trocaire College to found the Russell J. Salvatore School of Hospitality and Business. Situated on a satellite campus next to his new steakhouse, students at the school gain concrete experience through internships at Russell's Steaks, Chops and More, and Salvatore's Grand Hotel.

In the wake of one of our region's most tragic days, Russ stepped in to aid heartbroken local families. On February 12, 2009, a passenger plane known as Flight 3407 crashed to the ground in Clarence Center, New York, killing all on board. To honor the fifty victims, Russ helped secure a memorial in Heroes and Patriots Park.

Perhaps one of Russ's most well-known gestures is his purchase of 10,000 Buffalo Bills tickets, which prevented a ''black-out'' of a home game in December 2012. Russ's investment allowed one of the season's last games to be broadcast on local television. He donated nearly all 10,000 tickets to local organizations, patrons of his restaurant, and community members, to show his deep gratitude to the people of Western New York.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize Mr. Russell Salvatore's great contributions and admirable generosity. Buffalo is nicknamed the ''City of Good Neighbors,'' and Russ epitomizes this spirit. I congratulate him on the incredible honor of being named Executive of the Year, and I wish him continued fulfillment and the absolute best in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING MAINE MAPLE SUNDAY

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Maine's maple syrup producers in celebrating Maine Maple Sunday on March 24, 2013.

The history of maple syrup in Maine dates back to before the colonists first landed on our shores. Native American tribes from throughout the Northeast first developed the practice of drawing sugar and syrup from the sap of maple trees. Hundreds of years later, maple syrup remains a staple of Maine's economy and cultural heritage.

Maine Maple Sunday is always held on the fourth Sunday in March. Sugarhouses open their doors on this day to offer free samples and demonstrations to enthusiastic customers from all over the Northeast. Nurtured by Maine's unique soils and climate, the maple syrup on display during Maple Sunday is among the finest in the world.

I would like to extend a special thank you to Arnold and Elaine Luce of Anson, T.A. Greene of Sebago, the family of the late Linwood Foster of Skowhegan, John Hodgkins of Yarmouth, Robert Smith of Skowhegan, the family of the late Chester Basford of Fairfield, John and Eva Steeves of Skowhegan, and Pete Tracy of Farmington for their hard work in making Maine Maple Sunday possible. Their efforts are responsible for the successful continuation of one of Maine's oldest and proudest traditions.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating Maine's maple syrup producers on putting together another Maine Maple Sunday.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' BLOIS SEAL

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have known Judy Seal for many years and have respected, appreciated and admired her leadership on education issues in my district.

It was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of her father William ''Bill'' Blois Seal—a native Long Beach son who bravely served his country in war and later served his community as an educator for more than four decades.

Bill was born at Seaside Hospital in 1924, attended schools in Long Beach and graduated from Wilson High School.

Enlisting in the Army in 1942, Bill's youthful hobby of pigeon ing led him to service as a Pigeoneer in the U.S. Army. Homing pigeons and their handlers served in all fronts of the war, often times providing communications when other means were not available or too unsecure.

Bill was in the fourth wave to land at Omaha Beach during the Normandy Invasion and wound up spending his 20th birthday just days later in a foxhole on the Allied beachhead. He later served through the push across France and fought in the Battle of the Bulge, the last major German offensive of the war.

Selected for officer training, Bill's tour in Europe was cut short as he was sent back to the States. The war ended before Bill could be redeployed and he returned to Long Beach to continue his interrupted education.

He entered Long Beach City College, and then moved on to the University of Southern California where he earned both undergraduate and Master's degrees in education.

During this time, Bill married his high school sweetheart, Betty. They would remain married until her passing in 2011. They would go on to have three children: son Christopher and daughters Judy and Nancy.

As a young educator, Bill joined the Long Beach Unified School District, becoming part of the original faculty at both Stanford Junior High and Millikan High schools. His career eventually took him to back to Long Beach City College, where he had begun his higher education and where his own father had worked as a Dean.

At the end of his 43-year career in education, Bill had become a beloved figure in Long Beach, both for his educational work and for his work on behalf of Vietnam War veterans and the Cambodian community.

Bill passed away on March 15, 2013 at Long Beach Community Hospital in the arms of his beloved daughter, Judy.

THE KEYS TO LIFE: HONORING AN AMERICAN HERO, CORPORAL ADAM KEYS OF THE 618TH ENGINEER SUPPORT CO., THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Pennsylvania's most heroic sons, Adam Keys of the United States Army, 618th Engineer Combat Team. On July 14, 2010, while on patrol in his vehicle, a thousand pound IED went off, killing four of Adam's Brothers in Arms, including his best friend Jesse Reed. Adam and Jesse were close friends at White High School and joined the Army together. Close to death, miraculously Adam survived to begin his new battle. Adam lost his legs and an arm in this horrific attack. I have spent time with Adam and his mother, Julie Keys, on a number of occasions. Adam's bravery and Mrs. Keys' strength go unmatched. This poem, ''The Keys to Life,'' authored by Mr. Bert Caswell—a tireless and devoted advocate for our wounded warriors—is

in honor of Adam's courageous sacrifice for our nation and the inspiration he offers to his family, friends, and those he meets along his journey today.

THE KEYS TO LIFE

Along the road of life. . .
There are some Keys to so realize. . .
That which, we should all so live by!
Up which rise so very high,
up above all else which now so lies!
Where, faith and honor. . .
but so touch the sky!
That which so determines,
who we are as realized!
When, who so lives and so dies!
All in these the short moments of our lives. . .
All in that most magnificent code,
that which we should all so live by. . .
A code of honor,
that which so makes even the Angels cry!
That all in our stead,
so determines if we have so followed or led!
And so left behind!
When, to this world we say goodbye. . .
For The Greatest Things of All,
we find in hearts of courage full who come to call!
Who so serve our country armed with words like,
Strength In Honor, Faith and Courage. . .
who all in the darkest nights will not so be discouraged. . .
With words like Duty, Country, and God,
which so ranks the highest of them all. . .
As The Key To Life is so found,
all in a heart of faith which now so astound!
So very deep down,
inside of one's soul that which comes to call. . .
All in your most splendid life,
as Adam we have so saw. . .
Which brings such tears,
to even the Angel's eyes which now fall. . .
That gives one the strength to so courageously stand tall!
While, all those darkest of all nights of all!
As we so see Adam's fine heart so come to call!
But, to wear that uniform. . .
of The United States Army,
and march off to war with hearts of courage warm. . .
To so face of death,
but For The Greater Good all in a Heroes quest!
All in your most heroic sheen,
To But Be The Best!
And Adam,
when in that moment of truth,
as there you were so close to death!
As your fine life hung by just a thread. . .
As four of your Brothers In Arms,
now beside you so heroically lie dead!
And you so saw,
what this war had done. . .
and you so began to cry for your lost loved ones. . .
As it was all in that moment of truth,
as when you so gallantly denied death!
As your fine heart so chose to fight,
to rise up with not much left!
As you so dug deep down inside,
and so reached for the skies!
But, to Live or Die?
As somehow,
you so found that faith and courage to so survive!
As Pennsylvania's Pride,
as you so wiped away all of those tears from your eyes!
And you so began your new battle cry!
As all out on your road to recovery,
as you so passed them all so by!
As somehow we must catch up to you,
so try!
For it's all within your great heart of faith,
that you found the way. . .
But where The Key's To Life So Lie!
As you so unlocked all of that heartache and pain,
and would not compromise!
As your fine heart got up,
and so began to rise!
And for all of your fallen Brothers In Arms,
you so carry with you now inside!
As you so honor them all in this way,
all in what your most courageous life now portrays!
As you are Army Strong in every way!
Hoo. . . ah. . . as you so rebuild your life day after day!
For a heart can take us to places,
to where dreams are so made this!
Can so help us to win wars,
and bring us back from the dead as the world we so amaze!
Even without legs, and arms. . .
can help us walk again and hold the world in our arms this day!
For Adam they may take your strong arm and legs!
But, they can not so touch Adam,
what's within your fine heart of faith so armed!
Because, Adam you are Army Strong!
And your fine life is but a song,
a song of character and faith to us which now belongs. . .
With The Keys To Life to keep us strong!
So we better start running,
if we want to catch up to you!
Because, some people are put upon this earth. . .
To So Teach and So Beseech Us All In Their Great Worth!
So surely Adam,
as you have so shown us all what so truly comes first!
And your fine Mother,
who through thick and thin stood. . .
Has so stood by you in the very worst!
And helped you with your rebirth!
For these are The Keys To Life,
chapter and verse!
And if ever I have a son,
I wish he could be as courageous as this one!
Who with his fine heart of gold,
so shines like the morning sun,
for all of us to so behold!
Because Adam,
all in what your fine life is about. . .
Are also found the keys to Heaven no doubt!
As you have so bravely shown us all,
how to so live with and without!
But, up in Heaven. . .
you need not arms nor legs. . .
And Adam my son,
that's where you're going one fine day. . .
Up with our Lord where you will run. . .
For you have so shone us all,
The Keys to Life,
my son!

RECOGNIZING DR. WILLIAM J. MCKINNEY

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. William McKinney, a nationally recognized teacher, scholar, and academic leader, on his appointment as the 9th President of Valdosta State University and to wish him luck during his inaugural week.

Dr. McKinney earned a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering and a Bachelor of Arts in History from Bucknell University and both a Master of Arts in History and Philosophy and a Ph.D. at Indiana University-Bloomington. Prior to his appointment as Valdosta State University President, Dr. McKinney served as the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, as the Chairperson of Philosophy and Religion at Southeast Missouri State, and as Dean of the College of Humanities, Fine and Performing Arts at Slippery Rock University in Pennsylvania.

As a lifelong supporter of a liberal arts education, Dr. McKinney has published well over 100 papers, book chapters, and reviews on everything from environmental ethics to civic engagement. I know he will be an asset to the Valdosta State University Campus. I am proud to have him representing Valdosta State University and my home state. Congratulations, again, to Dr. McKinney. I look forward to working with him in the years to come.

HONORING THE CAREER OF CAPTAIN JOHN DEMARCO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary career of Captain John DeMarco, upon the occasion of his retirement from the Niagara Falls Police Department.

A third-generation police officer, Captain DeMarco has a proud family legacy of public service. His grandfather was well-known as a Niagara Falls motorcycle cop. His father was a chief in the New York State Park Police, serving for forty years. His brother, Bob, will remain active in the Niagara Falls Police force as a Juvenile Detective.

Prior to his career in the Niagara Falls Police Department, Captain DeMarco pursued higher education, earning a degree from Niagara University in 1972. After graduation, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps, honorably serving our nation for twelve years.

Upon returning home to Niagara Falls, Captain DeMarco earned a place in the police department's patrol unit. He rose through the ranks, becoming a patrol lieutenant, then a deputy to Superintendent Christopher Carlin in 2000. When Superintendent Carlin left for active military duty from November 2001 to October 2002, he entrusted Captain DeMarco to serve as acting police superintendent, a role he continued to serve under Carlin's successor, John Chella.

As an officer, Captain DeMarco understood and revered the police department's immense responsibility to protect their neighbors. He sought to build trusting relationships with community members, working in conjunction to create a safer Niagara Falls. Active within the community himself, he is a founding member of the Niagara Falls Law Enforcement Foundation and continues to serve on the Niagara Police Athletic League.

Captain DeMarco served Niagara Falls with great pride and bravery. On February 7, 2009, two fellow officers, Walter Nichols Jr. and Michael D. Bird, were shot on South Avenue. The police force united, performing at their

best to protect citizens and colleagues. Captain DeMarco valued the special bond between officers, and the great responsibility entrusted to the police force as the first to respond during crises.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to acknowledge the career of Captain John DeMarco. I am grateful for his twenty-six years of service to Niagara Falls, and I wish him the best of luck as he brings his expertise in law enforcement to his new role as a faculty member in the Niagara University Criminal Justice Department.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE COMPANY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the 150th anniversary of Fireman's Fund Insurance Company, which was established in the city of San Francisco in 1863, and which is now headquartered in my Congressional District in Novato, California. A celebration of this important milestone will be taking place on April 4th at the Old San Francisco Mint.

Fireman's Fund has been one of the nation's premier insurance companies, protecting the future for individuals, families, and businesses. Its own history parallels that of both this state and country. Fireman's Fund has insured the construction of national landmarks including the Hoover Dam, the Golden Gate Bridge, and Charles Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis.

It survived the Chicago Fire of 1871 and the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906, playing a critical role in rebuilding after the devastation. The company was also there when it mattered for many displaced people after the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989.

This company is a true innovator—the first insurance provider to write a standing grain policy in the U.S., the first carrier to offer nationwide automobile insurance and standardized homeowners insurance, and the first company to add ''green'' insurance to their offerings for homes and businesses.

The Fireman's Fund name, which is heralded in California, emanates from the founder's arrangement to pay 10 percent of the company's profits to support the widows and orphans of firefighters who died in the line of duty. That tradition continues today through the company's Heritage Program®, providing fire departments throughout the nation with life-saving equipment and training. Working in combination with its employees, agents and brokers, the company has distributed more than $30 million to support firefighters for safer communities since 2004. The company has also been a benefactor of numerous charities in the San Francisco Bay Area and its generosity has added tremendously to the vitality of our communities.

More than 1,200 Californians work for Fireman's Fund, with the majority of them residing in my own Congressional District. They are not only dedicated professionals who partner with agents and brokers to provide high quality insurance services, but many spend countless hours engaged in volunteer work for a variety of causes.

I look forward to being at the 150th Anniversary Celebration of Fireman's Fund on April 4th. It is a great company with outstanding people and it remains one of California's most enduring financial institutions. Given the time of rapid change in which we live, it is comforting to know that companies like Fireman's Fund still endure, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them well with the hope that they will still be with us for another 150 years.

HUNGARY TODAY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago I chaired a hearing on ''Anti-Semitism: A Growing Threat to All Faiths.'' One of the witnesses was Tamás Fellegi, a former minister in the Orbán government, who is himself Jewish. His testimony was impressive, as was the long list of significant actions the Orbán government has taken to combat anti-Semitism in Hungarian society.

Mr. Fellegi admitted frankly that anti-Semitism is a serious social problem in Hungary. Fortunately, the Orbán government is on a clear upward trajectory here, and gives every sign that it will continue to be part of the solution rather than the problem. I'm confident it will particularly take on the persistent attempts to rehabilitate Holocaust perpetrators and vicious anti-Semites, both from the 1930s and 1940s and today. I will certainly continue to urge it to do so.

We all know that many NGOs and a few governments, including our own, have been vocal in criticizing the Hungarian government on various grounds touching on democracy and human rights—and that the Hungarian government and its supporters have rejected these criticisms vigorously.

Having reviewed material on both sides, I must say that I believe the Orbán government is right when it says that many of the criticisms are unfair, involving double standards, misrepresentations, and inaccurate information. The Hungarian government has carefully documented this, for example in its ''Open Letter to Freedom House.''

For another example, the administration, in criticizing the Orbán government's adoption of a new constitution, claimed in its written testimony to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe this week that in ''fundamental'' matters, ''the process must lead to a consensus built from a cross-section of society, rather than reflect only the opinions of the ruling coalition . . . the lack of serious consultation with different sectors of society, did not honor the democratic spirit . . .'' Anyone familiar with the passage of the Obamacare legislation might well question whether this is a message our government is ideally situated to deliver. Certainly it should have avoided the rude insinuation about democracy.

Yet we need to continue delivering these and similar messages to a number of foreign governments—we must not give in to the cynicism induced by our own or any other government's failings.

But we should be a lot more humble—especially when we are dealing with a country like Hungary, where the system of constitutional checks and balances is alive and well, where a democratic party with an unprecedented supermajority and a mandate for dramatic change, gained in a free and fair election, passed a democratic constitution and shows itself open to working with others to amend and improve the flaws in its new laws. This is a conversation between equals, and there is a lot we can learn from Hungary. I'm thinking particularly here of the constitutional cap on public debt and the statement that life will be protected in the womb.

I'd like to congratulate the Hungarian government for the many laudable things in the new constitution—many things that advance human rights, including the prohibition of human trafficking, reproductive cloning, and its promotion of the culture of life. And for the rest, I look forward to a continuing conversation with the Hungarian government about their and our constitutional traditions and how they can both be improved.

RECOGNIZING STEPHEN WEIR

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY and Congressman ERIC SWALWELL to recognize the unparalleled career of Mr. Stephen Weir and congratulate him as he retires after forty years of public service on behalf of the people of Contra Costa County. Steve Weir has been known throughout our community as a man of uncommon commitment and unwavering integrity.

Born in Richmond, California and raised in Pleasant Hill, Steve has been a life-long resident of Contra Costa County. Following his graduation with Honors from the University of California at Berkeley, Steve moved back to Central County to begin his career as a public servant. He won his first elected position in 1973 as the Contra Costa Water District Director. After serving seven years in that capacity, Steve was elected to the Concord City Council in 1980, and in 1984 he was selected by his colleagues to serve a two-year term as Concord's Mayor. During this time, Steve also took on the responsibilities of regional Commissioner for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and became Chairman in 1991.

It was in 1989, following the death of County Recorder Jim Olson, that Steve was appointed to fill the vacant seat for County Recorder. Steve was subsequently elected to the office in 1990 and has been returned to the position by voters every four years since.

As County Clerk-Recorder, Steve immediately went to work streamlining the Clerk office system from five offices spread throughout Martinez, to one consolidated, state-of-the-art facility. Leveraging nearly $13 million in federal and state grant funding, he developed and purchased a vote tabulation system and introduced electronic recording to our county. Steve's efficiency continued to garner favorable results as his implementation of a department-wide Performance Management Program

brought high praise from the Contra Costa County Grand Jury. He also established a Real Estate Fraud Notification System which has protected the County's property owners.

Steve has earned many awards and distinctions throughout his career, including the 1993 Citizen of the Year Award from the California Transportation Foundation in recognition of his skill in bringing improvements to the Contra Costa and Bay Area's transportation systems and under his watch, the Contra Costa County Clerk's Office was awarded the County Department of the Year Award in 1994. However, we are certain that the distinction Steve and his long-time partner, John Hemm, take most pride in is the fact that their marriage in June of 2008 was the very first same-gender union ever conducted in Contra Costa County.

As Steve trades his desk chair in Martinez for his bicycle seat, we expect to see him quickly surpass the record 5600 miles of roads and trails he logged last year and to easily hit his personal goal of 75 round trip rides to the 3,864 foot summit of Mt. Diablo this coming year.

Mr. Speaker, we invite our colleagues to join us in commending City Clerk-Recorder Steve Weir for his years of outstanding service to the citizens of Contra Costa County. We are pleased to join his husband, John, his family, friends and colleagues, in congratulating Steve on an outstanding career and wishing him the very best as he begins a well-deserved and we imagine, a very active retirement.

HONORING 125 YEARS OF THE EASTMAN MACHINE COMPANY AND THE STEVENSON FAMILY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and honor the Eastman Machine Company for its 125 years of business. Owned by the Stevenson family for the past five generations, Eastman revolutionized the apparel industry. Today, Eastman is undoubtedly the global standard for material handling, spreading, and cutting equipment.

The Eastman Machine Company began in 1888, when Canadian inventor George Eastman developed the first fractional electric motor that could be mounted onto a cutting base. By attaching the motor to a reciprocating knife, he created the Eastman, the first electric fabric-cutting machine.

The Eastman rendered manual cutting obsolete, transforming the apparel industry. Rather than painstakingly cutting materials by hand, the Eastman allowed companies to cut fabric mechanically, which exponentially increased production speeds while drastically lowering production costs.

Ten years later, one of Eastman's first investors, Charles P. Stevenson, took over full ownership of the company. The Stevenson family holds the company to this day and remains intimately involved in all aspects of the business.

C.P. Stevenson's son, Wade, assumed leadership in 1908, when he was just twenty-two years old. A shrewd businessman, Wade greatly expanded Eastman's markets. Initially, he propelled sales to reach across the country. By 1921, he was selling Eastman products in Europe, South America, and South Africa. To further increase sales, Wade developed numerous patents, each stemming from the original Eastman fabric cutter.

Wade controlled Eastman Machine Company for sixty years, passing the company to his son C.P. ''Chuck'' Stevenson in 1968. Due to his leadership, Eastman acquired the world's leading producer of cloth spreading machines in 1974, Cutting Room Appliance Corporation. With this purchase Eastman became the unequivocal source for all types of apparel manufacturing and fabric cutting machines.

In 1988, Robert L. Stevenson and Wade Stevenson bought the rapidly growing company from their father. Robert became President, and Wade remained in charge of international operations as Export President. Under their innovative leadership, they sought to make Eastman able to produce the complete set of material cutting and handling equipment. They understood that by controlling each piece of machinery, their customers would have the most efficient, economical solution, a truly revolutionary idea.

To accommodate rapidly expanding and widely variable global markets, Eastman purchased North Technology Systems in 1995. North Technology Systems developed groundbreaking software used in computers that controlled cutting machines, and pioneered the use of materials Kevlar and Mylar, which allowed Eastman to expand into new industries that used composite and industrial fabrics.

The Stevenson brothers continue to be passionate about their company's potential and visionary in their pursuit of it. Abroad, Eastman opened a factory in Ningbo, China, in 2004. In 2008, the company acquired Saber Industries of Nashville, Tennessee, improving spreading capacity.

Today, the Eastman Machine Company has produced over one thousand automated systems located in over twenty countries. Since its humble beginnings in Buffalo, New York, it has become the world's foremost producer of material handling, spreading, and cutting equipment, with innumerable patents, and hundreds of machines, and facilities on five continents.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank you for allowing me to acknowledge the incredible legacy of the Eastman Machine Company and the ingenuity, dedication, and vision of the Stevenson family. I wish all those involved with this institution the best of luck in all future endeavors.

HONORING AUSTIN LEE CABLE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austin Lee Cable. Austin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Austin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Austin led his troop as Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, became an Ordeal Member of the Order of the Arrow and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic–O–Say. Austin has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Austin designed and supervised the construction of an outdoor seating area at Harmony Vineyard Church in Kansas City, Missouri, complete with a cedar pergola, two cedar benches and finished with Missouri River Rock landscaping.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austin Lee Cable for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES ALAN JOHNSON

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, my college debate coach, and my mentor, James Alan Johnson—known to everyone as ''Al''—who passed away in late December of last year. Al Johnson's life began in the little farming town of Swink, Colorado, on July 6, 1930. He attended school in nearby La Junta, and when he was old enough he joined the United States Navy and fought in the Korean War. After the war, he earned his bachelor's degree from Colorado College (CC), and went on to receive a Masters in economics from Stanford University.

He returned to his undergraduate alma mater to spend his career, and became a beloved figure on CC's campus. Respected by his colleagues and admired by his students, Al's career spanned many decades, where he was a professor of economics, the college's debate coach, and the college Registrar. As Registrar, he guided the college towards excellence. It was under his leadership that CC's unique approach towards higher education—the Block Plan—became a reality. Because of this visionary plan of study, Colorado College students have the opportunity to focus on one class at a time. Al's steady hand as Registrar made the vision of the Block Plan a reality; one that continues to challenge students today.

As CC's debate coach, Al inspired generations of debaters. He expected nothing less than our best at all times. He urged us to be scholar-debaters, not just debaters; driving us to research a topic thoroughly, yet honestly, looking at the matter from all sides. All these years later, I remember how Al would repeat anything that was particularly important three times. As I now spend my days giving speeches designed to influence and inform, that guidance continues to resonate with me—to repeat that which is important as you make your argument.

Al's commitment to debate ran beyond just our classroom. He held the positions of president and treasurer of the National Collegiate Debate Association, and organized the National Parliamentary Debate Association and various international tournaments. Even in his

retirement, Al continued his active involvement with the debate community, urging the national associations to keep the activity relevant to the training of future generations of leaders.

Throughout his life, Al loved to travel, and in fact, he and his brother Bill visited all 50 states, six continents and 50 different countries. In recent years, Al and Bill made regular trips to Washington, DC to visit their late sister, Shirley, and he always called me when he was in town. A lifelong Coloradan, Al was a scholar of Colorado state history, as well as American and world history, and frequently gave speeches on history in El Paso County and in Denver.

Al was beloved by his many former students and colleagues. During his final illness, the outpouring of love and support from his friends helped ease his days. Al received visits, phone calls, cards, and emails from around the world. A true mark of his influence was how the community rallied around him. I had the honor of seeing Al just a few weeks before his death, and will forever be glad that I had one more opportunity to hear his wisdom.

Al Johnson was a scholar, a teacher, a mentor and a friend to countless students and colleagues throughout his life. His passing is a great loss for Colorado College, for the state of Colorado, and a personal loss for me and all who loved him. He will be sorely missed, but I know his legacy of excellence will endure.

SAINT THOMAS MORE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL COUGARS BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM WINS THE LOUISIANA CLASS 4A STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Saint Thomas More Catholic High School Boys basketball team for their recent achievement of winning Louisiana's Class 4A State Championship. This team had a tough season, but it finished strong in the end. This game accounted for the Cougars' third triumph against the Northside High School Vikings this year. The Cougars are proud to claim the state title and bring it home to Lafayette.

With five seniors on the team providing steady leadership, Coach Danny Broussard knew the Vikings would shine during the state playoffs. In a season full of commitment and many practices, the Cougars' efforts proved worthwhile and successful. Because of the team's hard work, the community was blessed to witness those five seniors finish their final game with the reward of a state championship.

Also, I want to commend the team's entire coaching staff on their hard work and dedication. Coach Danny Broussard has led the team for many years with a bench full of capable assistant coaches that are vital to the team. Wesley Cortese and Brad Geoffroy allocate a tremendous amount of time to this team, and that sacrifice does not go unrecognized. I am excited to see the team defend its title next year in its quest for a repeat performance, and I wish the Cougars basketball team much luck and success in the future.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,739,939,855,865.39. We've added $6,113,062,806,952.31 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO SALLY JOHNSTON

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my constituents, Mrs. Sally Johnston. Sally is currently the New York Department President of the American Legion Auxiliary and will be finishing her one-year term this upcoming July.

Sally has been a member of the American Legion Auxiliary for over 25 years. During this period she has worked tirelessly on behalf of veterans and their families throughout New York State, serving as President of the Third District (2000–01) and Fourth District (2006–07), as well as Department Second and Third Vice President (2009–11) before becoming Department President. Sally has received numerous awards including national recognition when she was awarded the Department National Historian award for the best overall entry in the Eastern Division.

Recently, Sally has focused her energy on the Warriors Assistance Program. Under her guidance, the Warriors Assistance Program has steadily grown, raising $39,000 so far, an amount that is expected to increase overtime.

Sally truly exemplifies the American Legion Auxiliary's motto of "service not self." In addition to her work with the American Legion Auxiliary, Sally is an active member in her community, serving on various educational, church and cultural boards. Her lifelong commitment to improve and support the lives of others, particularly those who have served our great country, reflects the best in our citizenry.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Sally Johnston for her many years of service to the veterans and their families of New York State. I wish Sally all the best in the many years ahead.

RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEE OF THE OFFICERS AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. Miller of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Margaret Mitchell of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer who has reached the milestone of 25 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives. Margaret began her career in 1987 as a receptionist in the computer center, and she has continued to be an exemplary employee as she has gone on to assume many roles within HIR.

Ms. Mitchell is acknowledged and commended for her hard work, dedication, professionalism, support of House Members, their staffs and constituents, and for her contributions, day-in and day-out, to the overall operations of the House. I am proud to stand before you and the Nation on Ms. Mitchell's behalf to recognize the importance of her public service.

HONORING HUNTER SAMUEL BENTCH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Hunter Samuel Bentch. Hunter is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Hunter has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Hunter has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Hunter led his troop as Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, and attended the Colorado and Philmont High Adventure Camps. Hunter has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Hunter designed and constructed a five–foot high, 46–foot long, fence along a section of the Trail of Heroes at the Kansas City Missouri Police Academy where the trail had a sharp drop–off.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Hunter Samuel Bentch for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 83 regarding the "Mulvaney of South Carolina Substitute Amendment No. 1" (H. Con. Res. 25). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

I missed rollcall vote No. 84 regarding the "Scott of Virginia Substitute Amendment No. 2" (H. Con. Res. 25). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

I missed rollcall vote No. 85 regarding the "Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 3" (H. Con. Res. 25). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

I missed rollcall vote No. 86 regarding the "Woodall of Georgia Substitute Amendment No. 4" (H. Con. Res. 25). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

FIREARMS RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to introduce an important piece of legislation: the Firearms Risk Protection Act (FRPA). This bill will require gun owners to purchase liability coverage and to show proof of that coverage when they purchase a firearm. This is an idea whose time has come. In fact, lawmakers in several states including Massachusetts and Illinois have introduced similar legislative proposals.

In the wake of horrific tragedies like those at Newtown, Aurora, and Tucson, we as a society and we as lawmakers must provide answers. We must respect Americans' rights to own guns but limit gun violence and gun death. We must continue to enable guns to be used in a lawful and safe manner by responsible citizens and we must keep guns out of the hands of others. We must make sure the atrocities we have witnessed never happen again.

This federal requirement would serve as a market-based solution to holding gun owners liable for the weapons they own. As with car insurance premiums, higher risk gun owners will face higher premiums. Actuarial determinations will be made by insurance companies, as those experts are in the best position to make those determinations based on sound data analysis.

Under the Firearms Risk Protection Act (FRPA), state regulated insurance companies would be able to extend coverage to their customers—this is not a federal insurance program. Additionally, this bill poses no specific requirements on insurance companies themselves, but instead, imposes a fine of $10,000 if during the sale of a weapon the seller does not confirm coverage or the buyer has not purchased it.

As lawmakers, we must stand ready to work on solutions to curtail our nation's gun violence and requiring liability coverage for gun owners should be part of the solution. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this important piece of legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 34TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, April 10 marks a significant date for the relationship between the United States and the Republic of China, our dear friends in Southeast Asia. This is the 34th anniversary of the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act that codified the bond that we share with Taiwan.

Even though we have been friends and allies for much longer, it was the Taiwan Relations Act that officially outlined the importance that both nations place in each other. We are strong partners in trade, peace and democracy.

When it comes to trade, Taiwan imported $25.9 billion from the United States in 2011. This is an incredible 40% increase over 2009. It shows the focus Taiwan is placing on buying American goods which translates to jobs here in the United States.

In New York alone, exports to Taiwan were over $1 billion. We also appreciate the many Taiwanese companies, such as Young Stuff Apparel Group and China Airlines that have invested in New York.

We look forward to our continued friendship and partnership with Taiwan for many years to come.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, as a proud member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, CPC, I rise in strong support of the CPC's alternative to H. Con. Res. 25. This alternative budget, more appropriately known as the "Budget for All" Substitute invests in America, reforms corporate and individual taxes in a balanced manner, and adopts sensible, modern defense spending. Simply put: the CPC is an egalitarian and effective budget for all of America.

The CPC's "Budget for All" wisely invests the hard earned peace dividend resulting from the successful end to the war in Iraq and the winding down of the war in Afghanistan to promote economic growth and a healthier and cleaner environment.

In addition, this budget puts Americans back to work, charts a path to responsible deficit reduction, enhances our economic competitiveness, rebuilds the middle class and invests in our future. The CPC budget makes no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security benefits, and asks those who have benefited most from our economy to pay a sensible share. It is only fair.

The CPC budget addresses America's persistently high unemployment levels with more than $2.9 trillion in additional job-creating investments, which frankly will help depressed economies in inner-city communities across America, including those in my hometown of Houston, Texas. This plan utilizes every tool at the government's disposal to get our economy moving again, including:

Direct hire programs that create a School Improvement Corps, a Park Improvement Corps, and a Student Jobs Corps, among others.

Targeted tax incentives that spur clean energy, manufacturing, and cutting-edge technological investments in the private sector.

Widespread domestic investments including an infrastructure bank, a $556 billion surface transportation bill, and approximately $2.1 trillion in widespread domestic investment.

The Budget for All achieves $6.8 trillion in deficit reduction, hits the same debt to GDP ratio as the Republican budget with lower deficits in the last five years; and does so in a responsible way that does not eviscerate vital services Americans want preserved.

These benchmarks are achieved by focusing on the true drivers of our deficit: unsustainable tax policies, the wars overseas, and policies that helped cause the recent recession—rather than irresponsibly putting the middle class's social safety net on the chopping block.

The budget also taxes fairly, because it:

Ends tax cuts for the top 2% of Americans on schedule at year's end.

Extends tax relief for middle class households and the vast majority of Americans.

Creates new tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires.

Eliminates the tax code's preferential treatment of capital gains and dividends.

Abolishes corporate welfare for oil, gas, and coal companies.

Eliminates loopholes that allow businesses to dodge their true tax liability.

Calls for the adoption of the "Buffett Rule".

Creates a publicly funded federal election system that gets corporate money out of politics for good.

The CPC budget demonstrates that we have been listening to the American people because we responsibly and sensibly end our military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, leaving America more secure at home and abroad; and modernizes our military to address 21st century threats and stop contributing to our deficit problems. This is the peace dividend. With this dividend, the CPC budget:

Provides a Making Work Pay tax credit for families struggling with high gas and food cost's 2013–2015.

Extends Earned Income Tax Credit, and the Child and Dependent Care Credit.

Invests in programs to stave off further foreclosures to keep families in their homes.

Invests in our children's education by increasing Education, Training, and Social Services.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is a moral document, with meaning, fiber, and a unique texture. Sometimes we lose sight of this fact given the preoccupation by many with, I could wax on and on today on the Floor about the "baselines," "benchmarks," and "extrapolations and projections of future budget conditions," based on the assumptions that may or may not turn out to be accurate.

But real people living, struggling with real problems in the real world are not interested in such esoteric discussion. They want us to focus on their lives and their problems. They want to know that we understand the necessity of making taxes fairer, simpler, and economically reasonable.

Most economists agree, Mr. Speaker, that entitlement policy must be evaluated and progressively modified to achieve sustainability. Unlike discretionary spending, mandatory spending grew rapidly from 5% of GDP in 1962 to a range of 9% to 10.5% of GDP from

1975 to 2007, peaking in recession years because of automatic stabilizers.

Let me be clear: I am unalterably opposed to any entitlement reform that deprives seniors, like the ones that reside in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, of benefits they have labored long and hard to earn. To do otherwise would break a promise to prior generations who faithfully paid into the current system. These are not entitlements; they are earned benefits. And they must not be taken away.

And speaking of Texas; recently my hometown of Houston was forced to lay off nearly one thousand municipal employees. When these employees are put on the unemployment line, libraries close, schools cut back on essential after-school programs, community centers lose personnel, police hours are trimmed, and the truly destitute become an afterthought.

Those tough budget decisions had a human cost and I hear from my constituents every day about them. Frankly, I do not want tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of jobs for working and middle class families in Texas.

The CPC fiscal year 2014 budget alternative stands in clear contrast to the budget that our Republican colleagues have put forward. This budget will reduce the deficit in a balanced and credible way, making difficult choices while providing investments that help create jobs now and build an even stronger economy for the future.

But unlike the Republican budget—which ends the Medicare guarantee while providing enormous tax breaks to millionaires—we ask the very wealthy and special interests to share responsibility for reducing the deficit. We must embark on a truly shared sacrifice.

I ask my colleagues to support the CPC Budget for All Substitute.

HONORING TROY ISKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Troy Iske. Troy is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 138, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Troy has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Troy has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Troy has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Troy led a team in refurbishing and painting benches and cleaning the shooting ranges at the Pigeon Hill Conservation Area in St. Joseph, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Troy Iske for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2053–S2234

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 632–650, S.J. Res. 12, and S. Res. 86–89. **Pages S2145–46**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "History, Jurisdiction, and a Summary of Activities of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources During the 112th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 113–4)

Special Report entitled "Report on the Activities of the Committee on Finance During the 112th Congress." (S. Rept. No. 113–5)

Special Report entitled "Report on the Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary During the 112th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 113–6) **Page S2145**

Measures Passed:

Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. 540, to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center", and the bill was then passed. **Pages S2231–32**

Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Senate agreed to S. Res. 88, providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library. **Page S2232**

National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 89, designating March 25, 2013, as "National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day". **Page S2232**

Authorizing use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 18, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service. **Page S2232**

Authorizing use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 19, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Page S2232**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2053–S2141**

Adopted:

By 79 yeas to 20 nays (Vote No. 47), Reid (for Hatch) Amendment No. 297, to promote innovation, preserve high-paying jobs, and encourage economic growth for manufacturers of lifesaving medical devices and cutting edge medical therapies. **Pages S2130, S2133**

By 96 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 48), Reid (for Stabenow) Amendment No. 432, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare's guaranteed benefits and to prohibit replacing guaranteed benefits with the House passed budget plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program. **Pages S2130, S2133**

Rejected:

By 46 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 45), Sessions motion to recommit the concurrent resolution to the Committee on the Budget, with instructions to report back no later than March 22, 2013 with such changes as may be necessary to achieve unified budget by fiscal year 2023. **Page S2132**

By 40 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 46), Reid (for Murray) Amendment No. 433, to amend the resolution. **Pages S2130, S2131–33**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 49), Reid (for Grassley) Amendment No. 156, to protect Americans from a $1,000,000,000,000 tax increase and provide for pro-growth revenue-neutral comprehensive tax reform. **Pages S2130, S2134**

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 431, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to require equal pay policies and practices. **Page S2130**

Reid (for Ayotte/Thune) Amendment No. 158, to prohibit the consideration of a budget resolution

that includes revenue increases while the civilian unemployment rate is above 5.5 percent, the administration's prediction for the unemployment rate without the stimulus. **Page S2130**

Reid (for Cruz) Amendment No. 202, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and to encourage patient-centered reforms to improve health outcomes and reduce health care costs, promoting economic growth. **Pages S2130–31**

Reid (for Murray) Amendment No. 439, to amend the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to provide tax relief for low and middle income families. **Page S2131**

Reid (for Crapo) Amendment No. 222, to establish a deficit neutral reserve fund to repeal the tax increases enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that were imposed on low-and middle-income Americans. **Page S2131**

Reid (for Shaheen/Stabenow) Amendment No. 438, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to health care, including primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, and employer-provided contraceptive coverage, such as was provided under the Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111–148). **Page S2131**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution at approximately 9 a.m., on Friday, March 22, 2013, with the time until 11 a.m., equally divided between the two managers, or their designees; that at 11 a.m., Senate vote on or in relation to Reid (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 431; Reid (for Ayotte) Amendment No. 158; Reid (for Cruz) Amendment No. 202; Reid (for Murray) Amendment No. 439; Reid (for Crapo) Amendment No. 222; and Reid (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 438; that there be two minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and all after the first vote in this sequence be ten minute votes; that upon disposition of the last amendment listed, there be two hours equally divided between the two managers, or their designees, remaining on the concurrent resolution; and that the next amendment in order be an amendment from the Majority side to be followed by a Republican alternative to Reid (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 438. **Page S2124**

Appointments:

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, appointed and reappointed the following individuals to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Senator Warner vice The Honorable Kent Conrad of North Dakota and Senator Feinstein (reappointment).

British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appointed Senator Leahy as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress. **Page S2232**

U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276n, appointed the following Senator as Chairman of the U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: Senator Begich. **Page S2232**

Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d–276g, as amended, appointed the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group conference during the 113th Congress: Senator Klobuchar. **Page S2232**

Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference for the 113th Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C 276h–276k, as amended, appointed the following Senator as Chairman to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference for the 113th Congress: Senator Kaine. **Page S2232**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

Constance B. Tobias, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals for a term of six years.

Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017.

Allison M. Macfarlane, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2018.

Marilyn A. Brown, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2017.

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Patricia M. Wald, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2019.

Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

Vicki Miles-LaGrange, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2015.

Ranee Ramaswamy, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2018.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Foreign Service.

Pages S2233–34

Messages from the House: **Page S2143**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2143–44, S2232**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2144–45**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2145**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2146–49**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2149–63**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2142–43**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2163–S2231**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2231**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2231**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—49) **Pages S2132–34**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 10:56 p.m., until 9 a.m. on Friday, March 22, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2233.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Sarah Jewell, of Washington, to be Secretary of the Interior.

REBALANCE TO ASIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs concluded a hearing to examine Asia, focusing on democracy, good governance and human rights, after receiving testimony from Joseph Y. Yun, Acting Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and Daniel B. Baer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, both of the Department of State; Steven Rood, The Asia Foundation, San Francisco, California; and Ellen Bork, The Foreign Policy Initiative, Washington, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on a progress report on management, after receiving testimony from Jane Holl Lute, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security; Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, and Cathleen A. Berrick, Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice, both of the Government Accountability Office; Shawn Reese, Analyst in Emergency Management and Homeland Security Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Elaine C. Duke, former Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management, Woodbridge, Virginia; and Richard L. Skinner, former Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, Alexandria, Virginia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 93 public bills, H.R. 1308–1400; 1 private bill, H.R. 1401; and 9 resolutions, H. Res. 131–139 were introduced. **Pages H1820–28**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1828–29**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Miller (FL) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1723**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H1723**

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933 as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule 20. **Page H1725**

Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013—Motion to Concur: The House agreed to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, by a yea-and-nay vote of 318 yeas to 109 nays, Roll No. 89. **Pages H1725–94, H1801–02**

The motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933 was considered pursuant to the order of the House of March 20, 2013.

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 25, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 88. Consideration of the concurrent resolution began on Tuesday, March 19th. **Pages H1794–H1801**

H. Res. 122, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) and the resolution (H. Res. 115), was agreed to on Tuesday, March 19th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, March 25th. **Page H1802**

Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member to serve as Co-Chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission: Representative Wolf. **Page H1802**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1723.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1801 and H1801–02. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—MEMBER AND OUTSIDE WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing for Members of Congress and outside witnesses. Testimony was heard from Representatives Meehan; Keating; Larsen (WA); Farr; Peters (CA); and Reed.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development held a hearing on Federal Transit Administration Oversight. Testimony was heard from Peter Rogoff, Administrator, Federal Transit Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—USDA INSPECTOR GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies held a hearing on USDA Inspector General Oversight. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Phyllis K. Fong, Inspector General; Karen Ellis, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations; and Gil Harden, Assistant Inspector General for Audit.

UPDATE ON MILITARY SUICIDE PREVENTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on an Update on Military Suicide Prevention. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Howard B. Bromberg, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff G–1, United States Army; Jacqueline Garrick, Acting Director of the Defense Suicide Prevention Office, Department of Defense; Brigadier General Robert F. Hedelund, USMC, Director, Marine and Family Programs, United States Marine

Corps; Lieutenant General Darrell D. Jones, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services, United States Air Force; Jerry Reed, Jr., Director, Suicide Prevention Resource Center; and Vice Admiral Scott R. Van Buskirk, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Manpower, Personnel, Training, and Education, United States Navy.

OUR NATION OF BUILDERS: THE STRENGTH OF STEEL

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing on "Our Nation of Builders: The Strength of Steel". Testimony was heard from Representatives Murphy (PA); and Visclosky; and public witnesses.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES: ADMINISTRATION PERSPECTIVES ON INNOVATION AND REGULATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Health Information Technologies: Administration Perspectives on Innovation and Regulation". Testimony was heard from Farzad Mostashari, National Coordinator, Health Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services; and Christy Foreman, Director, Office of Device Evaluation, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration.

CYBER ATTACKS: AN UNPRECEDENTED THREAT TO U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled "Cyber Attacks: An Unprecedented Threat to U.S. National Security". Testimony was heard from Christopher Painter, Coordinator, Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues, Department of State; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 910, the "Sikes Act Reauthorization Act of 2013"; and H.R. 1080, to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements under such an Act for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities and to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate inter-agency cooperation in conservation programs to avoid or reduce adverse impacts on military readiness activities. Testimony was heard from John Conger, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environment and Installation, Department of Defense; Stephen D. Guertin, Deputy Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; Jimmy Anthony, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Wildlife, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on "America's Mineral Resources: Creating Mining and Manufacturing Jobs and Securing America"; H.R. 1063, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013"; H.R. 687, the "Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013"; H.R. 697, the "Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act"; H.R. 761, the "Critical and Strategic Minerals Production Act"; H.R. 767, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; H.R. 957, the "American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act"; and H.R. 981, the "Resource Assessment of Rare Earths Act of 2013". Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Gosar; Grijalva; Kirkpatrick; Heck (NV); and Johnson (GA); and James M. Iwanicki, Marquette County Road Commission; Jamie Connell, Bureau of Land Management, Acting Deputy Director, Department of the Interior; Mary Wagner, Associate Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Stephen Q. Miller, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, Pinal County; Soyla "Kiki" Peralta, Council Member, Superior Town Council; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AGAINST EMERGING AND COMPLEX CYBER-ATTACKS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Health and Technology held a hearing entitled, "Protecting Small Businesses Against Emerging and Complex Cyber-Attacks". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Ongoing Intelligence Activities". This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Friday, March 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, Budget Resolution, with up to 6 roll call votes beginning at 11 a.m. At approximately 3 p.m., Senate will proceed to the budget vote-a-rama.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Monday, March 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La.,E347, E348
Austin, David, Ga., E348
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E352
Bass, Karen, Calif., E356
Beto O'Rourke, Tex., E358
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E349
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E369
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E347
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E351
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E356
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E361, E362
Coble, Howard, N.C., E360
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E369
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E361
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E368
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E359, E369
DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E349
Dent, Charles W., Pa., E365
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E363
Farr, Sam, Calif., E350
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E356
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E362
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E358
Gabbard, Tulsi, Hawaii, E362
GARCIA, Joe, Fla., E359
Granger, Kay, Tex., E360
Graves, Sam, Mo., E368, E369, E371
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E357
Grimm, Michael G., N.Y., E348
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E363, E365, E366, E368
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E367
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E348, E370
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E348
Keating, William R., Mass., E350
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E366
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E351
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E352, E355, E356, E357, E358, E360, E361
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E347
Long, Billy, Mo., E357
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E365
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E360
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E355, E359, E370
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E365
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E364, E369
Miller, George, Calif., E367
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E362
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E352
Owens, William L., N.Y., E364, E369
Poe, Ted, Tex., E350
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E355, E370
Scalise, Steve, La., E352
Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'', Va., E353
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E360
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E367
Upton, Fred, Mich., E348
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E358, E364
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E351
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E349
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E359

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.