United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 2012 No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 19, 2012.

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

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

PRAYER

Reverend Gerald Baker, St. Ann Catholic Church, Morganfield, Kentucky, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank You this day for Your many blessings to us as citizens of the United States of America: for our Nation, for our freedom, for our prosperity, for our heritage, for our defenders past and present, for the beauty of our land, for our families, for our faith in You, for all whom we love.

Keep us in Your watchful care. Make us strong as a people. Bless our unity. Bless our diversity. Bless this august body in its deliberations.

May God bless us every one.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam 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. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HOCHUL 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.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND GERALD BAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that, today, Father Gerald Baker, pastor of the St. Ann Catholic Church in Morganfield, Kentucky, gave our opening prayer.

He has served as pastor in Morganfield since 2003. Prior to that, Father Baker was also the pastor in my hometown of Hopkinsville, Kentucky, where he was a wonderful community leader.

Among other things, he started the St. Luke's Free Clinic in Hopkinsville. He received his Master of Divinity degree from Mount St. Mary's Seminary in Emmitsburg, Maryland, in 1983, and I might say that was the same year that our chaplain, Father Conroy, received his degree, also. He was ordained in 1983.

We are also delighted to have the eighth-grade class of the St. Ann Catholic Church with us this morning from Morganfield, and they will be taking a tour of the Capitol.

So, once again, I want to thank Father Baker for being with us today, for his leadership in our congressional district as well as in the State of Kentucky, and for the spiritual leadership he provides our citizens.

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.

IN TRIBUTE TO HERB BRAV

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and service of Command Sergeant Major (retired) Herb Brav.

This extraordinary American, who served his country in uniform for over 30 years and another 27 years as waterfront, gymnasium, and physical fitness director for the Multinational Force and Observers, Sinai, Egypt, died March 9, 2012, in St. Augustine, Florida.

Herb was a legend. A former heavyweight boxer, he joined the Army in 1947, served tours in Korea, the Philippines and Vietnam. His iconic service with the MFO impacted thousands of soldiers from many contingent forces. I fondly remember his mantra: ''When the will is strong, everything is easy.'' Soldiering was everything to this patriot. He rarely took a vacation, and never spent a Christmas away from the soldiers at South Camp.

Printed on recycled paper.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to speak on behalf of MFO veterans worldwide, his wife, Gisela, and his two children in saluting Herb Brav for his service to country and his fellow man.

Let us remember his immortal words: ''When the will is strong, everything is easy.''

SERGEANT WILLIAM WILSON III

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

Ms. HOCHUL. I rise today to honor and recognize a true American patriot, Sergeant William Wilson of Amherst, New York, my district, for giving the ultimate sacrifice and service to his country. On March 26 of this year, Sergeant Wilson lost his life defending us in Afghanistan while serving with NATO forces.

Billy, as he was fondly called by his mom and dad and his brothers, served our country for 7 years, and was on his third tour of duty. His commander said:

> Without question, he was my best, most skilled and talented squad leader. That's who Billy was—selfless, dedicated and always putting his heart and soul into his soldiers.

If you ask his family or friends and look into the eyes of his mom and dad, they are overwhelmed with pride of his service. Billy was proud to put on the uniform and to serve our country. His smile would light up a room. Just ask any of the thousands of people who came and paid tribute to him just this past week—a devoted family friend, respected and loved by many. To his brother, he was known as Superman. For his brave efforts, Sergeant Wilson was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

But my message today is for Billy's parents, Bill and Kim, for his brothers Jeremy and Wesley, for his fiancee, for his entire family, for his grandma. I want them to know from a grateful Nation: your boy did not die in vain. He honored our country with his service, and for that we are forever grateful.

THE VOICE OF TEXAS—THE REGULATORS V. SUSAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it's a new day in Washington, and soon the unelected, unaccountable regulators will be sending out new rules to the people.

The fourth branch of government meddles in every aspect of our lives. In the name of saving us from ourselves, they regulate, regulate, regulate without regard to the consequences of these expensive government mandates. Sometimes they put businesses out of business. Susan, a small business owner in Texas, wrote me this:

> Our small business has operated on a shoestring for several years, and we started in 1978, but I fear we are at an end. We manufacture 400 products, all made from the same materials. The new product safety regulations require that we certify every product to the tune of about $500 per product, even though they're all made from the same materials. Do the math: $175,000 or more just to get these products that we've made since '78 certified. Add on the health care fines and the rising cost of gasoline and the rising property and sales and income taxes—well, you know the rest of the story.

Madam Speaker, the regulators close the doors of small businesses like Susan's, and that ought not to be.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 0910

LANCE CORPORAL ABRAHAM TARWOE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lance Corporal Abraham Tarwoe of the United States Marine Corps.

A Liberian American, Lance Corporal Tarwoe elected to serve the United States when he joined the Marine Corps in 2009. He was promoted to the rank of lance corporal just 2 years ago.

As a mortar man with the 2nd Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division based at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina, Lance Corporal Tarwoe was conducting combat operations as part of Operation Enduring Freedom in Helmand province in Afghanistan when he lost his life on April 12.

Among other awards, Lance Corporal Tarwoe earned the Combat Action Ribbon and Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

His family is planning to hold a burial service in Liberia, following a memorial service in the United States on April 28.

My thoughts and prayers are with Lance Corporal Tarwoe's wife, their 1-year-old son, and their entire extended family.

As a grateful Nation and with heavy hearts, we remember him today for making the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our freedom and on behalf of our Nation. May we honor his memory always.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, about 97 years ago, the government of the Ottoman Empire killed over 1.5 million people during the Armenian genocide. The Turkish state has never accepted responsibility for the acts of its predecessor government and maintains that the genocide never took place.

For the past 90 years, the Armenian people have sought justice, yet the Turkish Government has continued to actively obstruct any attempt to recognize what has happened to the Armenian people.

The United States can help bring closure to this longstanding moral issue by recognizing the Armenian genocide. That's why I'm proud to be a sponsor of House Resolution 304, which would formally recognize this atrocity. To date, 88 Members of this body have joined me in support of the resolution.

I urge all of my other colleagues to support what is a very important resolution.

If we do nothing, the victims of this horrible genocide may be forgotten. We cannot allow that to happen.

DAN-LOC AND AMERICAN MANUFACTURING

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of small business and domestic manufacturing in our district and throughout our country and the need for Congress to support manufacturing and job creation.

Last week, I visited DAN-LOC Bolt & Gasket, a bolt and metal gasket manufacturer located in our district in Houston. DAN-LOC's products are highly regarded for their quality and longevity. They produce for our energy industry the bolt like I'm holding right now.

In recent years, DAN-LOC, like thousands of similar businesses throughout our country, has been under attack from cheap and low-quality competition from overseas that has actually forced businesses to either close their doors or make drastic cuts. These foreign imports are oftentimes cheaper than the raw materials to produce these bolts. They can only do this with illegal subsidies from their governments.

We can no longer ignore this issue; otherwise, our Nation will no longer have a manufacturing sector and the millions of middle class jobs it supports.

Congress needs to remember the hard workers who make these bolts and support their jobs.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ILLINOIS MATH AND SCIENCE ACADEMY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy on their 25 years of excellent education.

Since opening its doors to students in 1986, the academy has graduated nearly 5,000 students and brought national and global recognition to the State of Illinois.

With a focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or

STEM, eduction, IMSA has developed the talented workforce our State and Nation needs to compete in the modern world. Furthermore, the academy has provided opportunities to underresourced students, effectively breaking down geographic and socioeconomic barriers.

I am proud to represent the academy here in Washington, and I'm proud of the way IMSA alumni represent Illinois.

I'd like to add a special thanks to Dr. Leon Letterman. His vision helped found the academy; his leadership has helped it to become what it is today, and his presence will be missed after he retires.

Congratulations to the Illinois Math and Science Academy, and good luck to the Titan Robotics Team as they compete in St. Louis.

MILITARY KID OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Sydney Schmidt.

Sydney hails from Hayfield, Minnesota, the First Congressional District of Minnesota, and was recently named the Military Kid of the Year. She is the daughter of Mary Kay and Lieutenant Colonel Brad Schmidt and a sister to Dani Schmidt.

As a high school teacher and a 24-year veteran of our military, I understand how challenging it is for families when parents are deployed overseas. We know that when a parent is called to duty, they aren't the only ones who serve this Nation. The family serves us as well.

Sydney maintains a 4.0 grade average, volunteers as a Big Sister, tutors elementary students, spends time with senior citizens, and, as well, excels at band and sports.

I applaud Sydney's ability to set an example for her peers, not only in Hayfield, but across this country. Sydney's remarkable achievements at such a young age are a testament to her passion for community, her involvement and her love of country. We honor those achievements and the example she has set for others.

Congratulations to Sydney, all the military kids, families, and servicemembers. I and the rest of this Nation thank you for your service to America.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL FORESTS

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, if managed wisely, America's national forests can provide a safe wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and thousands of jobs in the timber industry.

Unfortunately, a lack of effective forest management in the United States has led to poor forest health. This can and does cause catastrophic forest fires.

Recently, in Colorado, the North Fork fire destroyed 27 homes and killed 3 homeowners. The fire was caused by a prescribed burn designed to prevent a catastrophic forest fire. Clearly, this incident exemplifies the need for alternative forest management tools, such as increased timber harvesting, to reduce the risk of wildfires in the future.

Through prudent forest management and the ability to access and harvest our timber resources, these communities can support jobs while fostering healthy forests, safeguarding the natural beauty of Colorado and the Nation, and protecting against dangerous wildfires.

ROTARY DAY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the White House's first-ever Rotary Day. Tomorrow, Americans from Rotary Clubs across the Nation will be honored as champions of change in their communities.

Many of us in this House frequent Rotary Clubs throughout our districts. I'm always pleased to meet with constituents so committed to honest discussion, civic engagement, and the betterment of our community.

Last week, at a meeting of a Rotary Club in Coral Springs, Florida, I was reminded of something I would like to share with you today. It's called the Four-Way Test. These principles guide Rotary members in their daily lives, and they read as follows:

Is it the truth?

Is it fair to all concerned?

Will it build goodwill and better friendships?

Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

Madam Speaker, Washington has been paralyzed by partisan politics and a disappointing level of discourse. If we could just approach our Nation's problems a bit more like the Rotary Club's Four-Way Test, we would all be better off. After all, at a time of great challenges facing our Nation, the American people deserve no less than a Congress that operates with honesty, builds bipartisanship, and bases decisions on whether or not they will be beneficial to all our citizens.

Enjoy your visit to the White House tomorrow for Rotary Day. I hope the Rotary's Four-Way Test visits this U.S. Congress very soon.

□ 0920

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9, SMALL BUSINESS TAX CUT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 620 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 620

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for domestic business income of qualified small businesses. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Levin of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution with an amendment I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8 strike ''one hour'' and insert ''70 minutes''.

Page 2, line 16 strike ''20'' and insert ''25''.

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

Without objection, the resolution is amended.

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 620 provides a structured rule for H.R.

9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act. The bill was introduced on March 21, 2012, by our leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), and was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on April 10.

The rule provides for consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute as is standard practice for this legislation when dealing with tax policy.

Madam Speaker, today we will be considering the underlying legislation, which will allow the House of Representatives yet another opportunity to ease the burden on small businesses across America by giving them the economic tools to create jobs and to help grow our economy. It would be an understatement not to recognize that this country, including small business, is under duress.

We are under duress in this country. The economic circumstances, which abound across the entire country, are not only obvious to every one of our citizens but also to this body, and we are here doing our job today following through not just in regular order, but the process to make sure that we are talking about what Congress should be doing to aid small business. I believe that by giving them the economic tools, the free enterprise system and entrepreneurs, men and women, will know exactly what to do because we're allowing them competitive advantages.

Earlier this week, congressional Democrats and President Obama offered their competing plan, and their plan is to raise taxes on small businesses. We disagree with that.

Today, the Republicans in the House of Representatives, under the great tutelage and leadership of our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, offer a different vision for America. Despite their best effort, congressional Democrats think that we can tax our way to improving our economy. It's really simple logic. Increasing taxes on job creators will not help create jobs. It will place new impediments and roadblocks for not just job creation, but the opportunity for business and small business to be successful.

Congressional Republicans, once again today, will stand with small businesses across the Nation as we demand less government intervention and more marketplace creativity and the opportunity for small business to get what it needs.

Madam Speaker, as this Congress and the American people know, job creators are small businesses. They are the engine of our economy and, as a former chairman of the board for a small chamber of commerce in Dallas, Texas, the Greater East Dallas Chamber of Commerce, I saw firsthand entrepreneurship and the availability of talent that was necessary in small business. That same engine of our economy is what we are trying to restart and ignite today. Congressional Republicans will continue to promote job creation through robust economic growth because we must grow our economy by giving those job creators a chance to get that done.

H.R. 9 will allow small businesses under 500 full-time employees to take a tax deduction equal to 20 percent of their domestic business income. So, no matter how they're organized under the Tax Code, under the bill the size of the tax cut is kept at 50 percent of W–2 wages paid, encouraging increasing hiring. I have been in touch with small businesses across Dallas, Texas, and across that area, and we do understand that small business wants to come and create more jobs to increase the amount of not just employment, but to help them grow their businesses. In return, what happens is that loyalty that comes from entrepreneurship to those employees and obviously, then, Uncle Sam, gets the advantage because taxes are being paid instead of paying for unemployment.

Small business, we know, employs about half of our private sector workforce and generates 65 percent of our new jobs. What we are here on the floor talking about today supports ideas that come straight from these small business job creators, directly from men and women, many minorities, many moms who are in the marketplace who are trying to help their family to make sure that they can perhaps pay for their kids to go to college, ideas that they have.

Entrepreneurship, the American Dream, is what we are talking about today, and we need to keep that dream alive. With an unemployment rate consistently over 8 percent for the past 3 years, it's time that we not only take aggressive action, but that we do the things that are being asked for that will create jobs.

In my home State of Texas, the 14 million citizens who work for 387,000 small businesses and 1.69 million sole proprietorships will see immediate benefits from this bill. They call that relief. They call that competitiveness, and we call it up here giving back to those job creators what they need by listening to them and then offering solutions. Those real Texans are struggling even in the midst of perhaps one of the best economies in this country. Texans are still struggling, and small business needs this opportunity today.

Madam Speaker, just a few weeks ago, Congress and the President came together to pass what was known as the JOBS Act, a bill designed and designated to generate unique sources of new credit for small business. I was proud to manage that rule and for legislation that not only passed on a bipartisan effort, but has become law.

This underlying bill today applies those very same principles. But instead of opening up new avenues of credit, this legislation before us enables the very same small businesses to keep more of what they have earned and to reinvest into their own business and to make sure that that capital that was difficult to achieve is now possible through their own success.

Democrats, quite likely, as we have heard up in the Rules Committee and seen in the press, will oppose this novel concept because they really want Washington lawmakers and bureaucrats, not our hardworking constituents back home, to have the availability to get those dollars. I'm proud to tell the small businesses in the congressional district that I represent in Dallas, Irving, Addison, and Richardson, Texas, that with this bill those small businesses, not just in my congressional district that I am lucky to represent, but all across this country, will be able to see the potential, will be able to grow and succeed and, perhaps most of all, it is a group of people in Washington who are willing to listen to the needs of small business, men and women who are trying to create the avenues of success, not just for them and the American Dream, but also for more employees.

□ 0930

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this fair rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my friend for yielding the time.

I would begin a little bit unusually by asking a few questions of my friend and then yielding to him for any response that he may have.

A gentleman named Bruce Bartlett was the former Department economist for President Ronald Reagan. He makes this comment: The serious point here is that the term ''small business'' casts a very wide net.

Indeed, since the only test for being a small business under the legislation, as my good friend proposes, is the number of employees, the ultimate beneficiaries of the Republican bill will be some large and profitable businesses that just happen to have few employees.

What is my friend's response to that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you for yielding me the time, and I hope that the substance that I provide back is of great measure to the gentleman's request.

First of all, let me say I know Bruce Bartlett. I had a chance to work with Mr. Bartlett when I served as vice president of the National Center for Policy Analysis. Mr. Bartlett was a contributor not just to the NCPA, but of economic terms.

I will completely agree with Mr. Bartlett that there are many out there who have successful businesses. Our point is we want them all to grow. Successful businesses are able to hire new people. Unsuccessful businesses struggle and cannot provide not only an increase in the amount of pay, but also the benefit issue becomes difficult. So we want people to be successful. And I think Mr. Bartlett is correct. It's a wide swath.

I want small business, because of the size, not because of how successful they are, to be able to employ more people. And that's what Republicans are trying to do. Guilty as charged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Then I ask my friend first to just listen, and then I will ask yet another question.

Mr. Bartlett also said this:

The Republican tax plan will do nothing whatsoever to increase employment. It is nothing more than an election-year giveaway to favored Republican constituencies and should not be taken seriously.

But I ask my friend, after hearing what Mr. Bartlett said, and listening to you, as well, saying that it's suggested that there will be jobs, is there a requirement in the legislation as is proposed that requires the creation of jobs?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Can you give me a ''yes'' or ''no''?

Mr. SESSIONS. Here's what I can give. Mr. Bartlett is wrong, because I know there will be at least one new net job created, and I know that because the testimony and information that I received last week as I was at the North Dallas Chamber, several people told me this is exactly what they need. They needed the jobs bill to get credit. They need this opportunity.

And what's interesting is, on the reverse side, is where Illinois, in January, a full year ago, passed a bill which increased taxes, and they lost 58,000 jobs in Illinois quickly because of high taxes. We're trying to make it easier to grow small business. Mr. Bartlett seems like there will be no new job growth—there will be—and he knows better than that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Let me offer to my friend a complaint: the fact that this matter didn't go through regular order, did not have hearings. It did have one question period during the Ways and Means Committee markup, and the person that was being questioned on the Committee on Taxation was the chief of staff, Thomas Barthold. And when he was asked about the effects of H.R. 9—and the question was put to him by our colleague, Mr. BECERRA: Is there a requirement that you create jobs? Mr. Barthold says: There's no requirement on the result of the tax relief.

I go back to you and ask you again: Is there a requirement that jobs be created in the measure as offered?

Mr. SESSIONS. The answer is no. And I would reply to the gentleman, I saw in this House of Representatives when former Speaker PELOSI increased the amount of money that we had in our Member reimbursement account, we went out and did more, and I hired an additional person at that rate.

If given an opportunity, small business wants to grow and they want to add employees, and this is what nobody seems to understand in this town.

We are for growing our economy. No one on our side would do something that wouldn't necessarily work. We are doing it because this is what people are asking for to grow the economy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. My friend says that no one would do anything that would not necessarily work. Well, why are we spending the time on this when my friend and I know that this measure is not going to become law for the reason, whether we like it or not, that the United States Senate is not going to pass it?

Last week, contrary to what you said, in the United States Senate the President's plan and the Democrats' plan was offered where there would be an alternative minimum tax for people that pay a million dollars or more in taxes. It's been referred to as the Buffett rule. You said that it didn't pass. It had a majority. But it didn't come up because Republicans didn't allow for it to have a majority. Whereas, had it come up, it likely would have passed because some Republicans would have caused it to pass, also.

You don't create jobs with your 20 percent. And now you need to answer for me: What if somebody, after they get the 20 percent, rather than hiring somebody, fires somebody; do they still get the tax cut?

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much for yielding.

As the gentleman knows quite well from the legislation and from the hearing which we had in the Rules Committee yesterday, that while these are great questions that you ask, the answer is we do not tell them what to do. There are no limitations in this bill that would say that you must or must not do these things. We don't do that.

We try and encourage, on the Republican side, and believe that this is what small business is asking for. I think you will be shocked with not only the success, if we had testimony from these small businesses, but this is what they're asking for.

Let's go to the worthiness of why would we possibly push an agenda that will never be held to the light of day with a vote in the United States Senate—for the same reason that the President will never get a tax increase from JOHN BOEHNER. This Republican House will not increase taxes, and so I don't know why the President is doing what he's doing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. All of what my friend says is most regrettable. One of the things that I'm sure Members in your Conference are concerned about is the fact that this is a 1-year measure.

Am I correct about that?

Mr. SESSIONS. I believe that would be correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Tell me then, how many times have we passed anything 1 year that's a tax something or another that cuts taxes? Let's take the Bush tax cuts that lasted 10 years that are soon to expire. How is it then that you expect that this is not going to go beyond 1 year? One year already is going to cost $46 billion.

Now my friend is a deficit and a debt hawk, and I like to think that I'm conservative enough to feel that the deficit and the debt are matters that we should address in order to give Americans opportunity. Toward that end, what is a $46 billion measure going to do, other than blow a hole in the deficit, since it's not paid for?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate that and thank you so much for asking the question.

The gentleman was here in 1997. The exact same arguments took place as we worked with President Clinton, and we were told on this floor a capital gains tax cut will result in $9 million not coming into the Treasury, and $554 million appeared quickly in that same tax year.

I would say to the gentleman, if we encourage people to go do things, they will turn things into great opportunities.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, we can point back. I'm talking about what you're trying to do today. What you're trying to do today is blowing a $46 billion hole in the deficit, which will destroy opportunity.

I thank my friend, and let me move on, now that I've had the opportunity to talk with you.

□ 0940

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and its opportunity-destroying under the underlying bill. When it comes to small businesses, Congress should work to create chances for smart, savvy, small business owners to thrive so that hardworking Americans can get a fair shot at a good paying job for an honest day's work and thereby ensure that our economic recovery continues.

Instead, the Republican bill creates only one opportunity, and that is the opportunity for those that are better off, including those of us in the United States Congress, to pay less than we could and can as our fair share in taxes.

Make no mistake: H.R. 9, despite its name, is not going to level the playing field so that American businesses can create the kinds of opportunities that the average American needs. That's because House Republicans have made the benefits of this bill available to a wide range of enterprises owned by wealthy people, including lawyers. I'm one of the lawyers, not one of the wealthy. But when I was a lawyer and had three secretaries as a single practitioner, if you had given me a 20 percent tax cut, I may have shared some of that with those three employees. I assure you I would not have hired anybody. Had you, when I was a lawyer, given me a 20 percent tax cut and required me to hire somebody, then I would have hired somebody, and it may have done some good. But other wealthy people—lobbyists, hedge funds, private equity fund managers, as well as many professional sports teams, without a single requirement to expand employment or invest in the United States.

In fact, under this bill, a business owner could fire, as I asked my friend,

U.S. workers, hire full-time workers in foreign countries and still be eligible for the full deduction.

According to an analysis of the Tax Policy Center, approximately 49 percent of the benefits of H.R. 9 would go to 0.3 percent of people with incomes exceeding $1 million in 2012—each receiving an average tax cut of more than $44,000.

That's not creating an opportunity environment in which small businesses can create jobs. As I've said before and will say again, I have no quarrel with millionaires and billionaires and the wealthiest of us in America. And like my friend from Texas, I want everybody to be able to have significant wealth if that were to be possible. I do, however, have a problem with legislation designed to tip the scales in favor of the best among us in this country masquerading as tax cuts for small businesses.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, the Republican justifications for this kind of ''trickle down'' tax policy are inaccurate and debunked by history. In actuality, tax rates have little bearing on economic productivity. Some of the fastest economic growth of the postwar period came in the 1950s, when the top tax rate was above 80 percent. The slowest growth came in the 2000s, when the top tax rate was 35 percent—which I pay, and which some of you do not because you are in better circumstances than mine, but all of us in the House of Representatives are better off than the people we want to really help, other than those that are better off like us.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, the Republican justifications allow that this occurrence, that the change from the 1950s to the 2000s, is easy to explain. Businesses do not make decisions based on tax rates. They make decisions based on factors specific to their business, like their number of competitors and larger macro- and microeconomic factors.

Bills such as the one before us today ignore this reality in favor of pushing Republican pet policies that ignore the actual difficulties facing hardworking small business owners. In the Rules Committee, I cited Betty's Restaurant in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, where I eat breakfast and sometimes lunch or dinner. Betty's doesn't have more than nine employees. If we were to target our relief to 20 percent, Betty would be in better shape. But if Larry Flynt at ''Hustler'' is going to be in better shape because he has less than 500 employees, I'm taking Betty.

I get my clothes cleaned at Spring Cleaners. They've been in business for over 25 years. The owner of that business, after he retired, left it with his daughter. They don't have more than 10 employees in 2 of their cleaning plants. This kind of measure, if targeted to her, would help her. But a law firm here in Washington or a lobbying firm with 49 lawyers that's making $500 million a year will qualify for this tax cut, and I'm taking Spring Cleaners over those lawyers and lobbyists here in this town.

Simply put, what we have before us is the exact opposite of a jobs bill. It's a boon for the rich, the very antithesis of smart tax reform, and does nothing to create opportunities for middle class, let alone, poor Americans. Instead of this misguided legislation before us today, Madam Speaker, we should pass policy initiatives that stimulate economic growth and job creation such as public-private partnerships.

When compared to measures such as infrastructure spending, today's bill would have a relatively small effect on strengthening our economy and helping businesses create even more jobs. In comparison, for every $1 billion invested in infrastructure construction projects, 18,000 jobs—and nobody controverts that, and if you do, say 15,000 jobs—are supported nationwide. And my Governor turned down a billion-plus dollars for a rail project that had been appropriated and that Republicans and Democrats had sought, and it would have created 18,000 jobs. And yet we find ourselves in Florida, just like other places in this country, suffering job diminution. This wasn't money that did not go to Illinois, California, and the Northeast Corridor for rail; it just did not come to Florida.

There are other circumstances. We yesterday passed a measure here to extend the transportation measure for 3 months. Cut me some slack. Jim Oberstar had been begging us before he left Congress to do a $400 billion infrastructure bill that probably would have put us in the position of not having to have done the stimulus had we done it when he asked for it, and we need to do a better bill than the 3-month extension. This was the 10th extension of the transportation measure that we have done. We are better than that, and we could have done what the Senate offered, MAP–21, and we would kick-start this economy rather than kicking this can down the road.

Let me tell you something about the can. It's getting ready to run up against a wall or a cliff, and there ain't going to be nowhere else to kick it. Some day, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, are going to have to stand up and face the fact that we must address this in a significant way, and we can't have this gridlock, and we can't have this continuing standoff.

This is supposed to be the ''land of opportunity,'' Madam Speaker. Let's make sure that it's the land of opportunity for rich people. Let's make sure that it's the land of opportunity for middle class and poor people. Let's make sure that it's the land of opportunity for small and large businesses. In short, opportunity for all Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) who is a freshman who serves on the Transportation, Homeland Security, and Science Committees, and a man who understands what people back home are asking for.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cuts Act.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, American small businesses are drowning in red tape, and the National Federation of Independent Business has determined that tax compliance is one of the biggest costs.

American small businesses now spend between 1.7 billion and 1.8 billion hours on tax compliance, with a total estimated cost of between $15- to $16 billion annually. This wasted time and effort would be better invested in creating jobs and manufacturing products instead of handing over hard-earned capital to the government.

I support efforts to reform the Tax Code and make it simpler to reduce those tax compliance costs, and I also support reducing the tax burden on American job creators. That's why I am glad to be cosponsor of H.R. 9, legislation that would reduce the burden faced by small businesses. Since 99.9 percent of all U.S. businesses employ less than 500 people, small businesses are vital to the American economy.

In the Eighth District, 8 out of 10 jobs are due to small businesses. When I return home, I repeatedly listen to the same concerns from small business people in the Eighth District. My constituents are hesitant to expand their businesses as a result of deficient access to capital, complex legal burdens, and Tax Code uncertainty.

□ 0950

The Small Business Tax Cut Act immediately creates access to capital by allowing productive employers to reinvest more of their hard-earned money into their businesses.

The bill will have an immediate impact on every city and town in this country. In fact, more than 22 million small businesses will receive a much-needed infusion of capital.

Several small business owners that I have personally spoken with in my district have already expressed strong support for this proposal. This includes businesses like RC Fabricators in Hibbing, Minnesota, which manufactures precision steel and aluminum construction equipment; Extreme Equipment Repairs in Harris, Minnesota, which specializes in large transport truck repair; and the London Road Rental Center in Duluth, Minnesota, which provides all kinds of equipment and party rentals for the Duluth area.

For example, because of the recent success in northern Minnesota's mining and paper industries, RC Fabricators has been looking for ways to expand, but high taxes have prevented them from accumulating enough capital to grow. This bill will ease that tax

burden and allow them to update machinery, hire workers, and provide high-quality products. These kinds of stories are repeated throughout the country, and this legislation will help them.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 9 is a commonsense, pro-growth bill that will provide immediate assistance to employers and American workers as we labor to jump-start our economy and ease the burden felt by small businesses and American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on the Buffett rule, which Representative BALDWIN has introduced—and I'm a cosponsor of—as H.R. 3903, the Paying a Fair Share Act of 2012. This bill would ensure that people making over $1 million a year do not pay a lower tax rate than middle class Americans. To discuss our amendment to this rule, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for the time.

I rise today on behalf of the hard-working middle class families in Wisconsin and across the country who have unfairly been paying at a higher tax rate than multi-millionaires and billionaires.

Working Wisconsinites are struggling to find good-paying jobs, pay their mortgages, send their kids to college, and save for a secure retirement; meanwhile, the ultra-rich are reaping benefits unavailable to the rest of us. No wonder middle class Americans have long felt that our tax system is rigged against them. Frankly, it is.

Middle class Americans deserve a Tax Code that is fair. Powerful special interests have manipulated our Tax Code to make sure that the wealthiest Americans don't have to pay their fair share. Loopholes and special provisions have made it so that billionaire Warren Buffett's secretary pays a higher tax rate than he does. In fact, approximately one-quarter of all people who make over $1 million a year pay lower effective tax rates than middle class families.

I introduced the Paying a Fair Share Act, which would make the Buffett rule law and ensure that middle class workers do not pay a higher tax rate than those making over $1 million a year. This is a commonsense solution that would address the disparity that Warren Buffett decried, and it would reduce the deficit by billions of dollars over the next decade.

Now, let's be honest about what the Buffett rule is and what it is not. The Buffett rule is not a comprehensive tax reform bill, which I favor, by the way. The Buffett rule is not going to wipe our Nation's deficit away, something that I agree must be tackled. The Buffett rule is not a tax increase on small businesses. According to the Congressional Research Service, less than one-half of 1 percent of businesses may be impacted by the Buffett rule.

Here is what the Buffett rule is really about: fairness. Plain and simple, this is about fairness. It's high time that we level the playing field between middle class taxpayers and those who make over $1 million per year. The Paying a Fair Share Act will help restore people's faith that if you work hard and play by the rules, you'll have a chance to get ahead.

It's up to Congress to fix this obvious injustice. According to a recent CNN poll, nearly three-quarters of Americans support the Buffett rule. Earlier this week, a bipartisan majority of Senators demonstrated their support for the Buffett rule to institute tax fairness for the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question so that I may offer the Paying a Fair Share Act, also known as the Buffett rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, we're hearing a lot of rhetoric today about all these millionaires that are out there. And I would be for their ideas if they worked, but the facts of the case are what they create is less opportunity.

The IRS, on their Web site, shows that there were 37 percent fewer people who filed as millionaires one year over the next. That's the latest information we have on the IRS Web site—37 percent fewer people reported numbers of $1 million or more. That falls right in line with what's happening as America goes into bankruptcy. Because this is about fairness. Well, it shouldn't be about fairness. It should be about opportunities, creating more opportunities. That's the same reason why this same rhetoric, why 63 percent of our children move back in to our homes when they finish college—lack of opportunities. That's not fair. Fairness is opportunity and the chance for people to go make something better of their lives.

What we're talking about today will help some 54,509 women-owned businesses in the State of Texas alone that account for 483,000 individuals. That's what we're trying to help and save. This is the right thing. I'm very proud of it.

I know what they want to do is raise taxes. I know what they want to do is call it fairness. All it simply does is cause further economic malaise and deficiencies all across this country of small business.

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), the gentleman who sits on the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Madam Speaker, we hear so much out here on the House floor. I support the rule and the underlying legislation because it gives the ability to small businesses to create jobs here in America. It allows people to go back to work. Those folks, when they go back to work, actually pay taxes. They start contributing as citizens of this great country.

This small business group tax deduction affects small businesses that are minority-owned, that are women-owned, that are veteran-owned businesses. You hear all this talk about how it affects all these other folks, but this is really about creating jobs in America. It's about allowing people that are entrepreneurs to utilize the resources that they've worked hard for and their employees have worked hard for to create additional jobs.

You've heard a whole lot of stuff down here about transportation. The transportation bill expired back in September of 2009. My good friend from Florida, I agree with you, we should have a long-term transportation bill. But what did you do since 2009? I got up here in 2011. We're still talking about the lack of action by this Congress, by the Senate, and by this President since 2009 to get Americans back to work.

When you talk to those that are small businesses that actually do the work on roads, they said if you do a 90-day, a 2-year extension, we're not going to add jobs. We're going to be able to keep the jobs that we have, but we're not going to add jobs. We're not going to be buying equipment from Caterpillar up in Peoria, Illinois, and putting people to work in Illinois. We've already canceled those jobs.

So, Madam Speaker, this is about America. This is about actually looking people in the eye, those that actually create jobs. Remember, small businesses create over 70 percent of the new jobs in America. We're making them the villain in this instead of returning it back and saying, you know, small businesses and entrepreneurs, they're going to use the money to grow their business. That's why they're in it. That's why they get into this whole thing in regards to putting their risk, their money, and their reputations at stake.

□ 1000

You hear about class warfare. We heard it here today.

And I agree about comprehensive tax reform. I'll give you the best comprehensive tax reform. Why don't we move to the fair tax?

Why don't we move to the fact that we can encourage our small businesses and businesses in America that can compete globally instead of under a tax burden and debt that we have here in America?

We have the ability to move forward and do the right thing. Let's not get caught up in the semantics and the political rhetoric. Let's really stand here and do the right thing for small businesses to allow them, Madam Speaker, to create the jobs that we know they can. I have the utmost confidence in small businesses.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank Judge HASTINGS, I thank him very much for telling us the story of America, from spring cleaners to families that have held their businesses for a long period of time.

And I really wish I could join my friend. I know he's pleading for us to believe that any job will be created, but, frankly, the answer is that there is no requirement for jobs to be created under this tax bill.

What this tax bill does is complicate any manner of tax reform which Americans are begging for. It adds to the already burgeoning, growing Bush tax cuts. Now this added burden, $6 trillion in the combination package of the existing tax cuts under the Bush administration. It adds to the deficit of human life.

And let me just tell you about some young woman, a caretaker, a mother, maybe a mother who's at home and works at home, not only to take care of her children, but has a home business, or maybe a caretaker taking care of an elderly or disabled person. Let me tell you what these tax cuts will do. And this is what it equals.

It equals almost $180 billion in cuts and food stamps, where soldiers' families cannot eat and the caretakers cannot provide for their families. It equals to the increase in the Stafford loans to 6.8 percent in interest, where middle class families are priced out of higher education. It equals the cut in Medicaid to women who need access to health care.

And I don't know why we haven't addressed our good friends in the restaurant industry. These are the people whose doors are open and truly could hire an additional staff, who has the smallest margin of profit.

We're not doing anything for depreciation relief. No, we're sitting around giving the top 3 percent over one-half of this tax break, a big Christmas in the middle of April. 125,000 millionaires will get a check for $58,000, and then it'll cost a budget busting $46 billion.

In my own State of Texas, there's an article that says we're pricing the middle class, Congressman HASTINGS, out of higher education. They're investing in research, but tuition is going up and there's no relief. And the loans that we give from the Federal Government, as I said, will be almost 7 percent in interest in just about 70 days. This is what this tax cut will do.

I'm not afraid to stand up for small businesses, but you absolutely need to look at the framework. Five hundred employees. You could be a big law firm. You could be a big engineering firm. And God bless you; I want you to keep working. That's why I voted on the transportation bill. But what I need to have happen is that there is a requirement for jobs.

The stimulus package created 3 million jobs because we had a mission of shovel-ready projects, and, in addition, we gave monies to people who put the money out on the street.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

But not in this case. No requirement for jobs. You want to sit here and tell at-home moms, working moms like the young woman that I wanted to tell you about who gets up early morning, doesn't get into a car, gets onto a bus, rides that bus to get her child to the school, jumps off the bus, makes sure she can run to the front door of the school, drops the child before the bus turns around to get her back; on the bus to go across town to get a job or to go to her work, you're cutting her access to health care because you're taking $46 billion.

Madam Speaker, all I can say to you: This is a budget buster on top of $6 trillion of which we are paying for the Bush cuts. We're doing nothing for restaurants, nothing for small businesses, and nothing for the working young woman that I've told you about this morning.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

By the way, President Obama even admitted that did not work, that shovel-ready proposition that he tried to sell across the country simply did not work. I would be for the President's ideas if they worked. What they're about is the supposed fairness, which diminishes the economic opportunity for this country to grow and have jobs and make small businesses grow.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the time.

I wanted to come down and talk today. I support the rule, but I really support H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut bill. This tax relief will go to 28,000 small businesses in West Virginia.

I'm from a small State. Small businesses, I heard earlier, the statistics, create 70 percent of the jobs. In my State, it's probably 90 percent of the jobs are small business owners. Entrepreneurship and small businesses are going to drive us to recovery, not more spending and more debt.

I heard the gentlelady talk about restaurants. That's who this is aimed at. Our top three small businesses in West Virginia would be health care and the service industry and the food industry.

I've spent the last 2 weeks traveling in my district and listening to the concerns of families and job creators. They're very frustrated, very frustrated by the high price of gasoline, rising health care costs, and new regulation upon new regulation. It's making it difficult for our job creators to operate and to grow the jobs.

A recent study by the U.S. Chamber found that 80 percent of small businesses reported that taxation, regulation, and legislation from Washington make it harder for them, for their businesses, to hire more employees. This tax cut will have an immediate effect, I believe, on the economy and certainly in my State.

Just several weeks ago the Senate, the House, and the White House, we worked together to pass the JOBS Act; and I've already gotten very positive feedback from several people that they're, number one, glad that we're looking at the real problem in this country, which is the lack of jobs and job creation and, number two, that we did something together, that we worked together to try to get ourselves out of this slow recovery that we're in right now.

I hope we can work in the same bipartisan spirit and pass this tax cut to give our job creators the ability to hire somebody else, buy new equipment, expand their businesses, choose another location, all the things that I think this tax cut bill will provide.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would urge my friend from Texas that I'm going to be the last speaker, and I'm prepared to close if he has no further speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much. In fact, I would tell the gentleman we have no additional speakers other than myself, and I'll plan to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

H.R. 9 is not about creating jobs or helping small businesses increase hiring. It is another in a long line of Republican proposals that benefit those of us, including those of us in the House of Representatives, that are the better-off Americans at the expense of the middle class.

My Republican friends rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Representative CROWLEY, which I offered in the Rules Committee in his stead, which would have prevented businesses from eliminating jobs in the United States while creating jobs overseas under this bill.

Procedurally, it is also disconcerting that, contrary to my Republican colleagues' self-professed commitment to an open process, Democrats have been allowed only one substitute in an otherwise closed process. Nor was H.R. 9 the subject of any hearing before either the full Ways and Means Committee, or the Select Revenue Measures Subcommittee, with the exception of a brief question-and-answer session with Joint Committee on Taxation staff during the markup.

Finally, instead of taking real steps to address the very real need to create opportunities for businesses to succeed in a still nascent economic recovery, House Republicans are more than willing to rush through another tax bill that could, if it were to pass—and it is

not going to, and they know that—only help those of us that are better off in society, while sticking middle- and lower-income families with the bill and creating exactly zero jobs.

□ 1010

And you call this opportunity?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this opportunity-destroying measure and to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida, not only for his vigorous defense of the Democrat position to increase taxes, but I would like to, if I can, state what really are the facts of the case and what is in this bill.

The claim is that tax cuts will be available for small businesses even if they ship jobs overseas. Well, the fact is this legislation allows the 20 percent deduction for qualified domestic business income. Domestic. That's here. Domestic business. It would not be allowed to include money that was earned overseas. So I think that that is a good part of this bill. I think what Mr. CANTOR did is understand that we are trying to grow American jobs.

There have also been a lot of statements made by our friends, but I think the American people need to hear this about the bill and the substitute, which will be allowed and which was allowed in the Rules Committee, and that is, similar to H.R. 9, which is this bill, the Levin amendment, which would be the substitute, does not include any provision addressing companies that continue to make foreign investment. It's devoid of that. Both proposals do tie the small business tax deduction to domestic wages. Both bills do that exact same thing. So to accuse us of not doing something or something that would create or stop business from having jobs overseas, that's devoid of that in both bills. They are both consistent. It's about domestic works.

Similar to H.R. 9, the Levin amendment does not require job creation to benefit from the tax deduction. No one says you have to go and create jobs. We understand enough about business to know this is what they're asking for so they can grow jobs.

The Levin amendment does deviate from H.R. 9 in one very significant way, and that is the amount of money that would be available to small business so that they can expand the economy, grow jobs, and create opportunities for Americans. Obviously, what we're here today to do is to grow the economy.

Madam Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article which is from The Wall Street Journal, June of 2011. I would like to read just a little bit of this:

> This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the State personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in corporate taxes.

By the way—and it's off what is here—this was done for fairness. It is the same proposal that Barack Obama, as our President who was just elected, was trying to push in the campaign. Illinois thought it sounded really, really great. So let's see what happened, what the fairness resulted in, and I go back to the article, that between its passage and June—6 months later—Illinois lost 56,223 jobs according to statistics released by their own departments there in the State of Illinois. But here is what's really amazing. It's not just that they lost the jobs, but it's the hysteria that ensued therein. I continue to read:

> To combat the job losses caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce ''has already shelled out some $230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the State.''

So they were not even going to get $230 million worth of additional revenue. They put this tax on, and now they're having to beg people to stay. Madam Speaker, I would be for what President Obama and our friends, the Democrats, are for if it worked the way they said it would. The facts of the case are simple.

The Republicans understand business, but we understand the ability to listen and give small business what it's asking for. They'll do their job. I know small business and I know it well. They'll get their job done, and they'll do it quite well. They will add employment. They will hire their neighbors. They will hire more women and minorities who can come in. They will provide real dreams for people and give them not just that entrepreneurship angle but the angle to make sure that we're adding revenue in this country.

Republicans get it and Democrats, too. We are for fairness in a different way. Fairness comes from a job and job creation and the American Dream, not losing jobs and explaining to people, I'm sorry, we just had to do this just to make things fair.

Fairness and not having a job is not fairness. We're aiming for job creation and the development of that, and that's why we're asking people to make sure that we pass this bill today. I applaud Republican Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for introducing this legislation. It comes from his listening to people across this country.

I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule.

Over the last few weeks, President Barack Obama has adamantly supported raising taxes on corporations and small businesses that employ millions of American workers as a precondition for cutting our bloated federal spending.

To see the real world effect of this proposal on jobs and the economy, President Obama's home state provides a useful, cautionary example.

This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the state personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in corporate taxes. Between its passage and June, Illinois lost 56,223 jobs according to statistics released last week.

To combat the job losses caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce ''has already shelled out some $230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the state.''

So not only is Illinois bleeding productive jobs, but it's now allowing the government to pick winners (large, politically-connected companies) and losers (everyone else).

Extracting an ever-increasing toll from job creators is simply the wrong answer for American jobs. Just ask the 56,000 Illinoisans who have lost their jobs since January. Spreading this failure nationwide is simply not an option.

We are in a debt crisis not because we tax too little, but because Democrat-led Washington spends beyond its means. House Republicans have been focused on encouraging and providing certainty (not new burdens) to our job creators—and paying down our nation's debt for our children.

The rest of America simply cannot afford more of the failed policies of the President's home state, and House Republicans will fight against tax hikes so that we may ensure a brighter future for generations to come.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 620 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3903) to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 620, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 179, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—234

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Guinta
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Rangel
Sewell
Slaughter
Walsh (IL)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1041

Mr. PETERS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 172, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 172, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 172 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on Ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 620, Providing for consideration of H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—234

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Rangel
Schock
Slaughter
Walsh (IL)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1050

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 173, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 173 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to the resolution, as amended, to H. Res. 620, providing for consideration of H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 118, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—290

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Coble
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Matsui

McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NAYS—118

Adams
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Benishek
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capuano
Cardoza
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
DeFazio
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foxx
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
McCotter
McDermott
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schock
Shuler
Sires
Stark
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Amash
Gohmert
Owens

NOT VOTING—20

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Cummings
Davis (KY)
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Guinta
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Rangel
Schrader
Slaughter
Walsh (IL)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1057

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

SMALL BUSINESS TAX CUT ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 620, I call up the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for domestic business income of qualified small businesses, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 620, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 9

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Tax Cut Act''.

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 200. DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of a qualified small business, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 20 percent of the lesser of—

''(1) the qualified domestic business income of the taxpayer for the taxable year, or

''(2) taxable income (determined without regard to this section) for the taxable year.

''(b) DEDUCTION LIMITED BASED ON WAGES PAID.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the deduction allowable under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed 50 percent of the greater of—

''(A) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to non-owners, or

''(B) the sum of—

''(i) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to individuals who are non-owner family members of direct owners, plus

''(ii) any W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to 10-percent-or-less direct owners.

''(2) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO OWNERSHIP.—For purposes of this section—

''(A) NON-OWNER.—The term 'non-owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any person who does not own (and is not considered as owning within the meaning of subsection (c) or (e)(3) of section 267, as the case may be) any stock of such business (or, if such business is other than a corporation, any capital or profits interest of such business).

''(B) NON-OWNER FAMILY MEMBERS.—An individual is a non-owner family member of a direct owner if—

''(i) such individual is family (within the meaning of section 267(c)(4)) of a direct owner, and

''(ii) such individual would be a non-owner if subsections (c) and (e)(3) of section 267 were applied without regard to section 267(c)(2).

''(C) DIRECT OWNER.—The term 'direct owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any person who owns (or is considered as owning under the applicable non-family attribution rules) any stock of such business (or, if such business is other than a corporation, any capital or profits interest of such business).

''(D) 10-PERCENT-OR-LESS DIRECT OWNERS.—The term '10-percent-or-less direct owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any direct owner of such business who owns (or is considered as owning under the applicable non-family attribution rules)—

''(i) in the case of a qualified small business which is a corporation, not more than 10 percent of the outstanding stock of the corporation or stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all stock of the corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of a qualified small business which is not a corporation, not more than 10 percent of the capital or profits interest of such business.

''(E) APPLICABLE NON-FAMILY ATTRIBUTION RULES.—The term 'applicable non-family attribution rules' means the attribution rules of subsection (c) or (e)(3) of section 267, as the case may be, but in each case applied without regard to section 267(c)(2).

''(3) W–2 WAGES.—For purposes of this section—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'W–2 wages' means, with respect to any person for any taxable year of such person, the sum of the amounts described in paragraphs (3) and (8) of section 6051(a) paid by such person with respect to employment of employees by such person during the calendar year ending during such taxable year.

''(B) LIMITATION TO WAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO QUALIFIED DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME.—Such term shall not include any amount which is not properly allocable to domestic business gross receipts for purposes of subsection (c)(1).

''(C) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Except in the case of amounts treated as W–2 wages under paragraph (4)—

''(i) such term shall not include any amount which is not allowed as a deduction under section 162 for the taxable year, and

''(ii) such term shall not include any amount which is not properly included in a return filed with the Social Security Administration on or before the 60th day after the due date (including extensions) for such return.

''(4) CERTAIN PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTIONS TREATED AS W–2 WAGES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified small business which is a partnership and elects the application of this paragraph for the taxable year—

''(i) the qualified domestic business taxable income of such partnership for such taxable year (determined after the application of clause (ii)) which is allocable under rules similar to the rules of section 199(d)(1)(A)(ii) to each qualified service-providing partner shall be treated for purposes of this section as W–2 wages paid during such taxable year to such partner as an employee, and

''(ii) the domestic business gross receipts of such partnership for such taxable year shall be reduced by the amount so treated.

''(B) QUALIFIED SERVICE-PROVIDING PARTNER.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified service-providing partner' means, with respect to any qualified domestic business taxable income, any partner who is a 10-percent-or-less direct owner and who materially participates in the trade or business to which such income relates.

''(5) ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS.—The Secretary shall provide for the application of this subsection in cases where the taxpayer acquires, or disposes of, the major portion of a trade or business or the major portion of a separate unit of a trade or business during the taxable year.

''(c) QUALIFIED DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified domestic business income' for any taxable year means an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the taxpayer's domestic business gross receipts for such taxable year, over

''(B) the sum of—

''(i) the cost of goods sold that are allocable to such receipts, and

''(ii) other expenses, losses, or deductions (other than the deduction allowed under this section), which are properly allocable to such receipts.

''(2) DOMESTIC BUSINESS GROSS RECEIPTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'domestic business gross receipts' means the gross receipts of the taxpayer which are effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States within the meaning of section 864(c) but determined—

''(i) without regard to paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) thereof, and

''(ii) by substituting 'qualified small business (within the meaning of section 200)' for 'nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation' each place it appears therein.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), domestic business gross receipts shall not include any of the following:

''(i) Gross receipts derived from the sale or exchange of—

''(I) a capital asset, or

''(II) property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(b)).

''(ii) Royalties, rents, dividends, interest, or annuities.

''(iii) Any amount which constitutes wages (as defined in section 3401).

''(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 199(c) shall apply for purposes of this section (applied with respect to qualified domestic business income in lieu of qualified production activities income and with respect to domestic business gross receipts in lieu of domestic production gross receipts).

''(d) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small business' means any employer engaged in a trade or business if such employer had fewer than 500 full-time equivalent employees for either calendar year 2010 or 2011.

''(2) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES.—The term 'full-time equivalent employees' has the meaning given such term by subsection (d)(2) of section 45R applied—

''(A) without regard to subsection (d)(5) of such section,

''(B) with regard to subsection (e)(1) of such section, and

''(C) by substituting 'calendar year' for 'taxable year' each place it appears therein.

''(3) EMPLOYERS NOT IN EXISTENCE PRIOR TO 2012.—In the case of an employer which was not in existence on January 1, 2012, the determination under paragraph (1) shall be made with respect to calendar year 2012.

''(4) APPLICATION TO CALENDAR YEARS IN WHICH EMPLOYER IN EXISTENCE FOR PORTION OF CALENDAR YEAR.—In the case of any calendar year during which the employer comes into existence, the number of full-time equivalent employees determined under paragraph (2) with respect to such calendar year shall be increased by multiplying the number so determined (without regard to this paragraph) by the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(A) the number of days in such calendar year, by

''(B) the number of days during such calendar year which such employer is in existence.

''(5) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any person treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 (applied without regard to section 1563(b)) or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as a single employer for purposes of this subsection.

''(B) PREDECESSORS.—Any reference in this subsection to an employer shall include a reference to any predecessor of such employer.

''(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) ELECTIVE APPLICATION OF DEDUCTION.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the taxpayer may elect not to take any item of income into account as domestic business gross receipts for purposes of this section.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 199.—If a deduction is allowed under this section with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year—

''(A) any gross receipts of the taxpayer which are taken into account under this section for such taxable year shall not be taken into account under section 199 for such taxable year, and

''(B) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer which are taken into account under this section shall not be taken into account under section 199 for such taxable year.

''(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7) of section 199(d) shall apply for purposes of this section (applied with respect to qualified domestic business income in lieu of qualified production activities income).

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations which prevent a taxpayer which reorganizes from being treated as a qualified small business if such taxpayer would not have been treated as a qualified small business prior to such reorganization.

''(g) APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to the first taxable year of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 2011.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 56(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''deduction under section 199'' both places it appears and inserting ''deductions under sections 199 and 200''.

(2) Section 56(g)(4)(C) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vii) DEDUCTION FOR DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any amount allowable as a deduction under section 200.''.

(3) The following provisions of such Code are each amended by inserting ''200,'' after ''199,''.

(A) Section 86(b)(2)(A).

(B) Section 135(c)(4)(A).

(C) Section 137(b)(3)(A).

(D) Section 219(g)(3)(A)(ii).

(E) Section 221(b)(2)(C)(i).

(F) Section 222(b)(2)(C)(i).

(G) Section 246(b)(1).

(H) Section 469(i)(3)(F)(iii).

(4) Section 163(j)(6)(A)(i) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (III) and by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclause:

''(V) any deduction allowable under section 200, and''.

(5) Section 170(b)(2)(C) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (v) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

''(vi) section 200.''.

(6) Section 172(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—The deduction under section 200 shall not be allowed.''.

(7) Section 613(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''deduction under section 199'' and inserting ''deductions under sections 199 and 200''.

(8) Section 613A(d)(1) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) any deduction allowable under section 200,''.

(9) Section 1402(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16), by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18), and by inserting after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

''(17) the deduction provided by section 200 shall not be allowed; and''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 200. Domestic business income of qualified small businesses.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 70 minutes of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 112–447, if offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 25 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 35 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 9.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act. This legislation will allow small businesses with fewer than 500 employees to take a 20 percent tax deduction.

Small businesses are the engine of job creation, and while we pursue comprehensive tax reform that will give all businesses certainty to invest and hire, this bill will help small businesses to reinvest, hire new workers, or provide a raise to an employee.

The policies put forth by President Obama and congressional Democrats have yielded more government spending but have failed to generate strong income growth and the jobs Americans need. Instead of lowering unemployment, we got a lower credit rating; instead of massive job creation, we got massive and unprecedented levels of debt; and instead of higher wages for working families, we got higher gas prices.

This bill provides real relief to American small businesses and the workers they employ, and it treats every small business equally. Contrary to the political cronyism we've seen time and time again, this bill does not pick winners and losers. It provides relief to all small businesses, including those in my

home State of Michigan. Michigan has been hit especially hard over the last 3 years with some of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation. And while small business owners in my district need and want comprehensive tax reform, they also agree that we must take steps to spur investment and hiring today as well. These business owners are the real experts who know what they need to add jobs back to our communities.

Take, for example, Bob Yackel, president of Merrill Tool. As part of the 400-employee Merrill Technologies Group, Mr. Yackel says:

> As a manufacturing business in mid-Michigan, we know firsthand the ramifications of the recent economic turmoil. The best way Washington can help energize economic growth is by making sure business owners are spending less on tax payments and more on creating jobs.

Bob Yackel is a larger small business owner, but there are smaller businesses that feel the same way.

Jim Holton, owner of Mountain Town Station in Mount Pleasant, has served the central Michigan community as a restaurant owner for more than 15 years. He is especially pleased with the simplicity and ease of this legislative approach. He says:

> The beauty of the Small Business Tax Cut Act is its simplicity. If you're earning profits and contributing to the economy, then you can take 20 percent off your tax bill. No hoops to jump through. This is a great way for business owners like myself in the Great Lakes Bay region and across America to help jump-start our economy.

Those are just two examples in Michigan's Fourth District, but they echo small businesses and small business owners across the country.

Throughout our history, we've depended upon these industrious and innovative risk-takers to help us move through tough economic times. While we work to provide them the long-term comprehensive tax reform they need, we can also take steps today to unlock new opportunities for them immediately. Passing this bill will provide these much-needed, immediate opportunities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting small business and to demonstrate that they support them as well by voting ''yes'' on H.R. 9.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) be permitted to control the balance of the time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, Mr. CANTOR will control the time and have the authority to dispense time.

There was no objection.

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

This bill needs to be graded, and the grade it gets is F, a fat F grade. It fails all tests of sound tax policy.

Let me start with truth in advertising, a grade F. This is not a small business bill. It's small business in name only. It's totally untargeted, totally. It applies as long as an entity has under 500 employees—law firms, sports teams, financial consultants, lobbyists, corporate farmers—and regardless of what their annual receipts are. They can be tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Interestingly, when the SBA looks at its loan program, it has what's called a common standard. What that is is that generally the businesses it serves cannot have more than $7 million in average annual receipts for most nonmanufacturing firms. This bill has no limits—none—as to function or amount of receipts, so really this bill mocks the use of the title ''small business.'' This isn't about mom and pop. It's about popping the cork for wealthy taxpayers.

Secondly, graded on tax fairness, F. According to the most cautious estimate, 56 percent of the tax break under this bill goes to taxpayers making $250,000 or more annually. It provides 125,000 taxpayers making $1 million a year with a tax break of over $58,000. Another model says that 49 percent of this $46 billion revenue loss goes to people with incomes over $1 million. This is Bush tax cuts on steroids.

Thirdly, in terms of job creation, another grade F. Listen to the Joint Tax Committee analysis. It says this bill's economic impact ''is so small as to be incalculable.'' The only thing calculating about this bill is its political nature.

We've looked at the Web site of the majority leader. He uses Mr. Robbins, who was the one who advised Herman Cain on 9–9–9. Here's what Mr. Robbins says about this bill: He estimates that a 1-year tax cut would create 39,000 jobs. This is on the majority leader's Web site. So, according to the analysis that the leader is touting on its own Web site, H.R. 9 would increase the Federal deficit by $1.1 million for every job supposedly created. So, another big F.

Now let's talk about where these jobs would be created. The bill is so untargeted to require that the jobs that are created here would really be created, because a company would get this benefit if it sheds jobs or if it uses the deduction to hire workers overseas.

Let's next go to fiscal irresponsibility, another fat F in terms of responsibility. This bill adds a whopping $46 billion to the deficit in 1 year; if it's made permanent, one-half trillion dollars over the next 10 years. So I say this to anybody who votes for this bill and then goes home and utters the word, once, ''Federal deficit.'' They will sell short the intelligence of their constituents, because they will know when someone is selling them a pig in a poke.

Now let's talk about tax reform, another fat F. This bill is the antithesis of tax reform. What it does is ridicule supporters who claim their fealty to tax reform. It doesn't simplify tax structures; it complicates it. That's why I quote The Wall Street Journal this morning. This is what they say about your bill: It's another tax gimmick.

□ 1110

Just earlier today somebody got up here and read from The Wall Street Journal. It was some months ago. Again, The Wall Street Journal says: ''The U.S. economy does not need another tax gimmick.'' So this is tax policy gone haywire.

I'm going to offer a substitute, after we finish debate here on general debate, that's targeted; that will help create jobs; that's fair; that is fiscally responsible and continues a policy that both Republicans and Democrats have supported in the past.

This flies in the face of anything bipartisan. It flies in the face of anything that is truthful in advertising. It flies in the face of anything that is fair. It flies in the face of anything that creates jobs. It flies in the face of fiscal responsibility, and it flies in the face of tax reform.

So I more than urge people to vote ''no'' and vote ''yes'' on our substitute. I really urge that they exercise their responsibility to try to get this country moving in the right direction, not with policies that deserve a total F on the test of sound tax policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we know jobs won't come back until small businesses recover. Small businesses have generated over 65 percent of the new jobs in this country; but the economic downturn, red tape, and higher taxes coming from Washington have simply made it harder for small business to create jobs.

Tax policies should encourage economic growth, investment, and job creation, not stifle it. We need to stop and think about what kind of country we want to be. Do we want to be one with lower taxes, more growth, and more jobs; or do we want to be one of more government control and fewer opportunities?

This week, when every American filed their tax returns, the other party in the Senate voted to increase taxes. We should not be taking money out of the hands of those we are counting on to create jobs. We need to let small business owners keep more of their hard-earned money so they can start hiring again.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we'll vote on the Small Business Tax Cut Act to give every small business with fewer than 500 employees a 20 percent tax cut. Our bill puts more money into the hands of small business owners so they can reinvest those funds to retain and create more jobs and grow their businesses, plain and simple.

According to a study, the Small Business Tax Cut Act will help create more than 100,000 new jobs a year once fully in place. One-third of the firms that benefit from our tax cut are owned by

women. One-fifth are owned by minorities. And our legislation won't just benefit small business owners; it benefits current workers by boosting wages.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk with small business owners across the country, I hear they need more opportunity to grow. I hear that taxes are siphoning away their income. I hear they can't access capital.

One small business owner in Spotsylvania, Virginia, called the small business tax cut a win-win for him and other small business owners in the economy. He said that with more money to invest in his businesses he could afford to hire more staff, buy new equipment and expand.

Mr. Speaker, while we continue to work toward tax reform that broadens the base, brings down the rates for everybody, and gets rid of loopholes, Washington assumes the role of picking winners and losers. We need to take incremental steps to give job creators tax relief right away. This Small Business Tax Cut Act is a step in that right direction.

President Obama called small businesses the anchors of our Main Streets. We agree. I hope we can all unite around helping the small businesses which are the engines of job creation in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I'd say in response to the gentleman's assertion towards the definition of small business in this bill, this is the Small Business Administration definition of small business. This is what every program that comes out of this government aimed to help small businesses is premised upon. The SBA definition of a small business is one of 499 or fewer.

As far as the gentleman's allegations about the potential for abuse under this bill, if he'd read the language of the bill, Mr. Speaker, it caps the ability to benefit from the tax cut to 50 percent of the W–2 wages that that small business paid out. This is, straight up, something to help small businesses keep more of their money while they're having so much difficulty keeping the lights on and, instead, giving them the ability to grow, to grow, invest, and create more jobs.

As far as the gentleman's allegations that somehow this bill only affects those millionaires, billionaires and the rest, I think he will see the studies have shown that just 18.3 percent of those people are in the categories of income he suggests, with 80-some percent in the middle class—80-some percent, the true small business owners who we're relying on to create jobs for the middle class to come back.

And I would say to the gentleman, as far as the allegation of gimmickry, the essence of supply-side economics, the centrality issue on taxes is the reduction of marginal rates. That's exactly what this bill does.

Does it provide it for long enough? Does it provide permanency? No. But what we want to do in a permanent way is effect broader tax reform. But since we can't see eye to eye on that, since we've still got work to do, let's give the small businesses some help now.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

We have a Statement of Administration Policy in total opposition to this. The Small Business Administration would not provide a loan for innumerable people who benefit from this. They have a $7 million limit.

Supply-side economics, we tried that for a number of years, and we were losing 700,000 jobs a month when this administration took over—700,000, and you raise supply-side economics as something we should embrace? No way. No way.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Dr. JIM MCDERMOTT, a member of our committee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in 5 hours we're going to get on planes and go home, so we have to get the press releases ready to go. And that's what this is about.

This bill will be dead in the Senate the minute it hits the desk. It's not going anywhere. It is a press release, and it is the most wasteful bill of the season so far. Now, I'm sure that Mr. CANTOR and others will find worse things to do down the way as we get closer to the election.

This week has been a disaster in here. We started on Tuesday by deeming the budget passed, here and in the Senate. It's a fiction. It never happened. That's how this week started.

Then we went to the Ways and Means Committee yesterday, and we cut $68 billion out of health, children's services, social services, foster care, in reconciliation to balance the budget.

And then we get up this morning and here we have a bill that borrows $46 billion from the Chinese, or whoever, to give it to small business. The fact is that 125,000 millionaires in this country will get an average tax cut of $58,000.

That's what this bill does. It does not create jobs. It's supposed to create jobs. In fact, the job creation is so small, as you heard, it's incalculable.

Now, that wouldn't satisfy the majority leader. He had to go and find an economist somewhere who'd give him a better number.

□ 1120

So he found Herman Cain's guy, the guy who had the 9–9–9 tax deal. Now, there's a solid citizen. He really knows what's going. Well, he comes up with 39,000 jobs will be created. 39,000 jobs. It sounds like quite a bit, doesn't it? Until you figure how many billions of dollars are going to create them. The figure is that each job will cost $1.1 million in tax cuts. This is to get one job. Do you think they're hiring somebody for $1.1 million? They're hiring them for $6 or $8 an hour.

This is not a job creation bill. It is simply a press release. The Republicans have not brought out a serious job creation bill. Yesterday was as close as we came when we finally did the highway bill so that we could at least keep highway infrastructure being created. Otherwise, there has been nothing solid that has gotten through the Congress. The highway bill will get through because everybody knows it creates jobs, but this kind of stuff is simply sinking us.

What's really interesting, though, is that, as I look at that $1.1 million per job, I remember when they came up with the phony claim—never proven—that the Recovery Act would cost $278,000 for a job. This costs us four times as much, and it's from his own economist. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Last week, I met with more than 70 small businesses throughout southwest Washington, so I am here to support a bill today that would give every one of those businesses a much-needed, positive injection of capital.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have a hard time understanding is that 7 out of 10 jobs in this country over the last 20 years have come from small businesses. If we create an environment where they can grow and succeed, more people are going to find work, and that's what this is all about. They need it. My district has endured multiple years of double-digit unemployment, and job-providing small businesses haven't seen much from their government to give them hope or to encourage them to grow their workforces.

For example, many small businesses that I've met with are really worried about hitting that 50-employee threshold that is going to trigger the health care law's burdensome cost. They're staying under it. Imagine that: a government rule that is deterring small businesses from hiring. This is a terrible time to send that message. Another business owner talked to me about how he is exasperated by the government reaching out to him, saying he had 4 days to put together a mountain load of paperwork or face a fine.

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

Mr. CANTOR. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. We need to remove those barriers. Today, the bill that we get a chance to pass is going to send a different signal that says, Government wants you to grow. We want you to hire. You're not Uncle Sam's piggy bank. We want you to succeed and prosper.

These businesses are going to put moms, dads, and hardworking taxpayers to work. Let's allow them to do

more of that. On behalf of small business owners in southwest Washington, I stand in strong support of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 5 seconds.

Is it worth $1.1 million a job in Washington?

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Oregon, an active member of our committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I listened to my good friend and colleague from the other side of the river from my hometown of Portland, Oregon, talking about trying to assist small business and encourage economic development.

But the facts are that the vast majority of this aid, as we've talked about, is going to be unfocused. It's going to go to people whether they need it or not, including some of the wealthiest individuals and partnerships—accountants, lobbyists—and to companies regardless of whether or not they add employment or reduce it.

At this very time, we have people on Capitol Hill who are begging us to get real about infrastructure investment. We finally are getting a bill to conference, but we're hung up on funding it. The Republican budget would cut transportation funding 46 percent, $6.5 billion less than is necessary to keep current obligations. This week, small business people, including a number who visited my office, came in, imploring us to stop the games and to get on with the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Act.

If we really are going to borrow $46 billion from China or from whomever and add to the deficit, if we have that capacity, for heavens sakes, we should invest it in rebuilding and renewing America.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. With this $46 billion, added to the bipartisan Senate bill that passed with 74 votes—half the Republicans—we could have a robust reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Act and create hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs. Not by picking winners and losers, but by going back to the day when we used to work together on a bipartisan basis to fund infrastructure and to help strengthen every community around the country.

Reject this gimmick. If we have an extra $46 billion we're going to borrow, invest it in rebuilding and renewing America—really helping small business and strengthening the environment in every community across America.

Mr. CANTOR. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the leader for yielding.

Job growth is my top priority, and no one can deny that small business is the engine that drives our economy and our job market. Since 1980, small businesses have accounted for 60 percent of job creation. Their success is vital to the strength of this economy and to the availability of jobs for all Americans.

As a CPA and a legislator, I've heard from small business owners throughout my career, and their message has been remarkably consistent: They need relief from the burdensome Tax Code, and they need capital to hire and expand, which is exactly what the Small Business Tax Cut Act provides.

While our colleagues in the Senate are devising new and creative ways to raise taxes, here in the House we have the opportunity to pass legislation that supports our small businesses, encourages growth and job creation, and lifts our economy out of the current economics of the day. We can and should do all of this by passing the Small Business Tax Cut Act today.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 3 minutes to another very active member of our committee, the gentleman from California, XAVIER BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When you hear of small business, what comes up in your mind first? The corner drug store? The tech troubleshooting startup? My daughter's martial arts instructor? How about Donald Trump? How about Trump Sales and Leasing, or Paris Hilton Entertainment? What about Larry Flynt Publications? Not that any of these latter companies have volunteered to show me their tax returns, but by all accounts, these are the businesses that will devour the lion's share of the tax breaks in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, 3 percent of the businesses in America will get 56 percent of the tax breaks provided. The rich and famous will get most of the money. 125,000 millionaires in America will get $58,000 in tax breaks this year alone, which is the first year of this tax break. That's how targeted this particular bill is.

More than that, what we find is that most Americans don't believe that our tax system is fair. They believe that it is skewed towards the very wealthy. H.R. 9 proves that they are right. Seventy percent of Americans believe that the tax system is skewed against them and favors the very wealthy. If Paris Hilton, who has what we understand are about five employees based in Beverly Hills, can take advantage of this tax cut, or if Donald Trump or Larry Flynt or Kim Kardashian or Oprah Winfrey—all small business people—can take advantage and get, maybe, $58,000 in tax breaks while most small businesses will get barely anything, then I think the American public is correct.

□ 1130

Remember, most businesses in America are sole proprietorships. Most of those sole proprietorships have no employees. Under this bill, if you're a sole proprietor and have no employees, you get zero of the tax break benefits.

I have another example. Two companies, both have 500 employees. One company decides to hire more Americans; 10 more Americans are put on the payroll. The other company of 500 employees decides, I think it's easier for me to make more money if I take some of those jobs and put them overseas, so I'm going to fire 10 Americans here in America, and I'm going to start those jobs overseas, outsource those jobs.

Guess who gets the tax break—the company that hires 10 new American employees? No. They get nothing. The firm that fires 10 American employees here and outsources those jobs to another country, that company will get the benefits of this tax break.

The American public is correct. Today's tax system is skewed towards the wealthy, and that's why we have to vote against this legislation. Let us have job creation legislation. Let us focus on small businesses. This does neither.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 9.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield myself 30 seconds just in response, Mr. Speaker, to the allegation about those who benefit from the Small Business Tax Cut Act. I would ask the gentleman to perhaps look at the language of the Democrat alternative on the motion to recommit because it, as well, provides the same benefit it's trying to provide to others. All those people, the so-called ''rich and famous'' that he says are the only ones that benefit, also benefit under their alternative.

Mr. BECERRA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will not yield.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to provide the kind of relief to the small business men and women that will benefit from this.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you, Mr. Leader, for allowing me to be here today.

I have spent the last year and a half traveling throughout the Sixth Congressional District that I represent talking to small-, medium-, and large-size businesses. What I have asked them across the board is, what is it that would help you to be able to grow your business.

What I hear from them is that there's a lot of uncertainty out there, and they are concerned already about large burdens of increasing taxes, more regulations, more mandates. They really fear what Washington will do to them next.

What if we said to small businesses, that really are the engine of our economic growth, that we're going to do something for you instead of to you? What if Washington encouraged growth instead of causing small businesses to live in fear that one more tax might sink them?

Over 20 years ago, my family started a small business, and I can tell you that if the conditions were like they are today then we probably would not

have taken the risk to put everything on the line and start our small business. That's why I'm supporting Leader CANTOR's 20 percent small business tax cut that would allow small business owners to, one, retain more capital; two, invest in their business; and three—this is the key—to hire more workers.

In the State of Tennessee, we have over 96,000 small businesses that employ over 1.38 million individuals. In particular, we have 12,000 small women-owned businesses, which have been, until recently, the fastest growing sector of our small business economy.

So it's not just a cliche that getting small business growing again is the key to our economic growth; it's a fact.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

What the leader said is not correct. The substitute provides some help to those who invest in property, plant, and equipment. That's not Paris Hilton.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. Let me finish.

You didn't yield at all to us, so let me finish.

It has to be a factory that's built here.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BECERRA. What the gentleman Mr. LEVIN is saying is correct, and I want to correct Mr. CANTOR because he misspoke about the Democratic alternative.

The Democratic alternative requires that a small business make an investment in a plant or small machinery. If Paris Hilton wishes to invest in a plant and machinery, then perhaps she will qualify. If Larry Flynt would want to invest in plants and machinery for his business, perhaps he would qualify. Otherwise, this is a giveaway. Ours requires you to make investments in America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this proposal today.

I have just a couple of thoughts, having had long-term membership here.

This is not the way to write legislation, and the Members on the other side know this.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee should be here with us today to discuss this. This should have been vetted into the full committee. This should have had an active markup with full participation.

I revere this institution, and I revere that committee. Members spend their careers trying to become members of the Ways and Means Committee. To bring this legislation to the floor today without a hearing is ill-considered.

From a historic perspective, why don't we talk about how we got into this situation?

This bill today adds $46 billion to the deficit. Without a hearing? Why don't we just do these proposals by unanimous consent and bring them to the floor? We missed the point of what the vetting process does, where people stand in front of that committee and they offer expert testimony. But our friends on the Republican side, they call this a small business tax cut. This is about the theater of the election year, and everybody knows it.

This is the same group that would have you believe, incidentally, that tax cuts pay for themselves, even though you can't find an economist who will adhere to that position.

They have run up the deficits in this country recklessly, and in the name of a political campaign, they're prepared to do it again. They want to pour syrup on the plate and not even bother to serve pancakes with it. In our current fiscal situation, to have not vetted this sort of proposal in front of the committee is a mistake.

You want to talk about helping small business with tax policy? Count me in. We've worked on some good bipartisan legislation over the last 20 years to help small business, not to do it in this manner where this legislation has been brought to the floor.

We had a markup in the committee yesterday where cuts are being proposed to senior citizens, to low-income families, eliminate funding for Meals On Wheels, and yet they bring this proposal up today with a straight face.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

The Ways and Means Committee had two small business hearings on the implications of tax reform in which this proposal was raised. In addition, the gentleman well knows that there was a markup.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. If I could finish. No.

There was a markup in committee in which even the gentleman offered an amendment and then withdrew it because it was ruled nongermane. Of course there was a markup. Of course this idea has been the subject of discussion in committee.

Again, I just wanted to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Tuesday was Tax Day, when Americans everywhere were reminded just how much Uncle Sam takes out of our pockets each and every year. But it was also a reminder that not all of our tax policies are created equal.

Some in Washington want to raise taxes simply to feed the Federal Government's spending addiction, even when higher taxes on things like capital gains and investments would only discourage growth and shrink revenue in the long term.

I think our Tax Code should be designed to promote simplicity, competition, and economic growth. We can do this by reducing the burden on small American businesses that are responsible for the majority of new jobs created in our country every day.

This bill will provide an immediate 20 percent deduction for millions of small businesses, one-third of which, by the way, are owned by women and one-fifth of which are minority-owned.

□ 1140

Let's allow small businesses to reinvest in new jobs, new opportunities, and new products that will grow our economy. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to listen, as I have done, to the voices of their small business owners and operators back home.

Mr. LEVIN. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from the State of Ohio how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from the State of Michigan has 15½ minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another active member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

You know, the Republicans are always so much better in the names they give these bills than what's in them. I think in considering this one we have to look at what it is and what it is not.

It is not an economic recovery measure. A nonpartisan analysis has shown that the economic benefits are considered to be so small as to be incalculable.

It is not helpful to sole proprietors, who do not benefit at all from this bill.

It is not a way to reduce the deficit or the national debt. Indeed, this is a measure that will add $46 billion to the national deficit.

We were told only yesterday that because of a pressing national debt, we can no longer provide one source of federal funding for hot meals for seniors through the Meals on Wheels program in Texas, that we could not afford to provide Federal resources that are necessary there on child abuse or on keeping a child with disability at home, or helping seniors maintain their independence, that there just aren't the resources to do that. But today we are told there is $46 billion we can add to the debt for a nice-sounding bill.

What is this bill? It is another failed Republican retread. It is a measure that will help those at the top rather than those who are really struggling to get to the top. I'm concerned about the icehouse on the west side of San Antonio, about the beauty shop in Lockhart, about the auto repair shop in San Marcos. But those are not the places that will receive the principal benefits of this measure.

Indeed, 125,000 millionaires in this country will get more in tax benefits

out of this than many of the owners of those businesses earn during an entire year, in fact, more than the median income throughout San Antonio, Austin, and central and south Texas.

What this measure is is a boon.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. It will be a boon to highly paid professionals, private equity firms, hedge fund managers, and professional sports teams. I think they've received enough economic benefit in the past with the Bush tax cuts.

We ought to be focusing our support for small businesses not on those who are already at the top and should be contributing a little to the shared sacrifice necessary to get our national debt under control and meet basic human needs.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, the gentleman from Texas indicated that this bill doesn't benefit sole proprietors. Sole proprietors are, in fact, the disproportionate beneficiaries under this bill. According to the Committee on Joint Taxation, 17.9, almost 18 million sole proprietors benefit under this bill, again, to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), not only the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade but, as well, the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I want to first thank Leader CANTOR for his leadership on economic issues, especially those along Main Street. That's what this is about. This isn't about Paris Hilton, Larry Flynt, or even Hilary Rosen, the President's top adviser, who recently denigrated women who choose to work at home. It's not about celebrities. It's about small business people. They're the ones who have been left behind in the Obama economy.

Think about this. We have tens, literally, tens of millions of Americans who can't find a full-time job. There are millions more who have just given up. They don't even look for work anymore. Here we are. It's hard to believe there are fewer Americans working today than when the President took office. Bailouts, stimulus, Cash for Clunkers, housing bailout, Solyndra bailout, all of that, fewer Americans working, 700,000 fewer women with a job.

Small businesses have borne the brunt of this terrible recovery. It is time we help them instead of raising taxes on those who succeed. Why don't we let them keep 20 percent more of the income they earn, the sales they make, the weekends they work, the charges they put on their credit cards, all they do to survive and succeed in this economy? Republicans are determined to give them a chance to succeed until this economy can get back to work, to hire new workers, to keep new workers.

I have to tell you, I remember in Ways and Means Committee the debate on ObamaCare, the Republicans offered an amendment to shield small businesses from tax increases, and our Democrat friends said they can't do that because small businesses have had it too easy all these years—small businesses have had it too easy all these years.

It's time to give our small businesses a break, time to get this economy back on track. It's time to let them keep what they have worked so hard to earn.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to another very active member of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, we are really in the middle of the theater of the absurd. I'm not opposed, and apparently the other side is not opposed, to stimulus spending for the economy. I don't know where they have been for the last 18 months. Let's make effective stimulus.

Since you mentioned the CBO, Mr. CANTOR, through the Chair, they rank this bill next to last in bang for the buck in job creation. You didn't quote CBO about that.

Through the Speaker, the Joint Committee on Taxation said the economic impact is so small as to be incalculable—your own analysis on your Web site. It's very clear it's going to cost, add, $1.1 million, for every job created, to the deficit.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. Just yesterday, in order to comply with the majority's budget that violates the deal Speaker BOEHNER agreed to last year—that deal is clear, public—the Ways and Means Committee cut $53 billion in health care tax credits, child tax credits, social services block credits. You cut it yesterday for the disabled, for the elderly who are most vulnerable. In New Jersey, they could lose millions of dollars for Meals on Wheels, foster care.

This is unacceptable. We are voting to add $47 billion to the deficit today with a giveaway to professional sports teams—oh, you didn't know that—or hedge fund operators or managers or whatever they call themselves, and multimillion-dollar partnerships and corporations.

Yes, $47 billion goes to 125,000 millionaires.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. But each of them gets a tax cut, Mr. Speaker, $60,000. This is wrong.

The same report found that the best options for job growth include aid to States and increased safety net spending, something I know that the other side opposes.

In fact, the Agriculture Committee just voted yesterday to cut food stamps, get this, by $34 billion; like all of those people on food stamps want to be on food stamps, all those people that are poor want to be poor. And that's your anthem. But it can't find reality. It has no foundation, and it is immoral—immoral.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asks all Members to heed the gavel.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the leader for yielding.

You know, it never ceases to amaze me the misleading claims that will come from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle at times. One of them that has been talked about a lot here today is the fact that only the rich and famous would benefit from this piece of legislation. Well, I have been sitting back here, and I have been trying to think of even a handful of famous people in South Dakota that are going to benefit from this.

□ 1150

I can't come up with it; but I've got over 20,000 jobs in the State of South Dakota, and 20,000 different businesses that are going to benefit from this piece of legislation. That's why I'm supporting it. My constituents in South Dakota so many times only look at government as an entity that costs them money and makes it very detrimental and hard for them to succeed. When the government can actually step in and do something that makes it easier for them to succeed and help drive that success, then that is something we should be behind, and that's why the Small Business Tax Cut is a perfect example of that situation.

Small businesses create jobs, and they also employ almost half of all the private sector employees in this country. This bill is going to free up the cash so that those small businesses can keep people employed when they've hit tough times and maybe reinvest in their businesses. It's the key to what we need to do, and I hope we can all come together and support this good legislation before us.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman, my friend from Michigan, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. There are a number of reasons to oppose this legislation.

One, this bill is not targeted towards job creation. Frankly, it is not targeted at all. It will provide 99.6 percent of all businesses with a tax break, regardless of whether or not they create one American job or not.

Two, this bill does not prevent businesses from taking a tax cut even when they lay off workers.

Three, this bill fails to help the businesses most in need, such as new businesses or start-ups. They're not eligible for any provisions in this bill.

Fourth, this bill will add billions to the deficit, which will hurt economic growth in America.

Five, and most egregiously, this bill provides companies who are in the midst of offshoring jobs with a tax break.

During committee consideration of this legislation, I offered an amendment to deny this tax deduction to any company that reduces the number of American workers and jobs while correspondingly increasing its foreign workforce. Additionally, the amendment stated if a company offshores U.S. jobs next year, after this 1-year tax expenditure expires, the funds would be recaptured or taken back by the Treasury. This is so a company cannot take the money this year and run away with American dollars and jobs next year and put them overseas.

My amendment enjoyed the support of every Democrat on the Committee of Ways and Means. Unfortunately, it was not supported by one Republican on that committee. Americans and their taxpayer dollars should not be subsidizing the destruction of American jobs.

Let me state: Democrats recognize we live in a global economy. We recognize that many of our companies need to operate internationally to remain competitive and expand their markets and market share. But Americans should not have their hard-earned tax dollars—$46 billion in this case, Mr. Speaker—taken away and used to subsidize this kind of business activity.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. Democrats worked hard while in the majority to end the practice of incentivizing the offshoring of U.S. jobs in the Tax Code. We killed a number of perverse tax loopholes and reinvested the revenue into initiatives focused on creating U.S. jobs and assisting America's small businesses.

Defeat this bill. It is immoral. We should not be spending U.S. tax dollars in this way.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the gentleman. I think he put his finger on the problem here. The problem with his kind of amendment is the problem with the Tax Code today, because it means that if you're a business, under his rule, you would have to come to Washington to seek eligibility for a tax break or seek eligibility for a tax favor. And if you're on the approved list in Washington, then you can go and benefit and have an advantage over others.

That's not what we believe. We believe in helping all small businesses.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the Small Business Committee chairman.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, tax season reminds us that small businesses are disproportionately affected by tax compliance and high tax rates. The Small Business Administration reports that the average tax compliance cost per employee for small businesses is almost three times the cost of larger firms. And according to the NFIB, tax issues are the single most significant set of regulatory burdens for most small firms. The Small Business Tax Deduction Act is simple, fair, and gives small businesses access to badly needed capital to invest in their companies while providing a little more certainty to help them plan for the future.

As chairman of the Small Business Committee, I hear from small business owners every single week about their regulatory and tax burdens. Through our interactive Web page, ''Small Biz Open Mic,'' we have heard that tax policies may drive some small firms out of business.

On Tuesday, Wendy Koller, owner of Koller Moving and Storage in Fort Smith, Arkansas, said:

> We are hesitant to hire new employees for fear of what new tax burdens await us with the expiration of the older tax law and the new health care laws coming. We are concerned that these new issues may be the ones that push us out of business.

Last Saturday, Debbie Peacock, owner of a fabricating distributor in Mesa, Arizona, wrote:

> Any additional taxes will only stop any chance of a recovery, and the government needs to realize we need every penny to increase staff, which puts people back to work.

I can go on and on and on with examples like these.

Yesterday, our committee held a hearing on the flood of new taxes that are just around the corner, such as new taxes from the health care law and the massive tax increase that's going to occur if the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts expire. All of these measures could send the economy into a tailspin, costing thousands of jobs.

That's why the Small Business Tax Deduction Act is necessary and is going to provide that tax relief for America's most robust job creators.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues support this bill.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. This bill provides a windfall tax break to hedge fund owners, to big Washington law firms, to the very wealthy, even if they don't hire a single person—not one. In fact, in a cruel hoax and twist on this, wealthy individuals can qualify for this tax break even if they fire people this year. And in some cases they can also get a bigger tax break if they do not make their investments this year.

Mr. Speaker, this place sometimes gets to be a fact-free zone. We have the nonpartisan Joint Tax Committee say, The economic activity generated by this is so small as to be incalculable. That's why Bruce Bartlett, former economic adviser to President Reagan said, It will do nothing whatsoever to increase employment.

So what's this all about? It gives a big tax break to the wealthiest individuals while adding $50 billion to our deficit and debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this week highlights the unfortunate doublespeak from our Republican colleagues when it comes to the deficit. On the Senate side, a majority of Republicans voted against a bill to apply the Buffett rule, meaning that we were going to ask millionaires to pay the same effective tax rate as many of their employees paid and use that $50 billion toward deficit reduction. Here in the House, we're providing a $50 billion tax break that adds to the deficit, and this one is targeted disproportionately to very wealthy individuals.

There's another sort of strange irony. When we were debating the payroll tax cut for a year that would benefit 160 million Americans, our Republican colleagues dragged their feet and then said this was all a gimmick, it was a 1-year thing, it was a sugar high. Well, at least the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said that it would generate economic activity. In fact, they ranked it near the top.

This is a 1-year thing that's going to give a great sugar high to the wealthiest individuals. They are going to be floating on this. But it's ranked near the bottom by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office in terms of economic activity.

You want to know another irony? When it came to providing a tax break for 160 million Americans, payroll tax cut, we paid for it. We offset the cost of that. When it comes to providing a sugar high, $50 billion tax cut that disproportionately benefits the wealthy, we don't offset it. We put it on our national credit card. We increase the debt. Who pays for that? We've heard on a bipartisan basis that's our kids, our grandkids. We're all going to be paying for that debt.

□ 1200

So Mr. Speaker, this is worse than a gimmick. It's not good for the economy, it adds to the deficit, and I urge that we reject this bill.

Mr. CANTOR. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) be permitted to control the balance of the time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) now controls 14½ minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 5¼ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Small Business Tax Cut. Louisiana alone will see 80,000 small businesses that will be able to benefit from this and over 890,000 workers that will benefit from this. Yet my colleagues on the Democrat side maybe think that it's their money. They don't want those small businesses to be able to keep it, and they think that Washington can spend it better than the small businesses.

How has that worked, by the way? They don't want small businesses to be able to keep some more of the hard-earned money that they make so they can invest it in their business. They'd rather keep it up here for critical Washington spending like the $535 million they blew on Solyndra, or maybe the $850,000 that Obama's GSA blew on the Vegas junkets. Those are the kind of things that they would rather see, and so they don't want those small businesses to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money. They want to keep taxing businesses. They've added over $1.9 trillion of new taxes in President Obama's own budget.

We've tried it their way. More than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs since President Obama took office. How about we actually try letting small businesses keep more of their hard-earned money so they can create good jobs for hardworking taxpayers?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, it is hard to call us to responsibility, but that's what our public wants. Our public wants it on the right, they want it on the left, and they want it on the middle. This is fiscally a totally irresponsible piece of legislation, and you know it. And I know you know it, and America ought to know you know it.

Ladies and gentlemen, what this bill does is blow a $46 billion hole in the deficit this year alone. But ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, the people of America need to know that we use 10-year figures for the most part, so this means $460 billion.

Now, I know all of you on your side of the aisle—because I've been here for a substantial period of time—are next year going to say we're going to raise taxes on small businesses and put that 20 percent back. Bet me. You're going to say if we did that, it would be the largest tax increase in the history of small business. So you're going to do it year after year.

One of the previous speakers said that we're taking money from small businesses. Well, let me tell you who you're taking money from today: my children, your children; my grandchildren, your grandchildren; and, yes, my two great-grandchildren. That's who's going to pay this $46 billion hole that you're creating today.

And what does Bruce Bartlett, economic adviser to Ronald Reagan—not a Democrat, a Republican—an economic adviser, somebody who advised Ronald Reagan how to get this economy moving—unlike George Bush, I might add—and what did he say? What did he say about this bill that you have brought to the floor—which, by the way, The Wall Street Journal today called ''a tax gimmick.'' The Wall Street Journal called this bill that you are offering today a tax gimmick. And so what did Bruce Bartlett say? ''It will do nothing whatsoever to increase employment.''

Point number one, this is not a jobs bill. It will not grow the economy, and it will not do what all of us think needs to be done.

And they went on to say that ''it is nothing more than an election-year giveaway to a favored Republican constituency,'' a political gimmick, a tax gimmick that will cost us $46 billion this year alone and $460 billion—let me say, round that to half a trillion as inflation pushes it up, a half-a-trillion-dollar hole adding to the budget deficit that confronts this country that all Americans know we must address.

My colleagues, it takes no courage to vote for this bill. What takes courage is to pay for things. What takes courage is to say we have an obligation. What took courage was to make sure that we paid our debts. We didn't do it. So what happened? We almost took this country to the brink of default.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, summon the responsibility, judgment, and intellectual honesty that our public expects. Vote against this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again ask all Members to heed the gavel and also to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the distinguished chairman of Ways and Means. It's an honor to be able to speak on this floor. It's an honor to listen to the debate on both sides. And what's so ironic is that when you listen to the debate, you wonder, what happens here becomes law, but more importantly, do we ever measure, do we ever measure what creates jobs? Do we ever measure in America who creates jobs?

Now, some of you know my story. I actually grew up in a family of Democrats. I got rather fortunate. I didn't have great grades, so I went to junior college. The family didn't have enough money to send me away. I worked through the summer, I took my money, and I created a small business. At the end of 2 years, I then had enough money to pay my whole way through college, so I sold my business.

I applied for a summer internship with my local Congressman, and he turned me down. But today on this floor, I sit elected to the seat I couldn't even get an internship to. That small business paid my way through college. But when I sit and measure and talk and listen to my constituents, they talk about jobs.

They know that there have been 11 recessions since World War II, and every other recession we've come out of it stronger and faster. Even the greatest recession of '82, when interest rates were double digit, and you measured until today, we'd have 13 million more jobs. But the policy holds it back.

So I thought I would go back and I would analyze just the nearest time in America's culture of where we created jobs. So I went back to the end of the last recession, 2001, to the beginning of this recession in 2007. When people look at America, they think that was a pretty good time in America. The jobs grew, the economy was strong, and people were able to buy houses. And I analyzed who created the jobs. Do you realize during that time in America, small business added 7 million jobs? Large corporations cut a million.

So to hear somebody on the floor, Mr. Speaker, say they're some special constituency? Well, I'm very proud to stand with the constituency that will grow jobs. I'm very proud to stand today to cut 20 percent to put people back to work in America.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand proudly behind this bill because statistics, the facts, and the history of America have proven we are the strongest when small business is strongest, we are strongest and create jobs through small business, not through more politics.

Policy matters, small business matters, and jobs in America matter. That's why I tell Members on both sides of the aisle, this is an American bill for American jobs, for small business to be strong again in America, and America will be strong again.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us today.

Small businesses are the foundation of our economy. It's the small businesses that drive job creation in America. And every time I'm home in eastern Washington, it is such a privilege to sit down with small business owners. I'm always inspired by these people who have an idea to improve our lives and they turn it into a reality.

One such business that I recently toured was called Made Naturally. Two stay-at-home moms had an idea to come up with natural cleaning products 2 years ago. They put together a business plan, and they have now executed it, hired 13 employees, and they are doing well in Spokane, Washington. And when I toured their business, what they told me was that it is the tax burden and the regulatory uncertainty

that is preventing them from hiring any new employees right now.

Just like these two business owners in Spokane, Washington, there are men and women all across this country that face the same challenges when it comes to growing businesses. As someone who worked in a family business for more than 13 years, I can say they are certainly right.

So I'd like to shed some light, especially on the women, the entrepreneurial women right now whose businesses are hurting because of this administration's policies. It's important because two out of three businesses right now are being started by women in America. They're actually the fastest-growing segment in our U.S. economy, and every dollar they save in taxes is one more dollar they can spend in hiring a new employee.

The current path is both unacceptable and unsustainable. It's time to change course. It's time to give America's small business owners tax breaks, not tax burdens.

□ 1210

It's time to give them relief, not just rhetoric. It's time to give them the flexibility and freedom they need to create jobs. So it's time to move forward with the legislation that will do just that. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I want to say that our colleagues reveal their attitude toward taxpayer money when they say this will cost us. The attitude of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, is that all the money that hardworking taxpayers earn belongs to the government. This doesn't cost us; this allows some people to keep more of their money.

I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act, which would provide America's private sector with the resources needed to help supercharge desperately needed hiring.

It's worth mentioning how this bill will benefit women since one-third of the firms directly benefiting from the act are owned by women. In North Carolina, small businesses with between one and 500 employees employ 205,490 individuals; 23,348 of those businesses are women-owned. Mr. Speaker, it's for these reasons I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHILLING).

Mr. SCHILLING. I thank Leader CANTOR for giving me the opportunity to be here today and speak in favor of the Small Business Tax Cut Act.

As Illinoisans filed their tax returns, folks in my district felt the pinch of the tax increases imposed on them by our State's lawmakers, who last year raised personal income taxes by 66 percent and corporate taxes by 45 percent.

State lawmakers told us that taxes would be used to pay Illinois debt and prevent budget deficits down the line; but the truth, as many of us feared, is that these tax hikes have done nothing to help our State. In fact, Illinois unemployment has remained above 9 percent for 36 straight months, since March of 2009. And thanks to Illinois tax hikes, rising gas prices, and Federal tax rates as high as 35 percent, our small businesses are strapped for cash.

As a small business owner, I know the pain all too well. Rather than advancing partisan and un-serious show votes—votes that don't lower gas prices, don't encourage economic growth, and don't impact our deficit—we in the House want to ensure more opportunities for job seekers and job creators.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that this is a small business tax cut. It is not. It is a bait and switch. One-half of this so-called ''small business tax cut'' will go to millionaires. So you call it a small business tax cut, and they give away the store to millionaires, Mr. Speaker.

They are saying that we have to dismantle Medicare because they say we can't afford it on the one hand, and on the other hand they are lavishing millionaires with a $46 billion tax cut. If you're one of 125,000 millionaires in America, you get $58,000 from this bill. If you're a senior on Medicare, it costs you an additional $6,000 for your medicine. I oppose this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today on the intellectual responsibility of H.R. 9.

Back in my home town of Dunn, I have friends who are pharmacists. They own and run an independent pharmacy started by their father 60 years ago. I'm speaking of Paige Houston and Cathy Blackman.

Paige told me the other day that initially in this recession they were missed because people were afraid to go without their medications, and they were willing to pay the money even though the economy was starting to take a turn. Today, things are so bad that people are going without their medications, which as a result is a decrease in the number of customers they have and the amount of revenue coming in. Now their accountant has told them that they have no choice but to cut contributions to their employees' 401(k) plans and their health insurance premiums or be forced to lay off employees. Paige told me this 20 percent tax cut will keep more money in their business, allowing her to maintain benefits for her employees.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all understand that American small businesses are the engine of job creation. I think the Democrats are waging a war on small business.

I have spoken with so many small business job creators in my district, and they all share the same message: government overregulation and government overtaxation is stifling their ability to grow. This House has already acted decisively to address government overregulation, and today we're going to act decisively to give small businesses the tax relief that they need to grow.

Allowing small businesses with fewer than 500 employees a 20 percent tax cut to free up capital and to allow those businesses to invest in and to grow their businesses to create the jobs that we so desperately need in this economy is the right thing to do. So I was very disappointed to see that President Obama threatened to veto this bill, because, Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, I would respectfully tell you that hundreds of small manufacturing firms in Michigan that are struggling to buy new equipment, to pursue new customers and grow their businesses are not among the corporations with the biggest profits; and those small businesses would benefit from this bill. You can contrast that with General Electric, which made over $14 billion in profits in 2010 and yet paid no Federal income tax.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. We need to remember that the CEO of General Electric is actually the head of President Obama's Jobs Council.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we can trust the American small businesses to spend their money more wisely than government will ever do. Again, it's mystifying to me that the Democratic Party seems to be waging a war on the small business community of America.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. You all know the saying, ''money is power,'' right? I think we all can agree in this Chamber that the one thing that we want to do is empower small business. How do you empower small business? You let them keep more of the money they earn so they can go out and they

can invest in new products so they can hire people. I'd love to get people back to work. I'd love to empower small business. That's why we want to let them keep more of what they earn.

I did an initiative in my district called the One More Jobs Initiative, where it asks small business owners, What do you need from the Federal Government to create just one more job? A pretty noble concept: instead of pontificating here, let's actually ask those who create jobs. The number one answer I got, Mr. Speaker, was: let us keep more of the money we earn and let us hire people. Give us tax certainty.

That's why I rise in support today of this tax cut package, because this is exactly what small business needs to continue to be successful, to pull this country out of this recession we're in, and continue to reclaim our mantle as the most powerful country in the world.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Our Nation is at a crossroads. This President wants to take more money from the private sector and continue the exponential growth of the Federal Government. We want to make sure that job creators are able to reinvest their hard-earned money back into their businesses to expand and grow the economy and get this job creation cycle going again. That's why we support a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses. The President, on the other hand, wants to raise taxes on small businesses and job creators.

There are 22 million small businesses helped by this bill, and I think it's necessary that we pass this bill today. I urge my colleagues to support a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses so we can create jobs and make a more prosperous America.

□ 1220

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise both sides, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 2¼ minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I have two additional speakers. One of them will close, so I have one speaker before closing.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, this recession is different, and the difference is there's no recovery. And that is a historic difference.

Now, what is different about this recession and all our other recessions when we had a recovery is government policy. Government policy has stifled job creation. Normally, at this time in a recovery, 65 percent of the jobs are being created by small businesses. But 2 million jobs aren't there because of Obama's health care policies alone, regulatory policies, tax policies. Small business is struggling.

Now, let me tell you, Congress cannot create jobs. We're not going to create jobs with this bill. We're going to allow small businesses to create jobs.

You'll either choose government or you'll choose the people. You'll choose government to continue to create jobs like with Solyndra, and we saw the disaster there, or you'll allow the people to create those jobs. I'm putting my trust in the people.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, we're prepared to close.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the balance of my time to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill today—a $46 billion price tag, and it's unpaid for. Moreover, 1 year is not tax certainty if you're a small business person.

I rise also as a small business person. Equally as troubling as this bill, unpaid for, $46 billion bill, is the fact that yesterday, in the Ways and Means Committee, the majority passed a bill that they said was to reduce the deficit. But instead, what they did is they cut programs that were incredibly important to the elderly, to children, to the disabled, programs that allowed people help with their daycare so they could go to work. If those people don't have daycare, they're not going to be able to go to work. And, at the same time, the Ag Committee passed a bill to cut food stamps.

These actions are hard to understand, even in these most difficult times. But even harder to understand is, in light of this fiscally irresponsible bill today, those bills were passed.

I said yesterday that it was a bad day to be poor. Well, today is a bad day to be fiscally responsible, because this bill is anything but fiscally responsible.

And it's wrong to claim on Wednesday that you have to cut daycare for low-income people or put seniors at risk, disabled people at risk, and children at risk to cut the deficit but then turn around on Thursday and add $46 billion to the deficit. That's just wrong.

The Joint Committee on Taxation said that this bill's economic impact is ''so small as to be incalculable.'' I can tell you, the people that will be hurt across this country, that hurt won't be incalculable.

I strongly oppose this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I were small business owners for more than two decades, and we still retain part of that business, so I know what it's like to meet a payroll. I know what it's like to employ people. We only had 15 to 20 people on our payroll over the course of 20 years, but I worked a lot with small businesses. And in small business it really is about how do you grow, how do you have the positive cash flow, Mr. Speaker, to grow your business, to invest in new technology, new equipment, to take your ideas and spin them forward and grow jobs. That's your whole nature as an entrepreneur in America, and as it should be.

In Oregon, we've got 86,000 small businesses employing more than three-quarters of a million people. This legislation will help those small businesses have what is called ''positive cash flow.'' That is from whence jobs flow.

If you have the money and you can retain it rather than have to give it all up to the government, then you're going to make wise choices in your business to grow your business, because it's your competitive nature to grow your business, which means to create jobs in the economy.

My friends on the other side of the aisle had no problem a few years ago spending $1 trillion to have the government borrow the money and pick winners and losers and waste it.

This is a good way to spur jobs and growth in our economy. I urge its passage.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act, a bill that provides a $46 billion tax break for the wealthy paid for by ordinary working people. This bill will send half of the tax cuts to those with annual incomes over $1 million and 80 percent of benefits to those earning more than $200,000. Once again, Republicans are extending a helping hand to those who need it least, including professional sports teams, law firms, lobbying firms, and accounting firms.

The Republican Leadership claims that we need this legislation to create jobs, yet the non-partisan Joint Committee on Taxation, JCT, tells us that this bill will do no such thing. The Congressional Budget Office, CBO, ranks broad business tax deductions like this bill as one of the least effective proposals for promoting economic growth. This is not surprising. H.R. 9 gives a tax deduction to any business, even those that don't hire workers or even lay off workers.

Today's bill caps off another banner week for House Republicans that once again laid bare their priorities: hand tax breaks to those who don't need them, and cut the programs that help the middle class, the poor, the sick, and the elderly. Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee passed partisan legislation that would take away the child tax credit for 3 million children, weaken health coverage for 350,000 middle class Americans, and eliminate funding for the Social Services Block Grant that provides child care for 4.4 million children and serves 1.7 million low-income seniors through programs like Meals on Wheels. That's a total of $53 billion in cuts to the safety net so Republicans can pay for more take cuts for the rich. This is class warfare and one side is clearly winning.

If we want to commemorate Tax Day with a vote on a tax bill, we should be voting on the Buffett Rule, a bill that promotes tax fairness.

The Buffett Rule is targeted—it will only impact taxpayers who have income over $1 million and are not paying their fair share of taxes. Nearly 65 percent of taxpayers who earn more than $1 million pay lower tax rates for those who make less than $100,000. There is something wrong with our tax system when ordinary working families are paying higher tax rates than some of the wealthiest individuals.

According to CBO, the Buffett Rule would generate $47 billion over the next decade. We could use this $47 billion to create jobs, revitalize the middle class, and sustain a safety net for the poor, the sick, the elderly, and other groups who are being abused by the Republican Majority.

It is time we got our priorities straight and stopped providing handouts to the most fortunate at the expense of lower income Americans. I strongly oppose this legislation and urge my fellow members to join me in voting ''no''.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 9, an irresponsible bill that, in the name of cutting taxes for small business and spurring job growth, would provide a windfall for those who need them least. This one-year measure would increase our federal deficit to the tune of $46 billion.

H.R. 9 provides qualifying businesses with less than 500 employees a 20 percent tax deduction for domestic business income which could be taken during the current tax year. Instead of supporting local small businesses though, this bill inordinately benefits wealthy business owners. Half of the tax cuts in the bill would go to the four percent of small business owners earning over $1 million a year. The 55 percent of small-business employers that have incomes below $100,000 would receive only 6 percent of the benefit from this bill. Struggling small business owners who are operating at an annual loss will not benefit from this bill in any way.

The Center for American Progress reports that professional sports franchises such as the Los Angeles Dodgers, Donald Trump's Trump Tower Sales & Leasing, and Paris Hilton Entertainment, Inc. are among the businesses owned by millionaires that would enjoy this tax break.

This one-time windfall simply will not change incentives for hiring. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO): ''[T]he one-year of tax savings provided by the bill is unlikely to make the costs of much investment in physical capital or labor recruitment and training worthwhile.'' In fact, this will incentivize qualifying business to delay investment in order to maximize taxable income in 2012. Additionally, H.R. 9 does not require a company to create any jobs or invest in the U.S. economy. In fact, if a company reduces their workforce or sends jobs overseas, they would still qualify for this 20 percent tax break.

H.R. 9 borrows billions in order to create a new tax expenditure yet fails to address the primary issue facing American small business, lack of consumer demand. This bill chooses anti-tax orthodoxy over fiscal and economic logic. Given our current fiscal situation we cannot afford another reckless giveaway to the wealthy. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 9.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. There is nothing in this bill specifically for small businesses. Instead, this is another attempt to award tax breaks to the wealthy. In fact, millionaires will receive nearly half of the benefit from this legislation, while true small businesses accrue only 10 percent. Once again, as the largest corporations get fatter, small businesses have to struggle for scraps.

Small, fast growing startups, which often have little tax liability, would see no tax savings—yet these are the firms most likely to create jobs. Even worse, this plan would give tax breaks to companies shedding employees—exactly the wrong incentive. Finally, this bill does nothing to address small business owners' top concern—a lack of demand for their goods and services. A real small business bill would tackle that problem.

This is not a small business bill—it is a millionaire's tax break bill. Vote no so we can focus on real solutions to small businesses' needs.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this provision to get construction of Keystone XL pipeline underway.

For months, Members from both sides of the aisle have worked tirelessly to impress upon the Administration the urgent need for the Keystone XL pipeline project to proceed.

The justification for Keystone as a safe and critical boon to private sector job creation and American energy security has not changed. This project will still create thousands of jobs. It will still increase the nation's capacity to transport crude oil by 830,000 barrels per day; and the State Department is still on record stating that Keystone ''poses little environmental risk'' and will lead to ''no significant impacts to most resources.''

Unfortunately, the Administration's reluctance to proceed with the Keystone XL pipeline has left some other figures unchanged since debate on Keystone began. The unemployment is still above 8 percent. The U.S. still relies on the same sources of foreign energy; and American's are still asking why?

Yet thousands remain out of work because the President refuses to pick up his pen. Americans want more jobs and greater energy security. Construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline will help to ensure both. I urge support for this provision.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is expected to vote on the Small Business Tax Cut Act, legislation allowing for job creation promoting economic growth by cutting taxes for small business owners.

In an opinion piece published Tuesday in Politico, Steve Forbes writes ''Real economic growth has been pathetic during the Obama Presidency. Last year, the economy grew 1.7 percent. By comparison, the Reagan recovery was spectacular, growing at 4.5 percent in 1983, with nearly 3.5 million jobs. In just one month, September 1983, the Reagan economy added more than a million jobs, nearly as many as the economy grew for all of 2011.''

In order for our nation to recover from the economic recession, small businesses must be given the opportunity to grow and create jobs. The President and the liberal-controlled Senate continue to stall dozens of bills which would promote jobs. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill and help American families create jobs.

In conclusion, God Bless our troops and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9, the legislation before this chamber today that would provide a one-time tax windfall in the tens of thousands of dollars to entertainers, sports franchises, smut peddlers, and other wealthy business owners, while doing little to create jobs for struggling middle-class America and adding $46 billion to the national deficit.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are bringing this legislation before the House in the name of tax relief for small businesses and job creation.

I would happily vote in favor of legislation that provided targeted relief to small businesses and spurred much-needed job creation in my district and throughout the country.

Unfortunately, H.R. 9 would do no such thing. In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation stated, ''the effects of the bill on economic activity are so small as to be incalculable.''

Similarly, a report last year by the Congressional Budget Office rated the approach taken in H.R. 9 to be one of the least cost-effective ways to encourage growth or create jobs in a weak economy. CB0 estimated that this legislation's approach would create one job or fewer per $1 million of budgetary cost.

However, H.R. 9, if enacted, would be a boon to wealthy taxpayers. Nearly half of the benefit would go to individuals with incomes of over $1 million.

Seventy-six percent of small business employers have incomes below $200,000, but this group only received 16 percent of the benefit under H.R. 9. And 55 percent of small business employers have incomes below $100,000 but this group receives only six percent of the total benefit.

At a time when our Nation must tackle its growing deficit, and push further job creation, the last thing this Congress ought to do is give expensive handouts to the richest individuals in our society.

Instead, this Congress ought to be debating on how to deliver targeted job creation legislation and protect essential safety net programs, like the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program and Medicaid, which this House recently voted to cut in the hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade in the name of ''deficit reduction.''

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today to stand for commonsense fiscal principles and targeted job creation and vote against H.R. 9.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our small businesses are hurting.

In the past year, only one in five small businesses has hired.

This is a problem because if small businesses aren't hiring, we don't recover.

According to a survey from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, they are not hiring because they don't know what Washington, DC is going to do to them next.

Four in five small-business owners said that the taxes, regulations and legislation coming from Washington made it more difficult for them to hire additional workers.

In other words, our government is getting in the way of economic recovery.

H.R. 9 will be a breath of fresh air to them.

For every $100 of income, small businesses will save $7 in federal taxes.

That's 7 percent they can put towards hiring a veteran back from Iraq or someone who hasn't been able to find a job for years.

Washington needs to get out of the way and let our small businesses do what they do best: hire new workers.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I support tax and regulatory policies that help small businesses attract investment and create jobs, but I also believe that we in the Congress must be responsible stewards of taxpayer funds.

I voted against H.R. 9 because it would spend an enormous amount of money without any requirements that the funds be invested in job creation or even invested in the American economy. Any company that receives the tax benefit provided by this bill could use it to bolster profits while laying off workers and shipping American jobs overseas. Half of the tax breaks would go to only 0.3 percent of taxpayers, those with incomes exceeding $1 million, costing $46 billion while the rest of our Nation is forced to endure the impact of painful spending cuts in programs important to working middle-class families. That's hardly fair and certainly not right.

This measure is more about scoring political points in an election year—trying to play gotcha—when we should be trying to move forward on measures that would give a real boost to job creation and economic growth.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have been consistent in my support for comprehensive tax reform that lowers rates for individuals and businesses by eliminating the types of carve outs and deductions in the tax code that, as recently reported by The Hill, have let 26 Fortune 500 companies pay a negative tax rate over a four-year span. To be clear, that means these companies are getting paid by the government while hard-working men and women pay their taxes.

Something is very wrong with this picture. That is precisely the reason why we need real, long-term comprehensive tax reform. Last year, Senator TOM COBURN identified nearly $1 trillion in annual spending through the tax code through tax earmarks that benefit special interests such as video game developers, hedge fund managers, NASCAR, dog and horse tracks and ethanol producers. Unlike an earmark in an annual appropriations bill, these tax earmarks are far worse because once enacted they typically exist in perpetuity.

Using these extensive tax loopholes, General Electric (GE) paid no federal taxes in 2010. Yet, the Congressional Research Service has found that GE was honored by a Chinese newspaper for ranking 32nd among commercial service sector companies that paid taxes to China.

Let me repeat: GE paid no taxes to the United States, but was a significant source of tax revenue for China. China? China, a country that is spying on us, persecutes people of faith and has a long record of horrific human rights abuses.

Rather than putting forth true comprehensive tax reform—the type that would bring stability to the economy by providing certainty for job creators and families—both parties in both chambers have pushed political agendas instead of what is best for America.

The so-called ''Buffett rule'' the Senate attempted to pass earlier this week was defeated, and rightly so. Washington Post columnist Ruth Marcus points out President Obama's pursuit of this policy ''is pure political stunt. . . . It won't pass. And even if that happened, it would have a negligible impact on the exploding debt—$4.7 billion a year, or less than four-tenths of 1 percent of this year's deficit—and take a tiny nibble out of income inequality.''

At a time when strong leadership is needed to address our nation's crippling debt, it is unfortunate that President Obama has continually failed to lead by example. He even walked away from the recommendations of his own bipartisan fiscal commission.

Unfortunately, the House today has done no better than the Senate or president. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial today headlined Bipartisan Tax Gimmickry, candidly described the proposal before us as a ''gimmick'' and went on to say that Republicans ''would do more for the economy and their political prospects if they began to educate the country about sensible tax policy.''

The bill before us is a temporary, one-year proposal that will increase our debt by $46 billion, without an offset to pay for this additional deficit spending. I want to stress: $46 billion for a temporary, one-year proposal.

I want to remind my colleagues that two months ago Congress essentially wiped out the $95 billion in savings cut from the 2011 and 2012 appropriations bills when it approved extending the payroll ''holiday'' for another year at a cost of $93 billion.

We are now talking about adding to this spending for a total of $139 billion in temporary, one-year stimulus spending with no offsets; no way to pay for it.

We are already running trillion dollar deficits for the fourth straight year. We are $15.6 trillion in debt. We have unfunded obligations and liabilities of $65 trillion. Republicans on the Senate Budget Committee earlier this month posted a chart on its Web site showing that our debt at the end of 2011 was greater than the combined debt of the United Kingdom and the entire Eurozone.

We need look no further than the riots in Europe to see the destructive impact that results from the crushing reality of a government unable to deliver promised entitlements to its citizens. There have been riots in Belgium, Spain, France, Ireland, England, Italy, Latvia, and Greece. And yet we are considering another proposal that moves us closer to Europe's instability.

We are now spending $4.3 billion a week simply on interest to service the debt. And this is at historically low interest rates.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projects that by 2022 we're going to be sending $11.6 billion out the door each week to 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.

And, unless we change course, according to the CBO's long term estimate, every penny collected of the federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending by 2025.

Every penny. That means no money for national defense. No money for homeland security. No money to fix the nation's crumbling bridges and roads. No money for medical research to find a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's disease.

Quite frankly this borrowing is unsustainable, dangerous and irresponsible.

Given our nation's fiscal obligations, one must ask: Can we really afford another costly, one-year policy absent the needed comprehensive reform?

Why are we spending time on a policy that everyone knows has no chance of being signed into law as currently drafted? Could it be because, as recently reported by Politico, ''Congress is readying for a political fight with dueling tax votes this week that will define each party's priorities in this election year''?

The final paragraph of today's Wall Street Journal editorial noted that ''[t]he economy works best when investors and companies can operate under predictable policies that allow them to better judge their risks for the long term. Reagan-era officials understood this, but too many Republicans have forgotten. The U.S. economy doesn't need another tax gimmick. It needs a tax reform that includes a permanent cut in individual and business tax rates for everyone.''

The president and some on the other side of the aisle say that our debt crisis is because Americans are under-taxed. Like President Reagan said, and I believe, ''the problem is not that people are taxed too little, the problem is that government spends too much.'' There is no question that the real problem is overspending, especially on runaway entitlement costs and through hundreds of billions of so-called tax expenditures.

It is no secret that our inefficient and burdensome tax code is undermining consumer and business confidence, further weakening our fragile economic recovery. Comprehensive tax reform is needed now more than ever to rid our tax code of earmarks and loopholes that promote crony capitalism and let Washington pick winners and losers.

Two weeks ago I was one of 38 members to vote for the bipartisan Cooper-LaTourette substitute amendment to the budget, which was modeled on the work of the Simpson-Bowles Commission. 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 as other ''sacred cows,'' including tax reform and defense spending.

The Cooper-LaTourette substitute was a balanced and ambitious plan, that, while not perfect, was the type of bitter medicine necessary to address our deficit. There is never a convenient time to make tough decisions, but the longer we put off fixing the problem, the worse the medicine will be. Unfortunately, the amendment failed.

For nearly six years I have pushed bipartisan legislation to set up an independent commission to develop a comprehensive deficit reduction package that would require an up-or-down vote by the Congress. I have said that the enormity of the crisis we face demands that everything must be on the table for discussion—all entitlement spending, all domestic discretionary spending, and tax policy; not tax increases, but reforms to make the tax code simpler and fairer and free from special interest earmarks.

I have supported every serious effort to resolve this crisis: the Bowles-Simpson recommendations, the ''Gang of Six'' effort, and the ''Cut, Cap and Balance'' bill—including the Balanced Budget Amendment. None of these solutions were perfect, but they all took the steps necessary to rebuild and protect our economy.

But powerful special interests continue to hold this institution hostage and undermine every good faith effort to change course. And that's why we have these actions on the floor of the House and Senate instead of the much-needed proposal to enact comprehensive reform.

Mr. Speaker, I do not sign political pledges to special interest groups. My only pledge is the oath of office I take on the first day of each Congress. And that is why I cannot partake in this political vote that would further add to the deficit without dealing with the underlying drivers of our deficit and debt.

As The Hill reported this week: "Republicans and Democrats are hurtling toward a fiscal cliff, but neither side wants to take the plunge.

"In less than nine months, Bush-era tax rates are scheduled to expire, hiking rates for the middle class as well as top income earners. At the same time, automatic spending cuts will kick in. The combination, coupled with the expiration of the payroll tax cut and other factors, would constitute a blow that analysts say could imperil the economic recovery and send America crashing back into recession."

We need to simplify the tax code to lower tax rates. But we need to do it through real, comprehensive reform, not through a piecemeal approach that makes it too politically easy to ignore our overall finances. I vote "present" to bring attention to this point.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Small Business Tax Cut Act (H.R. 9), which will provide tax relief to Hoosier small businesses and help them to grow and create jobs.

In Indiana there are more than 100,000 small businesses that employ more than a million Hoosiers. Nearly 14,000 of these small businesses are owned by women. As I travel across Indiana and hear from these hard-working Hoosier entrepreneurs and taxpayers, one thing is clear: Washington, DC needs a new approach to fostering job growth. With unemployment in Indiana at a disheartening 8.4 percent, Hoosiers are looking for tax relief that will help their friends and neighbors get back to work.

The Small Business Tax Cut Act reduces the heavy burden of taxes on Hoosier small businesses by allowing them to deduct 20 percent of their active income this year. In all, this important measure would reduce taxes on job creators by $46 billion, freeing up capital for small businesses to grow and take on new employees.

This pro-growth, pro-taxpayer legislation will help to foster new investment in our economy and spur job growth. I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 9, the so-called Small Business Tax Cut Act, which, instead of helping small businesses or growing the economy, is merely another tax giveaway to the rich.

Americans are demanding that we take action to create jobs and spur economic growth, but this legislation before us today adds $46 billion to the deficit in the next year alone, fails to create jobs and actually discourages the investments our economy needs.

Now is the time to support American small businesses and grow the economy, as Democrats would do in an alternative proposal, by allowing companies to deduct 100% of the cost of capital, or "bonus depreciation," in the first year for new investment in machinery and equipment—a proposal even conservative economists consider one of the most productive ways to boost economic growth.

This is not the time to hand another tax cut to our nations' wealthiest as H.R. 9 proposes, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Tax Cut Act".

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 200. DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of a qualified small business, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 20 percent of the lesser of—

"(1) the qualified domestic business income of the taxpayer for the taxable year, or

"(2) taxable income (determined without regard to this section) for the taxable year.

"(b) DEDUCTION LIMITED BASED ON WAGES PAID.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the deduction allowable under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed 50 percent of the greater of—

"(A) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to non-owners, or

"(B) the sum of—

"(i) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to individuals who are non-owner family members of direct owners, plus

"(ii) any W–2 wages of the taxpayer paid to 10-percent-or-less direct owners.

"(2) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO OWNERSHIP.—For purposes of this section—

"(A) NON-OWNER.—The term 'non-owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any person who does not own (and is not considered as owning within the meaning of subsection (c) or (e)(3) of section 267, as the case may be) any stock of such business (or, if such business is other than a corporation, any capital or profits interest of such business).

"(B) NON-OWNER FAMILY MEMBERS.—An individual is a non-owner family member of a direct owner if—

"(i) such individual is family (within the meaning of section 267(c)(4)) of a direct owner, and

"(ii) such individual would be a non-owner if subsections (c) and (e)(3) of section 267 were applied without regard to section 267(c)(2).

"(C) DIRECT OWNER.—The term 'direct owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any person who owns (or is considered as owning under the applicable non-family attribution rules) any stock of such business (or, if such business is other than a corporation, any capital or profits interest of such business).

"(D) 10-PERCENT-OR-LESS DIRECT OWNERS.—The term '10-percent-or-less direct owner' means, with respect to any qualified small business, any direct owner of such business who owns (or is considered as owning under the applicable non-family attribution rules)—

"(i) in the case of a qualified small business which is a corporation, not more than 10 percent of the outstanding stock of the corporation or stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all stock of the corporation, or

"(ii) in the case of a qualified small business which is not a corporation, not more than 10 percent of the capital or profits interest of such business.

"(E) APPLICABLE NON-FAMILY ATTRIBUTION RULES.—The term 'applicable non-family attribution rules' means the attribution rules of subsection (c) or (e)(3) of section 267, as the case may be, but in each case applied without regard to section 267(c)(2).

"(3) W–2 WAGES.—For purposes of this section—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'W–2 wages' means, with respect to any person for any taxable year of such person, the sum of the amounts described in paragraphs (3) and (8) of section 6051(a) paid by such person with respect to employment of employees by such person during the calendar year ending during such taxable year.

"(B) LIMITATION TO WAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO QUALIFIED DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME.—Such term shall not include any amount which is not properly allocable to domestic business gross receipts for purposes of subsection (d)(1).

"(C) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Except in the case of amounts treated as W–2 wages under paragraph (4)—

"(i) such term shall not include any amount which is not allowed as a deduction under section 162 for the taxable year, and

"(ii) such term shall not include any amount which is not properly included in a return filed with the Social Security Administration on or before the 60th day after the due date (including extensions) for such return.

"(4) CERTAIN PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTIONS TREATED AS W–2 WAGES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified small business which is a partnership and elects the application of this paragraph for the taxable year—

"(i) the qualified domestic business taxable income of such partnership for such taxable year (determined after the application of clause (ii)) which is allocable under rules similar to the rules of section 199(d)(1)(A)(ii) to each qualified service-providing partner shall be treated for purposes of this section as W–2 wages paid during such taxable year to such partner as an employee, and

"(ii) the domestic business gross receipts of such partnership for such taxable year shall be reduced by the amount so treated.

"(B) QUALIFIED SERVICE-PROVIDING PARTNER.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified service-providing partner' means, with respect to any qualified domestic business taxable income, any partner who is a 10-percent-or-less direct owner and who materially participates in the trade or business to which such income relates.

"(5) ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS.—The Secretary shall provide for the application of this subsection in cases where the taxpayer acquires, or disposes of, the major portion of a trade or business or the major portion of a separate unit of a trade or business during the taxable year.

"(c) LIMITATION BASED ON INVESTMENT IN QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the deduction allowable under subsection (a) for

any taxable year shall not exceed the allowance which would be determined under section 168(k)(1)(A) with respect to the taxpayer for the taxable year if such section were applied—

''(A) by substituting '100 percent' for '50 percent', and

''(B) without regard to paragraph (2).

''(2) ADJUSTMENT OF BASIS.—No deduction shall be allowed to the taxpayer under subsection (a) for any taxable year unless the adjusted basis of property taken into account under paragraph (1) is reduced by the amount of the deduction allowed under subsection (a) before computing the amount otherwise allowable as a depreciation deduction under this chapter (including any allowance otherwise determined under section 168(k)) for such taxable year and any subsequent taxable year.

''(d) QUALIFIED DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified domestic business income' for any taxable year means an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the taxpayer's domestic business gross receipts for such taxable year, over

''(B) the sum of—

''(i) the cost of goods sold that are allocable to such receipts, and

''(ii) other expenses, losses, or deductions (other than the deduction allowed under this section), which are properly allocable to such receipts.

''(2) DOMESTIC BUSINESS GROSS RECEIPTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'domestic business gross receipts' means the gross receipts of the taxpayer which are effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States within the meaning of section 864(c) but determined—

''(i) without regard to paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) thereof, and

''(ii) by substituting 'qualified small business (within the meaning of section 200)' for 'nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation' each place it appears therein.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), domestic business gross receipts shall not include any of the following:

''(i) Gross receipts derived from the sale or exchange of—

''(I) a capital asset, or

''(II) property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(b)).

''(ii) Royalties, rents, dividends, interest, or annuities.

''(iii) Any amount which constitutes wages (as defined in section 3401).

''(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 199(c) shall apply for purposes of this section (applied with respect to qualified domestic business income in lieu of qualified production activities income and with respect to domestic business gross receipts in lieu of domestic production gross receipts).

''(e) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small business' means any employer engaged in a trade or business if such employer had fewer than 500 full-time equivalent employees for either calendar year 2010 or 2011.

''(2) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES.—The term 'full-time equivalent employees' has the meaning given such term by subsection (d)(2) of section 45R applied—

''(A) without regard to subsection (d)(5) of such section,

''(B) with regard to subsection (e)(1) of such section, and

''(C) by substituting 'calendar year' for 'taxable year' each place it appears therein.

''(3) EMPLOYERS NOT IN EXISTENCE PRIOR TO 2012.—In the case of an employer which was not in existence on January 1, 2012, the determination under paragraph (1) shall be made with respect to calendar year 2012.

''(4) APPLICATION TO CALENDAR YEARS IN WHICH EMPLOYER IN EXISTENCE FOR PORTION OF CALENDAR YEAR.—In the case of any calendar year during which the employer comes into existence, the number of full-time equivalent employees determined under paragraph (2) with respect to such calendar year shall be increased by multiplying the number so determined (without regard to this paragraph) by the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(A) the number of days in such calendar year, by

''(B) the number of days during such calendar year which such employer is in existence.

''(5) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any person treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 (applied without regard to section 1563(b)) or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as a single employer for purposes of this subsection.

''(B) PREDECESSORS.—Any reference in this subsection to an employer shall include a reference to any predecessor of such employer.

''(f) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) ELECTIVE APPLICATION OF DEDUCTION.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the taxpayer may elect not to take any item of income into account as domestic business gross receipts for purposes of this section.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 199.—If a deduction is allowed under this section with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year—

''(A) any gross receipts of the taxpayer which are taken into account under this section for such taxable year shall not be taken into account under section 199 for such taxable year, and

''(B) the W–2 wages of the taxpayer which are taken into account under this section shall not be taken into account under section 199 for such taxable year.

''(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7) of section 199(d) shall apply for purposes of this section (applied with respect to qualified domestic business income in lieu of qualified production activities income).

''(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations which prevent a taxpayer which reorganizes from being treated as a qualified small business if such taxpayer would not have been treated as a qualified small business prior to such reorganization.

''(h) APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to the first taxable year of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 2011.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 56(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''deduction under section 199'' both places it appears and inserting ''deductions under sections 199 and 200''.

(2) Section 56(g)(4)(C) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vii) DEDUCTION FOR DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any amount allowable as a deduction under section 200.''.

(3) The following provisions of such Code are each amended by inserting ''200,'' after ''199,'':

(A) Section 86(b)(2)(A).

(B) Section 135(c)(4)(A).

(C) Section 137(b)(3)(A).

(D) Section 219(g)(3)(A)(ii).

(E) Section 221(b)(2)(C)(i).

(F) Section 222(b)(2)(C)(i).

(G) Section 246(b)(1).

(H) Section 469(i)(3)(F)(iii).

(4) Section 163(j)(6)(A)(i) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (III) and by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclause:

''(V) any deduction allowable under section 200, and''.

(5) Section 170(b)(2)(C) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (v) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

''(vi) section 200.''.

(6) Section 172(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) DOMESTIC BUSINESS INCOME OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—The deduction under section 200 shall not be allowed.''.

(7) Section 613(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''deduction under section 199'' and inserting ''deductions under sections 199 and 200''.

(8) Section 613A(d)(1) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) any deduction allowable under section 200,''.

(9) Section 1402(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16), by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18), and by inserting after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

''(17) the deduction provided by section 200 shall not be allowed; and''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 200. Domestic business income of qualified small businesses.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 620, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 12½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute offers a 1-year extension of 100 percent bonus depreciation for certain U.S. businesses.

Most importantly, the amendment offers a stark contrast to the majority's untargeted giveaway to the very wealthy Americans.

First, bonus depreciation is available only to businesses that make investments in depreciable property. As a result, most of the benefit from the bonus depreciation provision will flow to businesses such as manufacturers that make significant investments in property, plant, and equipment. These are the types of businesses that create good jobs here in our country.

In contrast to the majority's mistaken bill, very little, if any, benefit would go to lawyers, lobbyists, hedge fund managers, and entertainers, to mention just a few. These service professionals simply do not make large investments in depreciable property.

Second, bonus depreciation is only available for property used in our country. So a business that builds a new factory only gets the deduction if the factory is built in this country.

In contrast, the majority's bill provides a benefit to businesses regardless of where they're expanding or investing. Businesses that cut jobs in the U.S. and expand overseas could get the benefit of H.R. 9. In practice, they would get no benefit from this amendment.

Third, the incentive to purchase depreciable property provides a benefit to all of the businesses that produce the property. The result is a more general and widespread economic stimulus.

Fourth, and finally, bonus depreciation is a proposal that has had bipartisan support, unlike H.R. 9. H.R. 9 is going nowhere—nowhere—and it should not.

Vote for and pass this substitute. It is sound policy and can become the law of the land.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) is recognized for 12½ minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I yield such time as he may consume to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my distinguished chairman yielding time.

I can understand why the American people are frustrated. We have a President who, from day one, campaigned on raising taxes, raising taxes, then became the President of the United States, and his party in the House and his party in the Senate, they've talked about raising taxes. All the while, we've had a down economy. All the while, we've had unemployment above 8 percent. Yet the interesting thing is that, when the same Democratic Party controlled the House of Representatives and controlled the United States Senate for 2 years, they decided not to implement the Buffett tax.

□ 1230

They decided not to increase taxes on Americans.

Why? Because they know what we know and they know the truth, and that is that raising taxes will hurt the economy, that raising taxes is not what you do when you want to put people back to work. It's bad policy. It's why a year ago, despite all the rhetoric against the Bush tax cuts, despite all the rhetoric against the '01 and '03 rates, this same majority in the United States Senate and this same President said—what? President Obama said, Now is not the time to increase taxes on any American. A year ago.

If that were good policy a year ago, I might submit to you that it's good policy today. I don't know many Americans who believed a year ago that the economy was in any worse of a situation than it is in today. Raising taxes is not good policy on any American. If ever there were a starker contrast between the two visions for America, if ever there were a starker contrast between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party's visions on how to get the economy going, it is what's happening today in Washington, D.C.

Across this hallway, in the United States Senate, they are attempting to raise taxes on America's small businesses—yes, pass-through entities that pay a rate and take that capital away from them and their ability to invest in capital, in their ability to hire workers. Here in the House of Representatives, we are trying to do the opposite. We're saying that we're listening to these job creators, that we're listening to these people who actually do the hiring.

Do you know what they're saying? Their access to capital is drying up, and the cash in their bank accounts doesn't quite meet their needs each month. They need more capital to be able to go out and hire people. They need more capital to be able to go out and buy equipment.

So that's what this targeted tax cut is. It's not for the big corporations. It's targeted at people who have fewer than 500 employees. And guess what? You can have whatever opinion you want on the political ideology. You can't have your own facts, and the facts are these:

Over the last 2 years, seven out of 10 jobs created in this country were created by people who employ fewer than 500 people, the very people this tax bill is targeted at. Second, you can't throw up your hands and wonder why America's job creators are not hiring, why unemployment continues to be above 8 percent for the longest time in our country's history while at the same time advocating policies that will drive a stake into the heart of our economy and our small businesses.

This tax policy targeted at America's small businesses will give them the capital they need to stay in business, to hire those additional workers, to invest in additional capital, and maybe even to prevent layoffs, maybe even to prevent somebody from having to go on the unemployment line. It is the right policy. I wish that our friends on the other side of the aisle would embrace the policy that they had a year ago, which is that tax increases on any American is a bad policy in a down economy.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman is correct in that the contrast is very stark. They've tried to raise taxes on millionaires in the Senate so they pay like the people who work for them. This bill would provide a tax break of $58,000 to those who make over $1 million, which are 125,000 taxpayers. That is a stark contrast. Have people very wealthy pay a fair share on the one side, and have this House give them a big break.

I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentlelady from Nevada, SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Levin substitute and on behalf of the middle class families of Nevada, who are struggling to make ends meet. I'm talking about the housekeepers and the card dealers, the teachers, the nurses, the cops on the beat, the ones who work hard to take care of their families—to put food on the tables, to fill their cars with gas, to buy new sneakers for their kids, and to make the mortgage payments on time.

Yet, in spite of these challenges, Washington asks them to give a little more. Washington Republicans ask them to make additional sacrifices and ask them to carry the extra burden for wealthy Wall Street millionaires who are not paying their fair share. Why on Earth should a waitress in Nevada pay a higher tax rate than a yacht owner? Why should a janitor pick up the slack for a Big Oil executive? Why should a card dealer sacrifice more than a Wall Street hedge fund manager? That doesn't make sense. It's not fair. Wall Street corporations shipping American jobs overseas and big oil companies making record profits don't need our help. Working men and women in this country do.

This piece of legislation would be destructive to them, their futures, and their families. It is time we started siding with middle class families, who most definitely do need our help, and that starts by passing the Buffett rule.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by my colleague's comments a few minutes ago about how we need to support this substitute to help small businesses and all.

Yet what troubles me is, first of all, it's highly complicated. It further complicates the Tax Code. The real beneficiary will be your accountant because you've got to go through all of these machinations to figure out which side of this you qualify for. At the end of the day, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, because of the imposition of the additional restrictions called for by the Democrats in their substitute, which we're debating at this moment, the entire relief would be something on the order of $287 million nationwide to small businesses.

So there is your alternative.

You've got the Democrats saying, boy, according to Joint Tax, $287 million. Oh, that's going to solve the problem this year. That's really going to help. We're saying, no, we want to do something that really affects small businesses, middle class small businesses—people like my wife and me when we were in small business and worked with other small businesses in small communities. They are small

businesses that want to keep some of their cash flow home, where they can invest it in their businesses, in their employees, chase these ever-rising costs of health insurance and all of these other things that you do in small business—the added government costs of regulation, all of the things that drive up your costs you need cash to pay for.

We want to help those small businesses because that is the heartbeat, the growth of where innovation comes from—from jobs in America. It is small business. This is targeted specifically at small businesses in America that can keep some of their money.

By the way, it's not the government's money first. The government wasn't your best business partner. You went out and you earned it. You ought to be able to keep more of it. That's the difference in philosophy working out here on the floor; and those of us who have met payrolls, who have paid bills, who have dealt with government regulation get that. Those who haven't have a hard time understanding why, at the beginning, this is the business's money, the individual's money, the individual who has worked hard. It is not the government's money. It is the individual's money.

I urge the defeat of the substitute.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I support the substitute amendment, and I oppose the underlying bill.

I think my Democratic friends actually have it all wrong about this bill. I could be mistaken, but I think there was a drafting error in this legislation. When introducing this bill, the sponsor said, It will put more money into the hands of small business owners to reinvest those funds in order to retain, create jobs and grow their businesses, plain and simple.

This bill does nothing of the sort.

For starters, it does not target small businesses as the title claims. Rather than maximizing assistance for those employers who need it most, fewer than half the tax cuts go to legitimate small businesses. What's more, there is no requirement that this taxpayer subsidy should be used to hire new workers or expand facilities to grow the economy. I am also puzzled, Mr. Speaker, when looking at the bill before us today and previous drafts. You see, earlier drafts excluded certain businesses like liquor stores, casinos and strip clubs from receiving any tax relief; but the current draft does not have such exclusions. Further, this bill is not offset and would actually increase the deficit by $46 billion, which I know runs contrary to the intent of the sponsor, who believes that even in emergencies Federal assistance should be offset.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are very busy and are, perhaps, distracted with issues like compromising women's reproductive health rights, which is why I can only assume that these simple drafting errors have come to characterize this bill. I urge its rejection. Let's start over.

□ 1240

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 6½ minutes remaining on both sides.

Mr. CAMP. Thank you.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ROSKAM.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to speak for just a minute on the substitute.

Speaking of drafting errors, you can only assume that there was a drafting error on the substitute. Look, that happens. If it was a drafting error, the best thing to do is take the bill out of the record and start again. I think the notion of comparing $287 million in tax relief to $47 billion in tax relief is simply a nonstarter. It's as if the minority is saying, We sort of accept part of the premise of this tax cut, but we're going to cut it down. And then we're going to cut down the tax relief a little more. And then we're going to cut down the tax relief a little more and a little more and a little more and a little more until finally it's this obscure little bit of nonsense that isn't going to do anything.

Here's what we need to do. We need to give relief to the small business in my district. I was touring a plant, and the owner/entrepreneur who started the company said, Look, the smart move for me, Congressman, is to put three-quarters of a million dollars into this new production line. It would mean that I would expand production, bring in more people, and so forth, and have a very simple ripple effect, but I'm not going to do it. The reason I'm not going to do it is because Washington, D.C., tells me I'm rich. I'm not rich. I'm just a prudent businessman who's built a successful business.

What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is to create an environment where that business owner, that entrepreneur says to himself or herself, I'm willing to invest.

They need relief. They're begging for relief in suburban Chicago from their tax liability, and this is an opportunity now with this language that is authored by the majority leader and that is on the House floor.

I urge its passage, and I urge rejection of the substitute.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, just to set the record straight, the amendment that was offered by Mr. MCDERMOTT at the Rules Committee, and what our Ranking Member LEVIN and we Democrats in the Ways and Means Committee supported, offered immediate expenses, a bonus depreciation for capital investment for small businesses that was fully offset and fully paid for by eliminating the tax breaks that large oil companies are receiving today, who are sitting on record profits, with record high prices. And it wouldn't add a nickel to the deficit.

That's why I adamantly oppose the underlying bill before us today. It's the here-we-go-again syndrome around here. How deep are we going to create this hole? It's a $46 billion tax cut that's not offset, that's not paid for, will go straight to deficit, close to half of it going to millionaires. An average tax savings of over $58,000 is not the way to get this economy out of the hole that it's in. In fact, when the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office analyzed the Republican underlying bill, they said this is probably the worst thing for the buck that we can invest in the economy to create the jobs that we need today. Yet, this is a syndrome that happens over and over again from the other side. They support huge tax cuts without paying for them, driving our Nation deeper into debt.

If they think it's worthwhile enough and important enough to invest in, then pay for it. Find offsets in the spending, and let's have that discussion as far as our priorities. But don't go down the easy route of trying to offer this illusion of tax relief to all Americans, especially the iconic small business owner out there, without paying a nickel for it and adding to the budget deficits that are accumulating today.

I tried to explain to folks back home how we got into this hole. Certainly, the most important driving factor is the underperforming economy and the huge recession that we're trying to climb out of right now. But you can also look back at previous policies not so long ago supported by the other side: two huge tax cuts that weren't paid for; two wars that weren't paid for; the largest expansion of entitlement spending in the prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for. It's little wonder we're facing huge deficits.

I reject the underlying bill and support the Levin amendment.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it needs to be reiterated once again that the sponsor of the underlying bill, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), believes that we need to find payfors. We need to pay for it and not add to the deficit when it comes to disaster relief.

Let's put that in perspective. A hurricane hits, wipes out a town. The American government cannot go and rescue and help those people and pay

for that without finding a pay-for in order to substitute for that payment.

When tornados hit middle America and peoples' lives are destroyed, their homes are destroyed, and cities and towns are eviscerated, the Congress has to come up with pay-fors in order to help in that disaster relief, but not when it comes to a tax break for companies that will offshore American jobs.

Those tax breaks we don't have to pay for. Mr. CANTOR doesn't believe you have to pay for those. But for disasters that hit America and cities and towns that are annihilated, they must be paid for. I just think that needs to be pointed out to the American people.

The Levin bill is a far superior bill. It incentivizes growth within small businesses without burdening the American taxpayer at the same time.

Whose money are we talking about? This is not the small business person's money. This is money that otherwise would be revenue to the country. This is the American taxpayer's money that we're just giving back to millionaires, hardworking Americans who work and toil every day to give a tax break to millionaires.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again ask Members to heed the gavel.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any other speakers?

Mr. CAMP. No.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I heard my good friend from Chicago talking about people begging for investment. Well, business is looking for our assistance, but nobody has come seeking an inefficient effort like this that will dig ourselves deeper into debt and not have impact. We have offered alternatives that would not have added to the deficit and would have helped business right away.

I'm honored to be joined on the floor by a young friend, Johnny Hammer, who in looking at this assessment, said, This is going to be adding to the deficit. That's right, and we didn't need to do that. Instead, we should be focusing on things that are deficit neutral that will give American business things that will add productivity right now.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and think about the young Johnny Hammers of this world investing in our future in a way that is responsible and sustainable.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

I believe the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has the right to close. It is Mr. LEVIN's amendment, and Mr. CAMP is a manager in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. There is a criticism that the bonus depreciation provision doesn't go far enough. My answer to that is: let's pass this and then join together. You have supported bonus depreciation in the past. You haven't acted on it. We do.

Let me just say what's at stake. This bill isn't going anywhere—it's going nowhere, but it says everything about the majority's priorities.

They oppose raising taxes on the very wealthy, they take a pledge that applies to the very wealthy, and they end up with a bill they won't pay for. They make empty rhetoric about the deficit. Essentially what they're coming here today to do is to make it worse, by giving a tax break to the very wealthy through this bill.

□ 1250

We've said it many times, nobody refutes it. You're stuck on a pledge not to raise taxes even for the very wealthy, and you come today with a proposal for a tax break for 125,000 taxpayers making more than a million dollars with a tax break of 58,000. Then to make it still worse, you cut necessary programs for lower- and middle-income families, from child care and Meals On Wheels. Where's your conscience?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has expired, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

I appreciate at least hearing some of the new-found fiscal responsibility from my friends on the other side, since the Obama administration has come into office with help from Democrats on the other side of the aisle who increased the debt by $5 trillion, with a ''t.''

Let me just comment on this substitute. It's not that the bonus depreciation in this legislation doesn't go far enough. It's that it doesn't provide bonus depreciation. It does limit the bill based on the concept of bonus depreciation, but this bill has been analyzed by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Rather than providing the $46 billion of tax relief, this bill only provides a small fraction of that, 6 percent. Under the underlying legislation, millions of small businesses would be able to make investments, be able to buy equipment, would be able to hire workers. This substitute guts the bill and will result in no economic impact in this country.

I would urge a ''no'' vote on the substitute. I would urge support for the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that it is not in order during debate to refer to persons on the floor of the House as guests of the House.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 236, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—175

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett

Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Guinta
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Nunes
Paul
Rangel
Schrader
Slaughter
Thompson (MS)
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Young (FL)

□ 1317

Mrs. ROBY and Messrs. MCCARTHY of California and REICHERT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, COURTNEY, and CAPUANO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 175 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on agreeing to the Levin Substitute Amendment to H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 175, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1320

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEUTCH. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Deutch moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

At the end of paragraph (2) of section 200(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as proposed to be added by section 2 of the bill, add the following:

''(C) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN BUSINESSES.—The term 'domestic business gross receipts' shall not include any gross receipts attributable to any of the following:

''(i) ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES.—Any illegal activity, including trafficking in illegal drugs and prostitution.

''(ii) PORNOGRAPHY.—Any property with respect to which records are required to be maintained under section 2257 of title 18, United States Code.

''(iii) DISCRIMINATORY GOLF COURSES AND CLUBS.—Golf courses or clubs that discriminatorily restrict membership on the basis of sex or race.

''(iv) LOBBYING.—Activities described in section 162(e)(1).

''(v) BUSINESS ACTIVITIES OF PERSONS IN VIOLATION OF THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.—Any activity of any person (including any successor, assign, affiliate, member, or joint venturer with an ownership interest in any property or project any portion of which is owned by such person) that is in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) or the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

''(D) DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—No amount shall be taken into account as domestic business gross receipts by any Member of Congress unless the amount of the deduction allowed under this section and a description of the business activities giving rise to such deduction are publicly disclosed (in such manner and form as the Secretary may prescribe) not later than the date on which the return of tax is filed.''.

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 3. DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR MOVING UNITED STATES JOBS OVERSEAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 200 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR MOVING UNITED STATES JOBS OVERSEAS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section with respect to any employer—

''(i) which has fewer full-time equivalent employees in the United States for the taxable year beginning in calendar year 2012 as compared to the preceding taxable year, and

''(ii) which has more full-time equivalent employees outside the United States for the taxable year beginning in calendar year 2012 as compared to the preceding taxable year.

''(B) EMPLOYEES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—For purposes of this paragraph, an employee shall be treated as employed by the employer outside the United States whether employed directly or indirectly through a controlled foreign corporation (as defined in section 957) or a pass-through entity in which the taxpayer holds at least 50 percent of the capital or profits interest.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR EMPLOYEES SEPARATED VOLUNTARILY OR FOR CAUSE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the number of full-time equivalent employees shall be determined without regard to any employee separated from employment voluntarily or for cause.

''(D) AGGREGATION RULE.—Subsection (d)(5)(A) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

Mr. DEUTCH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

Mr. CAMP. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. CAMP (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the reading.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this debate has revealed deep differences between the majority and minority when it comes to how to grow our economy. We object to how Leader CANTOR's bill borrows $47 billion from China for tax cuts designed to benefit millionaires. That's why the CBO ranked this proposal second to dead last in a long list of things we could do to create jobs.

Now, Americans have learned by now that there is no such thing as a temporary Republican tax cut for the wealthy. They're all permanent. Let's acknowledge the real price tag here, a half a trillion dollars in deficit spending over the next decade—not for education, not for infrastructure, another $500 billion in windfall for the wealthy.

As I said before, our disagreements run deep. The fact that we are outnumbered means that this misguided

legislation will likely pass. Given that reality, we should at least be able to come together and agree on which businesses should be excluded from this new windfall. That's what my amendment aims to do.

My changes are relatively small. In fact, Leader CANTOR's legislation remains largely the same. For example, pass my amendment, and H.R. 9 will still uphold the GOP plan to take $46 billion from China and give half of it to millionaires. H.R. 9 will still count oil speculators, professional sports teams, and corporate lobbyists as small businesses. H.R. 9 will still pick and choose winners and losers by arbitrarily adding new loopholes to our already overcomplicated Tax Code. And, of course, Leader CANTOR's massive tax cut will remain available to businesses even if they create no jobs at all.

So let me be crystal clear about what my bill changes. It better safeguards our taxpayer dollars.

First, my amendment will stop businesses engaging in illegal activity, from drug trafficking to prostitution, from receiving this deduction. This is a no-brainer, and I have no idea why it's not in the bill already. We should all agree, given the recent news from South America, that there is no such thing as being too careful with American tax dollars.

Second, this amendment ensures that no company that outsources American jobs will qualify for this windfall. Certainly our constituents don't want us borrowing money from China to give to companies that outsource jobs to China. Certainly we can all agree that cutting taxes for businesses that are American in name only, that choose foreign workers over American workers, do not deserve another giveaway.

Third, my amendment prevents companies that do business with Iran from being eligible for this tax cut. As Iran pursues an illicit nuclear weapons program, we should not reward businesses that threaten the security of the United States and our treasured ally Israel.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment also stops this bill from cutting taxes for pornographic empires that somehow qualify as small businesses under this bill. It also requires Members of Congress who are owners of small businesses to disclose any benefits that they get under this bill. It excludes golf courses that discriminate based on race and gender. Finally, my amendment bans lobbyists from cashing in on this deduction.

Now, look, I know as soon as I sit down a colleague from the other side of the aisle will come forward and claim that I'm pursuing some procedural ploy and attempting to kill the bill. That's simply not true. Adopt these changes so we can vote on the final bill right here and right now.

Join me and prevent Americans' hard-earned tax dollars from subsidizing Iranian nucs, cutting costs for criminals, and padding the pockets of pornographers. And let's make sure that this bill does not reward companies that ship jobs overseas. It is the right thing to do. It's up to us to make these changes. We can make them right here and right now.

I ask all of my colleagues to protect the American taxpayers and support these final protections to the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I would just say to my friend that I'm not going to stand up and say that this is a procedural ploy. But I will stand up and say it is a political ploy.

We should not be picking winners and losers. The fact is small businesses are hurting because of the failed policies of the Obama administration. It's time to stand up for small business and the people they employ.

Let's get America back to work. I urge defeat of this motion to recommit and support for H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 229, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—179

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Clyburn
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Green, Gene
Guinta
Landry
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Nunes
Paul
Rangel
Sewell
Sherman
Slaughter
Thompson (MS)
Walsh (IL)
Young (FL)

□ 1345

Mrs. EMERSON changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 176 due a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Motion to Recommit to H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 176, the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 9, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 176, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 173, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—173

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Wolf

NOT VOTING—22

Bass (NH)
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Clyburn
Filner
Flake
Gosar
Green, Gene
Guinta
Landry
Manzullo
Marino
Napolitano
Nunes
Paul
Perlmutter
Rangel
Slaughter
Thompson (MS)
Walsh (IL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1355

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177, final passage of H.R. 9, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 177 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on final passage of H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 177, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes today to attend to official government business in Illinois. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 172; "yea" on rollcall No. 173; "yea" on rollcall No. 174; "no" on rollcall No. 175; "no" on rollcall No. 176; and "yea" on rollcall No. 177.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2341

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2341.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman

from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Among next week's suspensions will be a noteworthy bill, H.R. 2146, authored by Congressman DARRELL ISSA and known as the DATA Act. This is an important step in our continuing effort to make government more accountable, accessible, and transparent, especially when it comes to the expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

It is also possible that the House will consider a motion to go to conference and motion to instruct conferees on the surface transportation authorization bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we expect a full debate next week on the importance of our Nation's cybersecurity. The House will consider a number of bipartisan bills to reduce obstacles to voluntary information sharing between the private sector and government, secure our Nation's infrastructure, better protect government systems and combat foreign threats.

A number of committees have been involved in this effort, Mr. Speaker, including the Intelligence Committee, Homeland Security, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

Of the bills coming to the floor, we will consider H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, under a rule. This important legislation is authored by Chairman MIKE ROGERS and cosponsored by Ranking Member DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

The gentleman, in his comments, indicates that we might go to conference on the surface transportation bill. As the gentleman knows, the Senate surface transportation bill passed overwhelmingly and with a very substantial bipartisan vote and a vote led by Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma. There were 22 Republican Senators. About half of the Republican Senators voted for it, and so it passed overwhelmingly.

I am wondering, given the timeframe in which we are dealing, whether or not the gentleman feels comfortable with some assurance that we are going to move to go to conference so that we can get a conference under way. I know the majority indicated it wanted a bill so that it could, in fact, go to conference. I have had discussions with, I think, you but I know Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker, and Mr. MCCARTHY, that that was the intent to go to conference.

What would preclude us, I suppose would be the better way to phrase the question, from having a motion to go to conference next week? As the gentleman knows, we are going to be out the week following so that we will not be back until May, into May; and to the extent that we delay going to conference, we are going to delay the resolution of what I think is a very, very important bill. I know the gentleman does as well. We believe this is a real job creator.

As you know, Mr. LaHood is the Secretary of Transportation, your former colleague on your side of the aisle. He has made it very clear that this is a very substantial jobs bill. To the extent that we could move quickly, I think it would be in the best interests of our country, of infrastructure investment, and the creation of jobs.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman we have every intention of going forward, and, at this point, I don't know what could come up and preclude us from doing so. But we look forward to working with the gentleman over the course of the next two-plus months to come to resolution so that we can provide some certainty to States, industries, private sector, public, and the rest with regard to our transportation infrastructure.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And in light of the fact that he looks forward to my help, I want to tell him that if he brings a motion to go to conference next week, I will bring the overwhelming majority of my caucus to a vote with that motion to go to conference so that we can get that done. I will be glad to help in that respect.

Will that help him?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't know whether those votes would help you get the job done that I think needs to be done. I don't say that facetiously. I think we want to go to conference. I have been told you want to go to conference, and I would hope we could move forward on that. As a matter of fact, the chairman of your committee, Representative MICA, said yesterday we should go to conference immediately, and we would be very interested in helping you towards that process.

Mr. Leader, the Appropriations Committee has started to mark up its bills and has dealt with the reconciliation instructions. My understanding is the reconciliation instructions, the result of those instructions will be coming to the floor probably the first month, the month of May.

Is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to the appropriations bills, much was made of the fact that you wanted to bring appropriations bills to the floor one at a time and under open rules. I think that's a good practice. Frankly, I would have liked to have done that when we were in charge, and we didn't get that done. I said then that I didn't think it was good for the institution for the consideration of appropriation bills, and you, I think, rightfully criticized us for that—not you, personally, but the Republican side of the aisle.

Is it your intention to bring the appropriations bills to the floor singly, individually, with an open rule as Speaker BOEHNER indicated would be the case, and, if so, when will that occur?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that, as he knows, working through the committee at this point are the CJS bill and the energy and water bill. It is our intention to bring one of those forward the week that he indicates, May 7, to be debated.

The Speaker has consistently come down on the side of wanting there to be an open process. I think that, given the House's track record on appropriations bills and the debates surrounding them, we are hoping that we can have a deliberate debate around the substance and policy of the issues and set as a model for going forward.

But I would say to the gentleman, as far as we go right now, we are looking at May 7 to be the time in which we bring one of those bills to the floor for deliberation and a vote.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I make the additional observation that we passed a budget. Many of us voted against that budget, as you know, that passed. We voted for our alternative. But the American people, I think, have an interest and, frankly, a right to know what the ramifications of that budget that was passed are; and obviously they will find that out as the appropriation bills move forward, are considered on this floor, open to debate and open to amendment. That will educate the American people on what the consequences are of passing budget A over budget B, your budget, our budget, or an alternative budget.

It's really in the appropriations bill. The budget doesn't really do anything, as we all know, other than set a 302(a) allocation. That is the amount of discretionary dollars that can be applied in the appropriations process. What that means is that the only thing it does is set that limit and does not apportion resources to particular objectives in the appropriations bill or, for that matter, in the Ways and Means Committee bill in terms of actions that might occur with reference to taxes and revenues.

□ 1410

So I say to my friend that the importance of bringing the appropriation bills to the floor is to give that transparency to the American public so they can make a judgment on which priorities they support. We think it's going to be very difficult, frankly, to bring appropriation bills to the floor under the constraints that have been imposed. And we regret, as the gentleman knows, very much that we did not follow the agreement that was reached when we precluded the country's going into default. We agreed on a figure of $1.048 trillion to be the figure that the Appropriations Committee would mark to.

I don't know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to see, but 12 out of the 14 Senators on the Appropriations Committee voted to honor the agreement that was reached today, including Senator MCCONNELL. Regrettably, we did not do that in the House. We reduced that figure very substantially, and we also shifted some of the resources from one object—nondefense to defense—which cuts even further the nondefense portion of the budget by about $8 billion.

So I ask the gentleman, in that context, is the committee going to mark to the House-passed budget, which we have deemed adopted? Notwithstanding the fact it has not been adopted, is the House going to mark to those figures, and will it mark to those figures knowing full well what dollars are left for bills that are to follow? In other words, are you going to front-load and make those appropriation bills sweeter? That will then not leave resources for bills that will come after.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, first of all, the gentleman knows that we did pass a budget in the House. We didn't have a conference committee report to vote on because the Senate did not pass a budget, which has then forced us to have to deem what the House passed—again, the Senate having gone way past a thousand days without a budget.

So I would say to the gentleman it is our perception that what the deal was in August, the BCA, was a ceiling. And that we want to try in every way we can to save taxpayer dollars, and that is a rule which we're continuing to follow. The Appropriations Committee has taken up its obligations and is working on the bills, and we will be bringing up those bills consistent with that rule.

Again, I say to the gentleman, we look forward to a robust, policy-oriented debate on the spending issues facing this country throughout the appropriations process and look forward to a deliberative civil process so that we can get our work done and deliver on what the people expect—and that is to begin to shave the spending that has gotten out of control in Washington over the last several decades.

Mr. HOYER. I know the gentleman doesn't like to relitigate history, but when he says spending got out of control over the last two decades, I may agree with him on the last decade we went deeply into debt, but certainly the decade preceding that my friend surely remembers that we ran 4 years of surplus and a net surplus over 8 years during the Clinton administration. A $62.9 billion net surplus after 8 years. And we had 4 years of surplus. Two of those were actual surpluses—and we counted Social Security's revenues, which obviously were borrowed money from the Social Security trust fund. So we swapped Social Security money for IOUs. But 2 of those years of actual balance.

So I would agree with him on the last decade, but I would not agree with him on the decade before that because, frankly, working from both sides of the aisle and an exploding economy, we created those deficits essentially together.

I want to say to my friend that in that context, yes, the American people want to see us use their money wisely. We all agree on that. They need to know how we intend to use their money. And if they don't have appropriation bills on the floor—because the gentleman talks about the fact that the Senate hasn't passed a budget in a thousand days. It has had no effect, none, zero on what we are doing. Why? Because all the budget does, as the gentleman well knows, is not allocate money. It sets a ceiling—as the gentleman likes, apparently, ceilings and not agreements—a ceiling on what discretionary spending will be. Other than that, it doesn't do anything. Therefore, it sets forth a plan.

But the key is going to be how you carry out that plan and let the American people know how you're going to carry it out. We do that in appropriation bills and the Ways and Means tax bills.

Does the gentleman have an idea of when a Ways and Means tax bill carrying out the budget might come to the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman knows, Ways and Means is continuing in their mission to conduct hearings as far as tax reform is concerned. They just had a hearing on retirement provisions and what comprehensive tax reform means when it comes to retirement provisions.

The gentleman knows that tax reform doesn't come easy in this town. And we are all, I think, bound by the commitment to try and simplify the code with the differences that we have. And we're going to continue to look to see what Chairman CAMP and the committee's work produces. But with maintaining our commitment that we believe, as you do—Mr. Speaker, I would say the gentleman joins me in wanting to simplify the code, bring down rates, get rid of loopholes, and the rest.

Again, I would say we're looking to our committees to continuing their work. They're doing good work toward that end exposing the issues and identifying them so that we can get this in a way that is responding to what the public really wants to see, which is a simplified Tax Code and a much fairer way.

Mr. HOYER. We passed—if I can go to another subject briefly—we passed a bill today which the gentleman was a principle advocate of which cost $46 billion in terms of revenues in effect forgone, if you will, that otherwise were being expected, if that bill passes. Does the gentleman believe that if that bill passes and is signed by the President, that in light of the fact it's a 1-year bill, does the gentleman believe that it will be only 1 year or does the gentleman intend, if his party happens to be in charge in the next Congress, to see that lapse and that tax increased again on small businesses? What is the gentleman's thought on that? I ask him that question, if I might, in light of The Wall Street Journal's observation today that certainly this did not give small businesses much certainty.

Mr. CANTOR. First of all, I'd say the gentleman has a very interesting question if we're talking about the scheduling of the floor and how we're going forward, but I'll be delighted to answer the question.

The bill that we passed today in a bipartisan way is a bill that responds to the urgency that small business is feeling and, frankly, the people of this country are feeling that the economy is not growing quickly enough.

Is it a panacea? No. Do we want to see comprehensive overall tax reform? Absolutely. But as the gentleman knows, our side and his have big differences when it comes to tax reform.

Unfortunately, the discussions that ensued last year were hung up on the notion that your side really, really continues to advocate higher taxes. You want to start with a baseline that's just higher than ours. We don't believe right now that we ought to assume Washington has a revenue problem. Instead, we ought to fix the spending problem before you start jacking up more taxes, if at all.

So this measure that we passed is something that is a first start towards a pro-growth outlook to empower businesses and allow men and women who are out there taking risks starting businesses and creating jobs a little easier time in doing so, allowing them to keep more of the money to put back into their business and allocate the capital the best way they see of doing so, not Washington.

Again, I know the gentleman knows we have a difference of opinion when it comes to that. But, again, it is a small step in a bridge toward what we all would like to see but are unable to accomplish right now, which is overall tax reform.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and he is correct, we do have a very substantial difference of opinion. The indication is this is a start. Frankly, we were told it was a start in 2001. We

were told it was a start in 2003 when we cut taxes very substantially. Unfortunately, we didn't cut revenues very substantially. And when you don't cut revenues after you cut taxes, what happens is you have deficit. And that's why we went from a $5.6 trillion projected surplus after the Clinton administration, projected by the Bush administration, to an $11 trillion deficit at the end of the Bush administration—because we cut revenues and we increased spending.

□ 1420

We were not in charge for 75 percent of that time. In fact, we weren't in charge of ultimately passing legislation any of that time because the President, of course, had an 8-year term. So I say to my friend, we dug another $46 billion hole.

My belief is that your side of the aisle will not want to reinstate that tax next year no matter what the economy is doing, no matter how good the economy is. That's my suspicion. But it's based upon 30 years of experience, I tell my friend. And if that's the case, then we're not talking about $46 billion, we're talking about a half trillion dollars, which is $46 billion times 10 with escalation for inflation, so about a half-a-trillion-dollar additional hole in the deficit unless the gentleman is prepared to say, look, if the economy recovers, we're going to reinstate that revenue.

The difference between us is you want to talk about tax increases, and I want to talk about paying our bills. And I believe that if we don't want to buy, then we don't have to tax. But if we buy, we have a moral responsibility to have the courage to ask people to pay for it.

Very frankly, I think you've taken the discipline out of the system. I think supply-side economics takes the discipline out of the system. What supply-side economics does is, we can cut revenues but don't have to cut spending because magically we're going to get more revenues.

Very frankly, Mr. Greenspan thought for a while that that worked. He said 3 years ago, no, he was wrong. I think he was right the second time. He was demonstrably, graphically not right the first time when he rationalized the 2001 and 2003. We cut revenues, they did not raise sufficient additional dollars and growth in the economy.

As a matter of fact, whether there was a direct result, we had the worst economy I've experienced in my adult lifetime at the end of the Bush term and at the beginning of the Obama term as responsibility for the economy went over to President Obama.

Now, there's a lot of debate during this bill about how we've lost jobs. That's true. Those jobs were lost in the early part of the Obama administration. As the gentleman knows, over the last 24 months, we've had 4 million new jobs created, 10 quarters of economic growth in our country, and the Dow has doubled. The Dow has doubled since March of 2009. It's hard for me to see how that was a failure. It certainly hasn't been the success we'd like, but not a failure.

I tell my friend that, yes, we have a difference, and the public needs to come to grips with that difference and that debate, and that is whether or not we're going to pay for things we buy. And if we don't want to buy them, we won't have to pay for them, and we can cut taxes.

Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE GSA SCANDAL

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the recently discovered GSA spending scandal is a prime example why Americans have lost faith in their government.

This week, I questioned GSA officials about the now infamous conference hosted in Las Vegas. This one lavish conference left American taxpayers with an $822,000 tab.

Let me list just a few of the expense items from Las Vegas that are sure to enrage the American taxpayers: $75,000 was spent on a bicycle-building exercise to encourage team building; $3,200 was spent on mind readers to entertain the attendees. Guess what I'm thinking now. The average cost for breakfast per attendee, $44—that's $44 per person per day. And I save the worse for last, a $30,000 pool party.

Adding insult to injury, the chief organizer of the 2010 Las Vegas conference was approved for a bonus by senior Obama officials for his work in organizing the conference.

Officials who organize and authorize wasteful spending must be held responsible. This body must work to end the culture of waste at GSA and other government agencies and ensure that taxpayer dollars are respected.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the National Day of Silence, which is tomorrow. This is the 15th year we've commemorated the National Day of Silence, a time when students across the country remain silent for the whole day to draw attention to discrimination toward their LGBT peers.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning youth and their allies face verbal and physical bullying on a daily basis just for being who they are.

In a time when these teens are at a greater risk of suicide and self-harm, we cannot afford to be silent.

I'm proud to say that in my district, queer youth and allies work together to make life better. Many of our middle schools and high schools in my district host student-run gay-straight alliances which create a supportive space so that queer youth do not feel isolated.

I'm proud of my constituents for calling for a stop to harassment of GLBT individuals, and I encourage all Americans to do the same.

I am particularly proud of two high school seniors from my district:

Joaquin Garcia, from Pacific Collegiate School, and Lucy Walters, from Harbor High School, are two of 14 recipients of eQuality Scholarships in honor of their service and leadership within the LGBT community. Joaquin and Lucy are already making a difference in their communities, and I know they will continue making a difference at college.

Though many lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender youth advocates and their straight allies are silent tomorrow, we in Congress must never be silent. It is our job to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

SMALL BUSINESSES CREATE NEW JOBS

(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, over the past two decades, our Nation's small businesses have generated 65 percent of new jobs. According to a recent small business survey from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, today 64 percent of small businesses stand idle at current staffing levels, with 52 percent not hiring because they aren't confident in our Nation's recovery, and another 33 percent pointing to uncertainty driven by Washington.

These concerns are justifiable, Mr. Speaker, with the Senate continually choosing to ignore our jobs crisis in favor of advancing an agenda that will only grow government, not our economy.

The latest proposal surely wasn't about economic growth, for it takes private investment away from small businesses and turns it over to bureaucracies. It wasn't even about fairness, because it was fair to no one—not to the wealthy who pay even more taxes instead of investing in our economy, and not to the rest of us who need jobs, growth, and greater opportunity.

With economic uncertainty still pervasive, every decision made by government must pass the simple test of

whether or not it aids the Nation's recovery. Senate Democrats either fail to understand our economic problems or have, as troubling as it may be, chosen to ignore them.

THE HOLOCAUST

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of my 1-minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, there was a Yom HaShoah service held in the United States Capitol, and they were held in State Capitals throughout the Nation. It's the remembrance of the Holocaust that occurred in Europe. Six million lives were lost.

What the Yom HaShoah program is about is never to forget the Holocaust and never to forget what caused it to occur, to remember the outstanding military and people that helped Jews survive, the military that liberated the camps and the hundreds of thousands of righteous gentiles who helped and risked their own lives to save Jews. I wear a button for Raoul Wallenberg. The Swedish Government sent people over here, and he was a diplomat that saved 100,000 Jews, and they participated today.

There was testimony about how Treasury Secretary Morgenthau and two people in his administration, Mr. Pehle and Mr. DuBois, implored the President to help rescue Jews, and they did so. Many, many were lost because we didn't get involved soon enough. Never be silent to evil and remember the victims of the Holocaust.

I urge you to visit the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with people in the U.S., in Israel and around the world in recognition of International Holocaust Remembrance Day. On this day we honor the memory of the six million Jews and the many millions of others who perished during the Holocaust and we celebrate the strength and perseverance of the survivors. By stopping each year to recognize the significance of this day, we also rededicate ourselves to the principles of individual freedom and to a just society and we renew our pledge to Never Forget.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Yom Hashoah, or Holocaust Remembrance Day, which is the official Israeli Day of Remembrance for victims of the Holocaust. During the Holocaust, six million European Jews were systematically annihilated by the Nazi Regime. Today, I rise to pay tribute to those whose lives were irreparably affected by the Holocaust and to reaffirm my commitment to human rights.

The extermination of the Jewish people during World War II is greatest crime against humanity committed by a nation state in the history of the world. The Holocaust was initiated by members of the National Socialist (Nazi) Party, led by Adolf Hitler, who took control of Germany in 1933 and began increasing assaults on the rights and properties of German Jewish citizens.

During World War II, the Nazi party went even further and implemented their ''Final Solution'' which sought to eliminate the entire Jewish people. Of the nine million Jews who had resided in Europe before the Holocaust, approximately two-thirds perished. In particular, over one million Jewish children were killed in the Holocaust.

Holocaust Remembrance Day, observed on the 27th day of Nisan on the Hebrew Calendar is observed internationally by the Jewish community. This day of remembrance was established in 1953, by a law signed by the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, and the President of Israel, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi. Although the date was established by the Israeli government, it has become a day observed by Jewish communities and individuals worldwide. Today, many commemorate Yom Hoshoah with candle lighting, speakers, poems, prayers, and singing. Often, six candles are lighted to represent the six million lives lost.

Holocaust Remembrance Day is a day of public observance and education. Public observation is important because it serves as tribute to those who perished. It is up to us to learn and share their stories on their behalf.

Further, the Holocaust was the ultimate disregard for human rights. Education is the best way to prevent these human rights abuses in the future. By encouraging educational programs about the Holocaust, we can help prevent future acts of genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in observing Yom Hashoah and in doing all we can to teach our children and future generations to work together to prevent bigotry, hatred, and prejudice. Let us commit ourselves to combating intolerance wherever it might exist.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the six million European Jews murdered by the Nazi regime during the Holocaust. Today, we join together to remember the victims who perished. We stand in solidarity with the people of Israel and around the world to honor Holocaust Remembrance Day, Yom Hashoah.

Six million Jews were killed at the hands of the Nazis as a part of the ''Final Solution'' to eradicate all of Europe's Jews, and countless others were brutalized, raped, dehumanized, and robbed. It is essential to listen and learn from the stories of the past, and to ensure that the experiences of the Holocaust are preserved as a permanent part of our history.

Too many times in history, people have stood by and allowed the targeting, brutalization, and massacre of an innocent civilian population. The 2012 theme of these Days of Remembrance, Choosing to Act: Stories of Rescue, highlights the actions of several witnesses who risked severe punishment to help Jews to safety. These actions serve to remind us of the amazing power of individual choice to act in the face of injustice. The principle ''Never Forget, Never Again.'' is a commitment to fighting hatred, intolerance, and brutality through education, dialogue, and determination. We can honor those who died in the Holocaust by countering similar atrocities in the future.

Holocaust remembrance is even more crucial today, given recent events in the Middle East and around the world. In the past year, there has been an increase in statements of holocaust denial throughout Europe, Asia, South America and the Middle East. The world has also witnessed an alarming increase in anti-Semitic attacks, coupled with harsh criticism of Israel that is tinged with anti-Semitism. As tensions escalate in the Middle East, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has alluded to the goal of the annihilation of Israel. It is continuously important to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship, and to focus on the goal of achieving lasting peace in the Middle East.

The annual Days of Remembrance are particularly meaningful to my community and to me, as a Jew. My district, the 9th Congressional District of Illinois, is home to one of the largest concentrations of Holocaust survivors in the country. Skokie, located in my district, attracted many Jewish families in the wake of WWII, and remains a vibrant Jewish community today. There are currently 1,000–2,000 Holocaust survivors living in Skokie, and this community understands the importance of preserving memories and honoring history.

In 2009, the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center in Skokie opened in Skokie, assisted by active involvement of the community, and welcomes over 250,000 visitors annually. The Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois has been educating school and community groups since 1981, and due largely to these efforts, Illinois was the first state to make Holocaust education mandatory. This center for education and preservation of history was made possible by the hard work and dedication of the community, and its commitment to combating intolerance.

Later this month, I will have the pleasure to visit with the remarkable students from McCracken Middle School in Skokie, who founded a student group to help prevent child labor around the world, Aiding Children Together, or A.C.T. On March 22, 2012, McCracken students involved in A.C.T. had the opportunity to visit the Illinois Holocaust Museum for their Student Leadership Day. The day included discussions, a chance to explore the museum, and then students were able to sit with survivors of the Holocaust at lunch and hear their stories. Students were deeply affected by guest speaker Nadja Halibegovich, and her account of living through the Bosnian War and genocide as a child. One student reflected, ''Just seeing all of the people who were killed in his horrible time just really made me want to push through, and make sure this would never happen again''. Another student mentioned, ''We should never forget what happened. I want to help and change the future; I won't be a bystander!''

Throughout these days of remembrance, we look back on the atrocities of the Holocaust, and we honor and mourn those who perished. It is equally important to remember the survivors and to learn from their experiences. As we move forward, it is imperative to preserve the past and to continue teaching the history of the Holocaust. We must commit today to fighting hatred and indifference in a world where genocide is an ever-present problem.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is Yom Hashoah U'Gvurah. It is a day to remember

the Holocaust heroes and martyrs—those who fought and those who resisted; those who survived and those who perished.

In Israel, the day is marked with the piercing wail of sirens that stops traffic and calls the nation to attention. Those sirens evoke the cries of loss, the cries of families torn asunder, the cries for vibrant Jewish communities reduced to memories and the cries of resolve that the State of Israel exists today as haven for Jews fleeing persecution.

In the United States, Yom Hashoah is observed with events in cities and states around the country. This week, the L.A. Museum of the Holocaust held a Walk of Remembrance and a day of activities at its memorial in Pan Pacific Park.

In Washington, DC, Yom Hashoah is commemorated as part of the Days of Remembrance sponsored by U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC.

This year, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum's events have the theme, ''Choosing to Act: Stories of Rescue.'' It is especially appropriate as we mark the 100th birthday of Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish Diplomat who used his post to save as many as 100,000 Hungarian Jews. His legacy is profound and this nation is proud to have made him an honorary citizen of the United States. With the Raoul Wallenberg Centennial Celebration Act that passed the House this week, he is also one of the next awardees of the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor.

Jewish tradition teaches that for one who saves a life, it is as if they have saved the whole world.

People like Wallenberg, Irena Sendler, Miep Gies and the thousands of others recognized by Yad Vashem as ''Righteous Among the Nation'' risked their lives over and over again for the Jewish people they saved. In doing so, they restored humanity in a place where there was no value for human life. They brought dignity to a time in history that is measured in shame. They helped save the world from being eclipsed by the evil of Nazism.

It is an honor to rise and pay tribute to the survivors of the Holocaust, the rescuers, and the liberators. At a time when fewer and fewer survivors are alive to tell their stories, we must all bear witness to their tremendous legacy.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to solemnly recognize Holocaust Remembrance Day—Yom Hashoah. This date marks the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, when thousands of Polish Jews, faced with deportation and certain death, launched the first urban-uprising in Nazi-occupied Europe.

Surprised by the makeshift, yet effective, resistance they encountered, German troops systematically leveled the ghetto building-by-building and killed or deported to death camps tens of thousands of innocent men, women and children. We look back with sadness at the terror and despair these victims must have felt and with admiration at the courage and strength they summoned. And from their heroics, we are called to remember how much we lost, as well as what we gained, from this unprecedented tragedy.

The Nazi killing machine slaughtered millions of people—law-abiding and productive members of society—because they were Jewish. We will never know what scientific discoveries these people or their children would have made, what businesses they would have started, what books they would have written, what music they would have composed and what trophies they would have won. Their loss has left a void not only in Europe, but throughout the world, and our lives are diminished because of it.

Let us honor the memory of those who perished in the Holocaust by remembering their suffering and bravery, standing by our friend and ally Israel, and fighting for justice and peace.

ANTIETAM NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD MEMORIAL ILLUMINATION

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore, Maryland, was site of the first blood that was shed in our Civil War on April 19, 1861. The next year, on September 17, 1862, the bloodiest one-day military battle in America's history took place on farms along Antietam Creek near the small town of Sharpsburg in Washington County, Maryland.

The 24th Antietam National Battlefield Memorial Illumination will take place on Saturday, December 1, 2012. At twilight, 23,110 luminaries prepared by 1,400 volunteers will be lit, one for each soldier who fell there. Twenty thousand people will personally witness 23,110 individual lights not divided into camps, one Union, the other Confederate, but one unbroken formation across peaceful, rolling farmland on a silent winter night.

The first illumination in 1988 was spearheaded by Georgene Charles, the event's founder, who continues each year to coordinate this monumental effort. Local Girl and Boy Scouts, the Hagerstown-Washington County Convention and Visitors Bureau, and others take pride in preparing North America's largest memorial illumination.

I highly recommend you make time to attend the 24th Antietam National Battlefield Memorial Illumination on December 1, 2012. It powerfully reminds us of the true costs of war and the sacrifices by generations of the members of our military and their families. It is a truly moving event. Please come.

□ 1430

TRIBUTE TO ''HUMAN EVENTS''

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a publication that has played a central role in shaping the ideas that have powered the conservative movement for decades.

Launched in 1944, Human Events is the Nation's oldest conservative newsweekly. In 1961, a rising star by the name of Ronald Reagan began reading Human Events. He enjoyed it so much that throughout his Presidency he would receive the very first issue each week hot off the presses.

Back in 1992, I was honored to serve as an intern for Human Events, where I worked closely with political editor John Gizzi, whom I consider a good friend. This week, Human Events relaunched its print edition with a new format and expanded Washington coverage.

Conservatives have long depended upon Human Events to carry out its mission, which is to analyze events through the eyes that favor limited constitutional government, local self-government, free enterprise, and individual freedom. That is a mission I wholeheartedly support.

I commend Human Events to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this entire body.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX CUT ACT

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the House just passed H.R. 9, purporting to give a temporary tax cut to small businesses. I say ''purporting'' because it doesn't cut spending at the same time, and thus it merely shifts current taxes into the future. Once a dollar has been spent, it has already become a tax, taken either from today or from tomorrow to pay off deficits.

Nor does H.R. 9 do much to promote economic growth because it does little to reward new productivity at the margin. At best, it produces a 1-year sugar high until the bills come due.

Tax cuts without either spending reductions or real economic growth are an illusion. Real tax reform would permanently reduce the marginal tax rate for all businesses and cut government spending concurrently. This would encourage and reward growth, shift investment decisions from politicians to entrepreneurs, and not rob our economy of its future. I hope before the end of this session that we will do so.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON, and I will claim the time on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. This is the Progressive Caucus' moment where we come together and talk about our ideals, our values, the things that are critically important, we believe, to all Americans.

This week, I'm joined by two outstanding leaders in the Progressive Caucus and in the Congress and in America, HANK JOHNSON of Georgia and LYNN WOOLSEY of California. I want to invite both of my colleagues to jump in as they feel inspired to do so, but let me just set the groundwork a little bit.

This week, we saw a number of things occur. One of the things that we saw this week is the Buffett rule that

was taken up in the Senate. The Senate voted on the Buffett rule on a policy that requires millionaires and billionaires to pay the same tax rates as middle class families and working people.

I want to make it clear: we don't begrudge anybody for doing well; but we do believe, in a country as great as America, if you have been privileged enough to do well, that maybe you should do something for America. This wildly popular measure was filibustered and therefore defeated in the Senate. According to the CNN international poll, nearly three-fourths of Americans support the Buffett rule and believe it should be law. Despite this, Republicans in the Senate blocked the bill from even getting a majority vote.

I mention this particular situation this way as I begin our dialogue that we'll have tonight over the course of this hour because I think that this is emblematic of the problem that we're facing today. We're going to talk tonight about Citizens United; we'll talk about a lot of things. But one of the things that I think is emblematic of the problem we're facing here in the U.S. Congress today is that what the overwhelming majority of Americans want the overwhelming majority of Americans don't get, something like the Buffett rule. The reason why is the pernicious and corrosive effect of money in politics today.

So, we are the Progressive Caucus. We're honored to be before the American people today, Mr. Speaker. We are the caucus that, yes, will stand up for civil and human rights for all people without regard to your color, your culture, your sex, your gender, your sexual preference, your religion, wherever you were born—national origin. We believe that all Americans are valued and believe in liberty and justice for all.

Yes, the Progressive Caucus is the caucus that's going to say that if you work hard every day, you ought to be able to make enough money to feed your family in America. And, yes, we believe that if you've been able to be in this great country of ours and do well in this environment, you ought to do something, you ought to pay enough taxes so that the needs and the costs of our society can be paid for. And, absolutely, we believe we have a duty and obligation, a responsibility to the environment and our natural world.

Now, we're not ashamed to stand up for these values: peace, working-class prosperity and fairness, environmental sustainability, and civil and human rights for all people. We care about these things and we're going to. But today, we're going to discuss a number of issues, including the Buffett rule, Citizens United, ALEC, the budget, the Ryan budget, and a whole range of issues.

At this point I'm going to hand it over to my colleague and friend, LYNN WOOLSEY of California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I'd like to thank the chairman of the Progressive Caucus for bringing this together today to talk about what's so important to the people of the United States of America, our country, and in turn the world.

I want to say a few things about the Buffett rule just to fill out that discussion. There are some things we know: the Buffett rule is fiscally responsible. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Buffett rule could reduce the deficit by anywhere from $47 billion to $162 billion over the next decade. The Buffett rule is widely supported, as the chairman just said. The Buffett rule would restore the principled fairness of the Tax Code because it ensures that millionaires can't game the system to pay a lower rate than middle class families.

Overwhelming majorities of Americans across the political spectrum believe millionaires should pay their fair share. An overwhelming 76 percent of Americans support increasing the taxes paid by people who make more than $1 million per year, which includes 75 percent of Independents and 56 percent of Republicans.

□ 1440

The majority of millionaires themselves support the Buffett rule. In a recent poll of millionaires, an overwhelming 68 percent support the Buffett rule. Millionaires support the Buffett rule.

And remember, it's taxation above $1 million and it's stepped up. It isn't the minute you hit $1 million you're taxed at a much greater rate. It's over. From $1 million up, the taxes will go up.

Seven thousand millionaires paid no individual income taxes in the year 2011. Seven thousand millionaires didn't pay any personal taxes in 2011. According to the Tax Policy Center, 7,000 millionaires—it was that tax center that told us that.

The Republican budget would shower even more tax breaks on millionaires while putting more of the burden on the middle-class families. While Democrats are fighting to restore fairness in the Tax Code, the Republican budget offers extreme right-wing alternatives—that's my opinion—that would shower millionaires and billionaires with tax breaks at the expense of the middle class, and that would further skew the system in favor of the wealthiest Americans.

So we've got a lot of statistics. We know the facts. We're ready to support the Buffett rule. Millionaires, themselves, support it. So the question is: Why can't we get the people we work with in the U.S. Congress to support the Buffett rule?

Mr. ELLISON. Well, I would say this to the gentlelady. You know, much of it has to do with the fact that we have a disproportionate percentage of wealthy interests. The fact is you've got money coming in, lobbyists paid for, campaign donations, all this stuff, and now we've got the onset of the super PAC and we have the Citizens United decision.

And if you ask yourself why can't we pass the Buffett rule, why can't we pass the public option, which is wildly popular, why can't we get environmental regulations we need to protect our lungs and our health and our Earth, why can't we do these things, and the reason why is because of the disproportionate corrosive effect of money in our government.

This is why earlier this week we were able to pass something, a Declaration for Democracy, which reads:

> I declare my support for amending the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of people undermined by Citizens United and related cases, to protect the integrity of our elections and limit the corrosive influence of money on the democratic process.

We have a lot of people who signed this particular document. But not just Members of Congress signed it. Some people who signed it were city council members, were community citizen activists. There are people from a broad cross section of American life, because they asked the same question you ask, Congresswoman WOOLSEY: Why can't we pass the Buffett rule? Why can't we pass environmental protections? Why can't we pass the public option? Why can't things that Americans want get through?

The reason they can't get through is because you've got the lobbyist money being poured in. You've got campaign donations here. You're about to see a whole plethora of ugly, nasty, divisive, corrosive attack ads in this upcoming Presidential election.

The bottom line is, if we get this money out, what will happen is that citizens' voices will emerge past the money. Citizens' voices will come up, and citizens will have their will reflected in the Congress more so.

It was an awesome lift to pick up health care, and we didn't even get all the things we wanted in there, but we got a lot of things we wanted.

But why didn't we get all the things we wanted even though they were popular? The corrosive, divisive effect of money.

I think the health care industry was putting in, like, $14 million a day to lobby against the Affordable Care Act. And of course you know with all that kind of pushing and shoving and cajoling, it just gets incredibly difficult.

So I want to yield back to the gentleman from Georgia, who has some important information about a number of things.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I'd first like to address, Congressman, the issue of taxes and fair taxes. Yesterday, or, actually, the day before yesterday, I stood with a group of ''Fair Taxers,'' people who are recommending the fair tax as an alternative to our current system. And I stood with them and I spoke to them, told them that I was not there to endorse the fair tax; I was there to tell them that I believed that it was something that Congress should definitely study. We shouldn't just put it aside.

There's no doubt that we need fundamental tax reform in this country, and the fair tax is a vehicle to open the door for Congress to start reviewing other possibilities, including the fair tax, as a way of fixing our inherently unequal Tax Code. And our policies—if we can't pass the Buffett rule, which simply says that a millionaire would not pay a less effective rate than working people, and so, in other words, the maids and the butlers and everyone else who—the secretary——

Mr. ELLISON. The police officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Cops who patrol the area, the security guards——

Mr. ELLISON. Teachers, nurses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.—that control the estate of these rich folks, the firefighters, ambulances that will come pick them up, they don't pay the same tax rates as those people.

And 70,000 of the millionaires in the country didn't pay a dime in income tax, and enjoying all of those benefits—police, fire. It's truly amazing to me that we are still not at the point in this country where we are willing to consider redoing our complicated Tax Code.

It's just ridiculous that it's not working. And we can't even pass a bill in this Congress which mandates that common people pay at a rate that is not in excess of those that the millionaires enjoy. That's just an issue of fairness. It's not fair. It's not right.

I would suggest to you, Congressman and Congresswoman, that perhaps the reason why we're seeing this kind of favorable treatment afforded to millionaires by this Congress is because almost half of the incoming freshmen, I understand, are millionaires. I think the figure is about 43 percent. And if someone can correct me on that, I'd stand corrected. But my information is 43 percent of the Tea Party freshmen are millionaires, and so they benefit from these laws, these trickle-down economics laws, and they've been enjoying them since 1980. That's when voodoo economics, as George Herbert Walker Bush called it, trickle-down economics, voodoo economics, or whatever you want to call it, it has not worked. But we still have proposals today to make it work.

And it's evident by what we did today, with a $46 billion tax cut for what's called ''small businesses,'' but, actually, a small business with 500 employees, when we only have about 1,000 businesses in the country with 1,000 or more employees. So we're actually talking about big business when we talk about 500 employees.

It's a one-time, 1-year, $46 billion tax cut that they get, according to this legislation that we passed today, and it's totally unpaid for.

□ 1450

Ms. WOOLSEY. I want to add a couple of things about the Buffett rule. There is so much to talk about that, I'm sure, our C–SPAN viewers and probably most of the Members of Congress really don't realize.

The 400 highest-earning Americans in 2008, who made an average each of $271 million, paid an average effective Federal tax rate of just 18.1 percent. At the same time, a married couple earning $70,000 a year paid a rate of 25 percent. Is that just unbelievable?

Mr. ELLISON. Amazing.

Ms. WOOLSEY. The Buffett rule seeks to restore balance to families, and the Tax Code would make sure that no millionaire would pay a lower tax rate than middle class Americans. In fact, the Buffett rule is targeted. The legislation will only impact taxpayers with a taxable income of over $1 million who are not paying a minimum tax rate of 30 percent. So realize that. Of the 144 million tax returns filed in 2010, fewer than 500,000 of them—0.1 percent of the taxpayers—had taxable incomes of over $1 million. Remember, these are taxable incomes because there are lots of write-offs.

Mr. ELLISON. So the people who have the kind of money you just described are actually a small part of the population, but I think they're punching above their weight because they have an inordinate influence in the political process.

Ms. WOOLSEY. You're right. They have an influence in the political process, and average working Americans don't realize that that's not them. The families who earn $70,000 a year are taxed on that at a rate of 25 percent.

Mr. ELLISON. So, if you're making 70k a year, paying 25 percent of your income in income taxes, that means, if there is an increase in your property taxes, you're really going to feel that. That's going to punch you right in the stomach. That's going to make a difference in whether the kids can get braces or not. That's going to make a difference as to whether or not you can put a roof on the house. It will make a huge difference. $70,000 is actually doing pretty well, but small variations can change your life.

If you're a two-income household and are making $70,000 and if one of the partners in the relationship gets sick or dies, that means catastrophic expenses on the family because, if you're spending at a $70,000-a-year level and you lose a household member, you've got all those bills with just the one person, and then you're going to be in bankruptcy. This is why we know 56 percent of all bankruptcy filings are driven by medical debt. This is how this happens even to middle class people. But the Buffett rule and putting Americans to work and doing a lot of things are really what the Progressive Caucus is all about. It's about addressing these systemic problems we're talking about today.

So I just want to let everybody know, if you want to check out what the Progressive Caucus says about the Buffett rule, you should know that we have the Buffett rule contained in our budget.

We put America back to work by front-loading jobs in our budget. We invest in America's future by investing in infrastructure, and we reduce the deficit, in part, by asking the wealthiest and most privileged Americans to do the patriotic thing and pony up a little bit more to help America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It's disturbing to me, with all that the Congressional Progressive Caucus has done to try to level the playing field in this country for working men and women, that we would all be lumped together and called names.

I want you to comment about one of our colleagues who, in response to a question asked of him—how many Communists are there in the United States Congress?—this Congressman stepped up to the mike in a calm and polite manner—thoughtful-looking, with a pensive look on his face—and he said, I believe that there are between 78 and 81 members of the Communist Party who are Members of Congress.

Now, can you respond to that, Congressman?

Mr. ELLISON. Do you know what? I have to demur and say that I'm not that excited to respond. I've responded on Ed Schultz. I've responded on Wolf Blitzer. I've responded on Martin Brashir, and I've just said it's not true. It's a false statement. It's untrue. It's unfair. It's unkind. It raises the level of vitriol and insult in this body, and of course, it's tough enough around here already. We don't need to hurl false accusations against each other.

I would just urge the public to remind Members of Congress that we need to have a little bit more civility around here and that, if you do want to make an ugly comment or a negative comment about your colleagues, at least try to make it somewhere within 10,000 miles of being true. This is absolutely false.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Sir, the next day, a statement was released by the gentleman. The statement was to the effect that the entire membership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus are card-carrying members of the Communist Party. I just think that it's important that we say, first of all, that that's not true and, secondly, that it has no place in the rational dialogue and in the honest dialogue that we seek to have here amongst us on both sides of the aisle. It has no place.

Mr. ELLISON. One thing I don't want to do—and I'm just speaking for me. If he calls us names, I'm not going to call him names. If he calls us names, I'm not going to call them ugly names like that. There are a lot of ugly names that you could call someone who has a right-wing perspective on the extreme. We don't engage in tit for tat, because that's childlike. We're adults. We're here to discharge a responsibility on behalf of the American people. We swore an oath to uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution, and that is what I'm going to do. I'm not going to be distracted by somebody who is not clear on what we're supposed to be doing here. I'm going to stay focused on what we're here to do.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would like to say, by caring about American workers, by caring about women and children, by caring about our seniors, by wanting to put food on the tables of all Americans and help them with clean air and good food and clean water, if that labels us, so be it. All that says to me is somebody is very frightened about the good things we do. I think we should move on now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Congresswoman, I agree.

I also want to point out that to label folks as Communists and Socialists just because they believe in fairness for the working people of this country is not true, and I think that it should be called out because, if it's left unaddressed, then some folks will think it's true.

With that, I certainly would love for us to get into a discussion about Citizens United, Congresswoman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you.

I believe that it's evermore important that we do something about the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United v. FEC, which overturns nearly 100 years of campaign finance laws in this country which limit corporation involvement in political campaigns.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) will control the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WOOLSEY. In that action by the Supreme Court, big business was given a louder voice than the individual in this country. If we want to protect our democracy, that's what we have to bring an end to, all that money coming into the political system without transparency and making the average citizen feel like their voice means nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Congresswoman, I believe that you have hit the nail on the head. This Citizens United ruling by the United States Supreme Court definitely puts corporations in a position of superiority over just the regular working people of this country. The reason why is because corporations have now been afforded the same rights that individuals have, to speak freely and with no regulation. Congress refuses to even consider any regulations on that speech for purposes of campaigning and affecting the outcome of campaigns.

This is a decision that is devastating to the working people of this country, the people who don't have a voice like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or like some unknown super PAC that is formed on the eve of an election, funded anonymously, and used to affect an election and used in such a way that you can't even mount a response to it because the cascade of money is in that PAC and you have the slightest ability to raise the requisite amount of money to match it. They control the outcome of these elections with the money, and that is a devastating blow to our democracy.

Ms. WOOLSEY. HANK, the entire time I've been in the Congress—I mean, I've been here for 20 years now, and we've had a Republican majority and we've had a Democrat majority. But when the Republicans have been in the majority, they use as part of their mantra that they are returning government to the people.

Excuse me. Citizens United takes government away from the people. I don't hear them trying to change that. They—the other side of the aisle, the party in the majority right now—seem to be defending Citizens United.

The other thing they are doing at this moment is they are trying to upend the Presidential campaign finance system. They want to drown out the voice of the people and give more power to the well-heeled special interests in the Presidential elections as well. Those elections go quite well with public financing. People choose on their tax form whether or not they want to give to the Presidential elections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Congresswoman, that was something that has happened this year that perhaps not a lot of people know about is that, under this Republican-controlled 112th Congress, the House has voted to do away with or abolish the $1 checkoff on a tax form that you send in. You can check the box and it will automatically deduct a dollar from the amount that you owe or the amount of whatever refund you're entitled to. That $1 then goes into a pot to be distributed among the candidates who applied for this funding.

So everything that had been put in place to try to make everything equal, along with giving people their rights to invest to a certain amount in campaign-related donations, everything is being dismantled systematically. It certainly does not help the people on our side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, who traditionally have depended on workers unions and labor organizations to be the deep pockets for our campaign contributions.

I had a visit from one of my good friends in labor the other day back in my district, and this gentleman has grown to be a good friend of mine. He's a good man. He is a full-time union worker, works for the union, the administrative part of the union, not just represented by the union. He told me that with all of the people in the union who are out of work today—and we've got a few jobs in the Atlanta area that are near completion. After completion, even those workers who are able to work won't have any more work, and then there's nothing else on the agenda that these people can go and get jobs at.

He said it's gotten so bad with the attacks on labor and the unemployment to where the workers represented by the union can't pay the dues, and then the moneys having been drawn down by the unions to take care of the workers to assist them during this extended period of unemployment are on the decline and almost exhausted. After telling me that, he said, Today is my last day employed at the union because they had to let me go. We both sat there and we cried.

It was really touching, because that gentleman is in the same boat that many other workers are in, and the union which represents those workers is suffering greatly. They won't be able to do what they have done in the past for campaigns. But these super PACs and wealthy individuals who fund them—anonymously, much of the time—can afford to actually put millions in and billions in. This is a very serious situation that we face in this country.

Who's going to win, is it money or is it the people?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Congressman, the one beacon of light in the system is the public financing of Presidential campaigns. I have to remind everybody, that's voluntary. People volunteer $1 a year out of their tax return to support the public financing of the Presidential races. They have to opt to do that. They don't have to. It's served our country well, and it's a very limited expense. It needs updating. It doesn't need dismantling. We need more public financing of our Federal election, not less.

Actually, if I had my way, we would have public financing, we would have a much shorter campaign season, and we would also publicly finance advertising as well as set spending limits and not turn campaigns—it's an industry in this country now that certainly employs thousands and thousands of people. But it spends a lot of our time and individual money in order to get people elected.

□ 1510

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yes. I would echo those comments, Congresswoman. You know, Members around here, some folks spend 60, 70 percent of their time, instead of being in committee meetings, they are out making phone calls trying to raise money for their next election. It's not, it doesn't augur well for the country's future for us to have, you know, this kind of leadership, in other words, leadership that depends on others to make the decision. They come in, vote on it, and then go back to the phones making calls.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right. I have been so fortunate because I represent a district that I fit. You know I'm retiring, but I have represented this district for 20 years, and I have fit so well that I have not had to raise millions of dollars.

I have watched my colleagues who are in these districts that could go either way and where now Citizens United has brought this super-PAC

money in against them, and I don't know how they do it. I mean, what a way to ruin our democracy, to have the people you elect to represent you spend much of their time raising money instead of raising consciousness, instead of raising issues, instead of fighting for what we know needs to be done in this country.

This corrupt campaign finance system we have, with the special interest money, is going to actually corrode our democracy. If we don't step up to it on both sides of the aisle, everybody is going to be affected by it, not just Democrats.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Well, I am going to tell you, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, that's why I am going to hate to see you leave, and I know you have been here for 20 years. That's a long time to be anywhere. You have certainly been an unrelenting spokesperson for equity and fairness for all, and you have been a voice for peace, and you have been a voice for telling the truth. You are, indeed, a rare breed in Congress, and I'm personally going to miss you, and I know many others will too.

But I'll tell you, Congresswoman, there are people on the other side of the aisle and some, I know, feel the same way that we do. They don't like the way or the route that our country is going. We've even had some good people over there who have already been defeated for reelection based on that special interest money coming in at the last minute, shaking things up and telling a bunch of lies, and then the public votes a good Representative out.

I think people on both sides of the aisle are being hurt by what's happening in America right now, and I'm hopeful that this next election will see the kind of change that needs to come here. We need to take care of the people's business. This is their Congress, this is not the corporations' Congress. We should be of, by and for the people, not of, by and for the corporate special interests.

You know, I'm afraid that's where we are now. I, myself, have been fortunate so far to be in sync with the people of my district and so, consequently, I've not been forced to go out there and raise a billion dollars, but I still have to raise money.

I would prefer a system where I could just be a legislator and we could have a fairness in our elections, everyone starting with the same amount of money to spend; and that way it's not the money, it's your message that counts.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right. If everybody has a certain amount of time on air, they can spend it putting down their opponent, or they can spend that time letting their constituents know who they are. If they want to be negative, they can do it the way they want to, but they will probably find out it's much more wholesome and people will like them a lot better when they know them for who they are and not as put-down artists.

When you say there's folks from the other side of the aisle, and I'm sure there are, I think that it's our job now to pull together a core here in the Congress who are willing to limit the influence of contributors and who are willing to curb the power of political action committees and impose spending limits and not let corporate America have a bigger voice than the average voter.

Somehow or another, I think it's going to be possible, but it's going to take leaders like yourself, HANK, to make that happen, so I'll be cheering for you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Well, I believe you are right about that. But I will say, though, those moderates on the other side of the aisle who I am referring to are the prime targets of the interests that want to get rid of them and go to an extreme. So folks over here on the Republican side of the aisle are forced to comply with the party line or else they'll suffer the consequences.

Even when they follow the party line here, they think, okay, well, we don't trust this person over here because there's some new blood over here that talks much more extremely, and so we want to get rid of that person here and put this new person in.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, if we eliminate special interest money, if we have the Declaration for Democracy and have a constitutional change, the United States Constitution regarding this Citizens United action of the Supreme Court, I think we can help turn that around.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Well, you know, Congresswoman, you lead into the Declaration for Democracy, which I had the pleasure to sign yesterday, along with many of my other colleagues; and I am sure that the longer that this is around, the more that people will sign up. Have you had an opportunity to sign?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I signed the little card. I haven't signed that one, but I'm looking why aren't I on there. I mean, that's how much I support it.

Actually, Leader PELOSI has signed the declaration. It's very well received in the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I'm going to read it. It's the Declaration for Democracy, and it reads as follows:

I declare my support for amending the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people undermined by Citizens United and related cases, to protect the integrity of our elections, and limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process.

Anytime we start talking about putting limits on any activity and creating more fairness, then we get labeled as socialists and communists and we're just people that care. I don't care what you call it, we're in support of this Declaration for Democracy, which would put the reins of government back into the hands of working people, poor people, everyone. Even the corporations would have a seat at the table, but they would not speak any louder than you or I; and I think it's very important. So I was proud to sign the Declaration for Democracy.

We are in a climate where we have an organization that is set up to connect the corporate influence, the corporate money, the special interests. We have an organization that is set up to pair those special interest corporations with legislators from the various State legislatures of the Nation.

□ 1520

About 60 percent of the legislators in the United States—the State legislators—have joined this organization. It's called ALEC. ALEC is the American Legislative Exchange Council. And what ALEC does is it's funded, of course, by business interests, billionaires and millionaires, and companies. What it does is it invites the legislators to join. It really entices them to join by offering them for a mere $50 a year—and the taxpayers, of course, pay that—as a professional fee or professional cost. And so the legislators join. Then he or she gets to go off on these 2- and 3-day weekends at some location like Hilton Head or Jekyll Island or Martha's Vineyard, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, wherever they can be alone and with some anonymity and in a luxurious setting.

So these legislators who join go to these locations for the retreats. The business interests are there because they're underwriting it. And then they get together in committees, and the committees work out various model laws that are produced before the folks even get there. They're told about these model laws in the committees that they work on—the committees being the legislators and the business interests. And the public's interest is not there. It's all done in secret.

And so the result is that the legislators come home, and they have legislation which they can claim as, This is my legislation and I'm introducing it. And, By the way, this is my 80th piece of legislation that I have introduced and it has passed and I'm a busy substantive legislator.

So it makes them look good out there on the campaign trail. Nobody knows what the substance of that legislation is and what it actually does and how much it costs. And then, for introducing that legislation, the legislator is rewarded with a campaign contribution also from the same corporations and individuals associated with those corporations.

So based on that formula right there you've got business being done behind closed doors to benefit folks other than the people who elect these legislators, and then you never know who those legislators are because that's private information. They keep it private. But if you're a member, you can log into

the Web site and then go to a page and find out who all of the corporate and who all the legislative members are. You can only get access to that if you're a member. And to become a member you have to be prescreened in advance to make sure that you are like-minded. And if you can pass that muster, they will let you in.

So this is the same organization that announced yesterday that they would not be involving themselves—they're disbanding their committee that had to do with social issues, as they call them, including voter rights. And so the Trayvon Martin killing, the shooting and killing of Trayvon Martin and then the claim of self-defense, stand your ground, but, really, shoot to kill legislation, that legislation was produced by an ALEC committee.

I'm glad to know that committee will no longer be in action, but the damage has already been done. As a result of that, you have had some corporations that have decided that this is not—we didn't buy into this. We didn't buy into this social thing. We just joined ALEC because we wanted to deal on the committees that deal with our issues—taxes, FDA, whatever. We wanted to deal on those things, but instead ALEC has gone to an extreme.

Now we have corporations that are threatened with boycotts of their goods and services jumping off the ALEC bandwagon, and that caused ALEC to announce yesterday that, We're not going to deal in any more social issues.

So I think that is instructive of the power of the people. If the people only know what is happening, the people will come together, despite the differences that we have. We can look at each other and say, Okay, you are older than I am. Plus, you are a white woman. And so, therefore, we don't have anything in common. Or I could say that this person over here doesn't have the same sexual orientation as I think they should and so therefore I'm going to condemn them to purgatory just on that basis alone. Or we can look at somebody and say Well, they've got a hoodie on. He's wearing a hoodie, and it's a black guy in a neighborhood. He can be 9 years old, he can be 15, or he can be 17; but he's still threatening me just by his mere presence. We size people up like that.

But when we really get down to it, our interests are the same. And if we can get past the fear that we have of each other and the misunderstanding that we have about each other, we can come together and we can reclaim this country so that it will be a government run by, of, and for the people. And so that is my goal, to continue to work towards that, if my citizens think that I'm worthy of continuing to do that.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

CLEARING THE NAMES OF JOHN BROW AND BROOKS GRUBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNNELEE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. I am coming to the floor again to clear the names of two marine pilots who crashed in Arizona April 8, 2000. Not only two pilots, but there were 17 marines in the back.

The V–22, which is the plane that goes from a helicopter mode to a plane mode, at that time was really an experimental plane. Major Gruber and Colonel Brow in the cockpit had no idea of what was happening when the plane went into what's called ''vortex ring state.''

I would like to go through this 10-year journey for the record, Mr. Speaker.

It so happened that in November 2002, Major Gruber's wife, who lives in my district in Jacksonville, North Carolina, wrote me a letter that I would like to read. Her husband, Brooks Gruber, was the copilot.

□ 1530

> I contact you in hopes that leaders of integrity, free of bias, would have both the intelligence and the courage it takes to decide the facts for themselves. If you do that, you will agree the ''human factor/pilot error'' findings should not stand as it is in the marine military history. Again, I respectfully ask for your support. Please do not simply pass this matter along to General Jones without offering the support my husband and his comrades deserve. Please remember, these 19 marines can no longer speak for themselves. And I certainly am not afraid to speak for them and I believe someone has to. Even though it's easier to put to rest and forgotten, please join me in doing the right thing by taking the time to address this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9 of this year, The Hill magazine—and I would like to thank a new young man on the staff named Jeremy Herb, who did an article in the magazine about this 10-year journey that started with Connie Gruber's letter to me.

Mr. Speaker, over the 10-year journey, I have spoken to many, many experts. One that I would like to quote today for the RECORD is a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Phil Coyle, and he states: Major Gruber should not be blamed for an accident caused by loss of lift due to the aircraft entering ''vortex ring state,'' a phenomena which no one in the Marine Corps adequately understood in relation to the Osprey at the time of the accident.

Secretary Coyle further states: Not only did the Marine Corps not understand Osprey performance under VRS, the root cause of the accident, but neither did the contractor nor the Marine Corps had not tested the aircraft near VRS—vortex ring state—conditions, something which, following the accident, it later took the Marine Corps years to accomplish. Surely Major Gruber and Colonel Brow could not be blamed for something that the Marine Corps, itself, did not grasp until years after the accident and after the death of the 19 marines. Considering that it was ignorance on the part of the Marine Corps that caused the April 2000 accident, the Marine Corps should make it clear to the Gruber and Brow families, with no ifs, ands, or buts, that Gruber and Brow were not responsible for the accident.

He further stated: I don't suppose the Marine Corps ever apologizes, but considering that the accident was their fault and not Major Gruber's and Colonel Brow's fault, an apology to the family would be in order also.

Mr. Speaker, I read that because this 10-year journey—and I will continue to add names in the next few minutes of people trying to help me. These two marines were the very best of the pilots, Major Brooks Gruber and Colonel John Brow. They gave their life for this new plane known as the V–22 Osprey. And those young marines sitting in the back, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 25, were selected from other marines to sit in the back of that plane. Those in the Marine leadership that created the mission in Arizona should join me in clearing the names of these two pilots.

Mr. Speaker, I further read for the RECORD, a former adviser to the Secretary of Defense, Rex Rivolo, stated in a letter trying to clear these names, and I read:

> The failure of the manufacturer, Bell-Boeing, and the Navy to characterize the slow speed, high rate of descent handling qualities of the V–22 through flight testing, to describe them for the aircrew in the NATOPS, and to provide an adequate warning system were the causes of the mishap—not aircrew error.
>
> With the passing of 10 years, and the future of the aircraft now secure, I sincerely hope that the names of Lieutenant Colonel Brow and Major Gruber can now be exonerated and cleared for posterity. I strongly support any and all measures to this end and request this letter be included in any official record regarding the causes of the MV–22 mishap at Marana, Arizona, on April 8, 2000, or any resolution attempting to clear the names of Lieutenant Colonel Brow and Major Gruber.

Mr. Speaker, what has been so ironic about this 10-year journey of everyone that was part of reviewing the accident, or maybe it was in the air like Lieutenant Colonel Jim Schaeffer who is joining this effort. Colonel Schaeffer was a friend of John Brow and Brooks Gruber, and Colonel Schaeffer was in a third airplane that night, a V–22, and he saw his friends and the 17 marines in the back flip, crash, and burn. And there is no reason that the Marine Corps will not give the wives what they're asking, and I'll explain that in just a moment, Mr. Speaker.

In this 10-year journey, Mr. Speaker, I've gotten to know the two attorneys, Jim Furman in Arizona, who defended the families of John Brow and Brooks Gruber before Bell-Boeing—it was a major suit—and then Brian Alexander in New York, who defended the 17 families of the marines sitting in the back of the plane. They have all joined in this effort to clear the names of John Brow and Brooks Gruber.

Mr. Speaker, what is so ironic in their effort, Jim Furman and Brian Alexander, to see the names cleared, they have given letters to the commandant that clearly state there can be no future lawsuits. It has all been settled. There can be no more lawsuits.

I must say that along this journey, at one time I had the Marine Corps to take the findings of the experts and put it into the personnel jacket of Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber. But, Mr. Speaker, I knew at that time that was not enough because the press continues to put articles about the crash in Arizona, and they say pilot error, human factors.

The JAGMAN report, which was the official report that was written by and signed by Colonel Mike Morgan, Colonel Ron Radich and Major Phil Stackhouse—they were the three investigators sent from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, to Arizona the day after the crash, and they were given the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of determining what caused the crash. Mr. Speaker, in the JAGMAN report that I just made reference to, on Page 77, those three men that I just named wrote this:

> During this investigation, we found nothing that we would characterize as negligence or deliberate pilot error.

Mr. Speaker, all the two wives are asking the Marine Corps is a letter from the commandant on his stationery that clearly states one paragraph: Lieutenant Colonel John Brow, pilot, and copilot, Major Brooks Gruber, were not at fault for the accident that occurred on April 8 of the year 2000.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, the three investigators have joined in this effort, and I'd like to read from retired Lieutenant Colonel Ron Radich, one of the three investigators that I just named:

> Despite the fact procedures were in the NATOPS for vortex ring state, there was no discussion concerning the aircraft flight characteristics during high rates of descent at slow airspeeds. No mention was made of a possible asymmetric condition that could lead to an uncontrolled and unrecoverable situation. With no knowledge, training, or warning concerning the possible consequences of VRS, the pilots of Nighthawk 72 were essentially on their own in unchartered territory.

These two pilots did not know what was happening, and it was the fault of Bell-Boeing and the Marine Corps. He further stated:

> It was through their misfortune that the MV22 VRS hazard was identified.

Because of the accident, they learned so that nothing like this would ever happen again to a pilot. Colonel Radich further stated:

> The Marana mishap of April 8, 2000, represents a monumental discovery that enhanced the overall safety and effectiveness of this highly capable weapon system. May the marines of Nighthawk 72 rest in peace knowing that the ultimate sacrifice they made for their country also led to a critical advancement in V22 safety and capability, and overall readiness of the United States Marine Corps. My thoughts and prayers go out to the families who continue to cope with the loss of their loved one and search for some form of closure.

Mr. Speaker, I further would like to add some comments from Lieutenant Colonel Mike Morgan. Again, he was the lead investigator of this crash that happened in Arizona. And I read:

> I applaud and fully support the extraordinary effort you have undertaken in support of John Brow, Brooks Gruber, and the families who lost loved ones in the tragic crash of Nighthawk 72. One merely needs to look at what has transpired in the years since this tragic accident. After a second MV22 crashed just 8 months later, a blue ribbon panel closely examined the MV22 program. NAVAIR also aggressively pursued a test program to understand VRS and develop safety measures to educate and protect future MV22 pilots from the dangers. This was such a monumental undertaking that the lead developmental test pilot, Mr. Tom McDonald, was awarded the Society of Experimental Test Pilots Kinchloe Award for outstanding professional accomplishment in the conduct of flight testing.

Colonel Morgan further states:

> John Brow and Brooks Gruber did their job and did it well. I look forward to the day when DoD officials accurately recognize the sacrifice made by them and all the marines of Nighthawk 72.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read the third letter from the third investigator, Major Phillip Stackhouse. It states:

> I do not believe that it would be a surprise to anyone that it is in my opinion the mishap was not a result of pilot error, but was the result of a perfect storm of circumstances. During the conduct of the investigation, we collected some 20 binders of evidence—including, among other things, maintenance records, training records, telemetry records, operational and testing records, and dozens of photographs.
>
> I do not feel that our investigation reflects that the mishap was a result of pilot error and if the investigation was interpreted that way, it was misinterpreted. For any record that reflects the mishap was the result of pilot error, it should be corrected. For any publication that reflects the mishap was a result of pilot error, it should be corrected and recanted.

Mr. Speaker, the problem has always been that after the JAGMAN report, which I just made reference to, if the Marine Corps in 2001, 2002 had issued a press release stating that new evidence has shown and proven that Colonel John Brow, pilot, and copilot Brooks Gruber were not at fault, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be on the floor today. But the Marine Corps has never, in a press release, corrected the misinformation that happened shortly after the Osprey crash when the Marine Corps' original press release indicated possible pilot error.

Mr. Speaker, that's why all these names that I have read today have joined me in asking the United States Marine Corps—who I have great respect for; they're among the best—to give the families, Connie Gruber and her daughter Brooks, to give Trish Brow and her two sons, Matthew and Mark, one letter on the commandant's heading on his stationery, clearly state to the Brow family that your husband, John Brow, a true American hero, was not responsible for the crash on April 8, 2,000. The same for Connie Gruber and her daughter Brooks down in Jacksonville, North Carolina, one paragraph with the same language that I just mentioned for Colonel John Brow, the same language for Major Brooks Gruber.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that as long as I have the privilege to serve in the United States Congress, and with all these experts that I've quoted today that are willing to join me, that the right thing must be done for the family, and the right thing is that letter from the commandant.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be the kind of person that I am without the faith that I have in my God. My mom and dad taught me the Bible. They taught me right from wrong, and they taught me that truth does matter. I have, with the help of God and the many experts, we have the truth. The truth is that these two outstanding pilots were put into an impossible situation without any training to understand how to react to vortex ring state. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to speak out on the floor of the House.

I have told the families that when this clarification comes through and their husbands are cleared, I would like to go with the Brow family to Arlington Cemetery and stand there with Trish, Matthew, and Mark and salute the colonel and say, Colonel, rest in peace. You're not blamed for this accident any longer.

I want to do the same thing with Connie Gruber down in Jacksonville, North Carolina, where her husband is buried. I want to walk with Connie and Brooks, and I want to stand at the grave and say the same thing to Major Gruber: Rest in peace. You no longer will be blamed for the accident on April 8, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, there's a quote that someone sent me in this 10-year journey to clear these names by Voltaire that says:

> To the living we owe respect. To the dead we owe the truth.

That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker, is the Marine Corps could issue one paragraph to the two families so that never again will they have to read in the paper the accident in Marana, Arizona, on April 8, 2000, was due to pilot error. Because as the families have said to me, help us get this clarification, and we will make sure that any print about the pilot error on April 8, we will ask and demand that it be retracted because it is not the truth.

□ 1550

I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God to hold in

His loving arms the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to please bless the Brow family and the Gruber family. Bring peace to these families, God, by helping us get this misinformation corrected.

And I'll ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people.

I will ask God to bless the President that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people.

And I'll ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BUDGET AUTONOMY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I've come to the floor today to inform the Congress of exciting new developments about the major priority for the District of Columbia for this year's Congress. These developments have come very quickly, both in the Congress and in the Nation.

We now have unprecedented momentum, both in the country and here in the Congress, to allow the District to spend its own local funds without coming to the Congress of the United States. That will seem very strange to Members of the public since they've never heard of a local jurisdiction having to bring its own local funds to a national legislature, which had nothing to do with raising those funds, for approval to spend them.

It is an anomaly whose time has passed. And I'm very pleased at the response we are getting in the Congress, and that we have gotten in very little time, less than 6 months.

We see it culminating in a national poll that, in essence, blesses the momentum we are seeing in the Congress for budget autonomy for the District of Columbia. This poll was released just this week, and it's been an important week for the District of Columbia, because the District has just celebrated Emancipation Day. The slaves who lived in the District of Columbia were emancipated 9 months before slaves in the rest of the United States. And there's some analogy here, my friends, because what was not emancipated was the budget of the District of Columbia. And that's what we're trying to free now.

And that's what the American people seem to want, by a very large majority. A polling organization that is bipartisan, called Purple Insights, using the traditional methodologies that you see in all the national polls, asked this question of Americans in all parts of the country, from both parties and Indepedents.

The question was preceded by the following: The budget of the city of Washington, DC, is funded by local residents' tax dollars. Do you think that decisions about Washington, DC's local budget should be made by Washington, DC, taxpayers and their own elected officials, or should those budget decisions be made by the U.S. Congress?

And here are the results. Seventy-one percent of the American people said the DC budget should be decided exclusively by the DC government. Only 23 percent said that the decisions should be made by the U.S. Congress.

What is most gratifying is the way in which these numbers reflect both parties. The polling organization broke down these numbers, and they were careful to ask people from both parties. For Democrats, the notion that the budget should be decided only by the DC government was 71 percent. But Independents were at 75 percent, and Republicans were at 72 percent. So, no matter where my colleagues come from, their constituents support the bedrock principle—no principle is more American—that if you raise the money, you get to decide how to use it. And you certainly don't go to a national body for approval.

And they looked at men and women. 68 percent of men, and 72 percent of women believe that the local government should decide the local budget and be the final decisionmakers.

If you look at regions of the country, Mr. Speaker, they had the same kind of virtually even breakdown in support of local control. If you look at the Northeast, it's 69 percent. You look at the Midwest, it goes up to 74 percent. You look at the South, it's 68 percent. You look at the West, it's 72 percent.

No red-blooded American is going to say, with a straight face, that you can take my local budget with my money in it and make the Congress the final decision-maker on that budget. That's what this poll shows.

The Republicans and the Democrats are virtually even. But more Republicans say that DC budgets should be made by the local DC government; that's 72 percent, 71 percent Democrats.

If you look at those who oppose, the opposition shows the same breakdown. You have 24 percent of Democrats saying Congress should control the DC budget, and you have 22 percent of Republicans.

Where's your majority here?

The majority is where I think most people would have expected it to be. But I am grateful for a local organization called DC Vote for commissioning this poll. And DC Vote realized that the poll might come under some scrutiny, so it went to a polling organization which is known for its bipartisan reputation in polling.

□ 1600

That, of course, should be all we need to hear, but the fact is we have a parallel development right here in the Congress.

This week, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN announced that he was preparing his own budget autonomy bill for the District of Columbia. Now, Senator LIEBERMAN, who works in a very bipartisan way in the Senate—I am so sorry to see that he has decided to retire—has long been the foremost Senate champion of equal rights for residents of the District of Columbia.

The momentum for budget autonomy began with a Republican chairman in the House, DARRELL ISSA. I will have something to say about how that happened. We then had two more Republican leaders—House Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and the Republican Governor of Virginia, Bob McDonnell—weigh in for budget autonomy for the District of Columbia. This week, citizens from the organization DC Vote were here in the Congress, speaking to Members about the latest poll results. But let me say something about the Members because it's the Members who have the last say here.

As chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, DARRELL ISSA is responsible in the House for matters that involve the District of Columbia. His committee, and I've been here more than 20 years, had never had a hearing on the DC budget. He decided to have one. He listened to his witnesses, and he listened to the chief financial officer of the District of Columbia and to other District of Columbia officials.

What he heard was that the District of Columbia had the largest budget surplus in the United States, here in the middle of a recession, and that its budget and finances were in better shape than those of virtually any State in the United States. He heard the witnesses from his side as well as our side—the Republican side as well as the Democratic side—and from objective witnesses from the outside saying that the major problem the District faces are the inefficiencies and the premiums it pays on Wall Street because its local budget cannot be implemented until it is approved by the Congress of the United States. This creates huge uncertainty, of course, among bondholders and on Wall Street not of the making of our citizens but due to the fact that the Congress has to approve the City's budget.

Now, I can tell you that no one can remember when the Congress of the United States has changed the City's budget itself, and you can imagine why. A budget is a very delicate document to put together, and Congress does not have the kind of hearings you would have here to know what to take out and what to put in and how to sew it back together again. So what's the point of bringing it over here except tradition? The chairman listened to the problems with bringing the D.C. budget to the Congress and heard even more problems than he expected.

School begins in September, but by the time Congress finishes with the Federal budgets, even the earliest

point is September 30. The reason that most jurisdictions are on a July 1 fiscal year and not a fiscal year that begins on October 1, as the Federal Government does, is precisely because of the importance of schools in every jurisdiction. But in the District, our schools and our city are handicapped by the fact that the budget isn't approved by the time school opens.

That impressed the chairman, apparently, and he was impressed by the fact—and I will soon get to this issue—that the District government has faced shutdowns because its budget was here during fights over the Federal budget, which has resulted in the possibility of the shutdown of the D.C. government.

Chairman ISSA listened at the hearing and did something I've never seen a chairman of a committee do before in my years in the Congress. He listened so intently, heard so well that he announced as the hearing ended that he intended to write a bill for DC budget autonomy. Everyone was surprised. His staff told us they had no idea in advance. Mr. ISSA decided upon hearing the witnesses at his hearing.

That is, I must say to my colleagues and to members of the public, a civics lesson in committee work at its best. The chairman listened. The chairman made a decision. The chairman then went to work.

He worked on several versions of a budget autonomy bill, and exchanged them with me, with the mayor, and with other officials in the city. There were some issues, and we indicated what those difficulties would be operationally. Then, he announced his final proposal for a DC budget autonomy bill. I can tell you that, while it has its own form that clearly bears his signature, in many ways it mirrors my own DC Budget Autonomy Act.

You can imagine how thrilled we were that the chairman of the full committee had, indeed, decided that it was in the best interest of the District of Columbia and in the best interest of the Congress for the District's budget to remain in the District and to be implemented in the same way that the budgets of every other jurisdiction in the United States, except the budget of the District, are implemented. June 30 comes. On July 1, other jurisdictions begin to implement their budget. They prepare for school, and they are ready when school begins.

Mr. ISSA's bill came to the attention of the President of the United States. The President had weighed in the year before for budget autonomy, but upon hearing of Mr. ISSA's bill, he included in his own budget, which was submitted this year, the following language:

> Consistent with the principle of home rule, it is the administration's view that the District's local budget should be authorized to take effect without a separate annual Federal appropriation bill. The administration will work with Congress and the mayor to pass legislation to amend the D.C. Home Rule Act to provide the District with local budget autonomy.

That's the President's statement, inspired by the Republican chairman's proposal for budget autonomy. I know that there are many in this Chamber and in the public who see rare instances—perhaps none—of bipartisan ideas from this Congress. There you see one. You see a Democratic President. You see a strong Republican chairman.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all.

Mr. ISSA was moved, in part, to address budget autonomy because of the problems the District has had with Federal shutdown threats. Most of America is aware of the shutdown threats. By the skin of our teeth, we barely missed a shutdown a year ago. No one believes, of course, that the underlying issues had anything to do with the District of Columbia budget. Those issues are well-known. They involve disagreements between Democrats and Republicans over Federal issues like the Federal deficit. The District has long had a balanced budget, and as I indicated before, beyond its balanced budget, it has the highest surplus in the United States.

So why is the District of Columbia caught in Federal fights that lead to the possibility of shutdowns of the Federal Government?

□ 1610

If the D.C. budget is here, if the budget of the District of Columbia is here and has not been passed by the Congress—and it usually is not passed until, of course, the Federal budgets are passed, or certainly no sooner than September 30—then the District of Columbia's local budget gets thrown in the pot with a budget of—for instance—Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, all of the Federal agencies that get shut down, though there's nothing that the District can do to extricate itself from this fight, because this fight does not involve any concession that the District can make—it involves only Federal issues—nevertheless, the District government will get shut down with the Federal Government.

There were three shutdown threats in 2011. The Federal Government didn't get shut down, although I can tell you it came so close to being shut down I don't even like to think about it. The problem is that every time there is the threat of a Federal shutdown, the local government of the District of Columbia has to spend time and money preparing to shutdown, whether or not it occurs.

Imagine your county, imagine your city pulling people together three times to prepare for a shutdown, to prepare for which agencies can keep going and which agencies to shut down. Because in the event of a shutdown, the only agencies that can be kept in operation are essential agencies. Three times the District of Columbia government had to do that. The District of Columbia is going through the same problems that every local jurisdiction is having as we climb out of the Great Recession. You can imagine what a waste of time and energy that was.

That was one of the issues that made Chairman ISSA think through the notion of budget autonomy. I myself have had several bills to keep the District government from shutting down in the case of a Federal Government shutdown. I put in a bill each fiscal year saying that if the Federal Government shuts down, the District can spend its own local funds, no other funds, no Federal funds, nobody can spend those, but its own local funds. Those bills have not passed.

Just 2 months ago, I warned the mayor that we could be headed for a shutdown this year because the Senate and the House have different budgets. An agreement was reached between the two Chambers in the Budget Control Act about the level of spending in 2013. While the Senate has stuck to that number, the House is using another number. So if the two don't agree, and they each come forward with different appropriation bills, the country could be faced again with the possible shutdown of the Federal Government.

That's bad enough for the country, but suppose you were the mayor of the District of Columbia or a member of the city council and had to consider that there could be a shutdown of the District government over the fact that the House and the Senate are using different budget numbers this year? That would be enough to make you, I think, tremble, as I'm sure the District is now as it considers what to do. Of course, Congress is going to try to reach some agreement. But at the moment, they're going in absolutely divergent directions, despite having reached an agreement on what the number would be for the budget this year.

The President, noting these shutdown threats and the cost to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, did something quite unusual. He not only submitted his views on budget autonomy—that he favored it—he submitted actual language that would keep the District open in case of a shutdown. I would like to submit that language for the record.

The language referred to is as follows:

> Consistent with the principle of home rule, it is the Administration's view that the District's local budget should be authorized to take effect without a separate annual Federal appropriations bill. The Administration will work with Congress and the Mayor to pass legislation to amend the D.C. Home Rule Act to provide the District with local budget autonomy.

When the President submits the language to the Congress, that puts a very special emphasis on the need for what he is asking for.

Mr. Speaker, not only have you had the President and Mr. ISSA; the majority leader of this body, Mr. CANTOR, has indicated that he supports budget autonomy. His spokesman said that ''he is certainly willing to work with the District toward its goal of budget autonomy.'' That's the first time that a leader of my friends on the other side of the aisle has indicated public support for budget autonomy.

This afternoon, I want to thank Mr. CANTOR personally for doing so. Mr. CANTOR may have been moved by his own Governor. The Republican Governor of Virginia, Governor Bob McDonnell, wrote to Majority Leader CANTOR indicating that he supports budget autonomy for the District.

One of the reasons he gave was that 100,000 Virginians come to the District of Columbia to work every day in the private and Federal sector, and that if the District government shuts down, those 100,000 residents from Virginia, who had nothing to do with this fight—just as the District of Columbia had nothing to do with the Federal fight—are seriously inconvenienced.

The fact that these two Virginians from our region have spoken out speaks to the practical reality behind budget autonomy. In addition, the Governor of Virginia made it clear he did not see how the mayor of the District of Columbia could run his city when he could not be certain when his budget would be passed. Here you have one chief executive speaking to another, and both from different parties.

The case we think, Mr. Speaker, has been made. It has been made here by the leadership of this body and the leadership of the Senate, and it has been made in the country as leaders have stepped forward to indicate that the rational thing to do, the American thing to do, if you will, is to respect the right of a local jurisdiction to spend its own local money without coming to a national body which has had nothing to do with raising those funds.

If I could inquire, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. I want to summarize how much on the same page Democrats and Republicans are on the proposition that D.C. should control D.C.'s local budget. There's nothing radical about that one, my friends. It would be hard to go out in the street of your city or your county and get a different response.

So it's not surprising, but it's very important to have these poll figures, which back up where Chairman ISSA is trying to take us, where Mr. CANTOR is trying to take us, where the Governor of Virginia is trying to take us, where D.C. officials, and, I hope, the Congress will come this year. The polls show very gratifying numbers, but they are numbers that reflect where Americans always are. Americans are, first, local people. They want to do as much locally as possible. They understand that there are national issues. They know that one of those issues is not their own local money.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the District of Columbia celebrated D.C. Emancipation Day, and, of course, it's worthy of celebration, when this city was the first jurisdiction whose slaves were freed by Abraham Lincoln. Isn't it amazing that the Nation's capital had slavery in 1862?

□ 1620

But it is very hard to celebrate Emancipation Day in the District of Columbia when your own local funds cannot be spent by your own local people. We raise about $6 billion in local funds. It is a very diverse city of people from all walks of life with all levels of income, and there is absolute agreement across all political lines that the one thing we deserve is budget autonomy.

This year was the 150th anniversary of the liberation of slaves by Abraham Lincoln in the District of Columbia. We noted that the slaves had to be very grateful to be liberated because there was nothing they could do to liberate themselves. Armed struggle was certainly not possible for slaves here or anywhere else. Peaceful opposition to slavery would have brought armed struggle against their peaceful opposition, so they had to wait to be liberated.

The people of the District of Columbia understand it is up to them to liberate themselves, but they, too, cannot free themselves entirely. They do not have a Member who has a vote on the floor of the United States Congress. I vote in committee. I do not have the right to vote for final passage of any legislation.

Yet my residents have been in every war the Nation has fought since the Nation was created. We pay federal income taxes at the highest levels. We're second per capita in federal income taxes among the 50 States and the District of Columbia. So you can imagine that it is with some anguish that we send our own local budget to people we respect but people who have contributed nothing to the money we have raised in our city.

I thank all who have supported us here in the Congress, and I look forward to the day, which I hope will be this year, when there will be budget autonomy for the District of Columbia.

I yield back the balance of my time.

''The following is the actual proposal the president included in his fiscal year 2013 budget to prevent a D.C. government shutdown in the event of a federal government shutdown:''

SEC. 817. Section 446 of the Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code sec. 1–204.46) is amended by adding the following at the end of its fourth sentence, before the period '': Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective for fiscal year 2013, and for each succeeding fiscal year, during a period in which there is an absence of a federal appropriations act authorizing the expenditure of District of Columbia local funds, the District of Columbia may obligate and expend local funds for programs and activities at the rate set forth in the Budget Request Act adopted by the Council, or a reprogramming adopted pursuant to this section.'' (Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2012.)

PURPLE INSIGHTS POLL, APRIL 5–9, 2012

Q: The budget of the city of Washington, D.C. is funded by local residents' tax dollars. Do you think that the decisions about Washington, D.C.'s local budget should be made by Washington, D.C. taxpayers and their own elected officials OR should those budget decisions be made by the U.S. Congress?

71% of Democrats believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

72% of Republicans believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

75% of Independents believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

68% of Males believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

73% of Females believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

60% with High School or Less believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

78% with Some College believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

80% of College Graduates believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

69% in the Northeast believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

74% in the Midwest believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

68% in the South believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

72% in the West believe D.C. should control D.C. local budget

24% of Democrats believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

22% of Republicans believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

20% of Independents believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

26% of Males believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

20% of Females believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

33% with High School or Less believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

18% with Some College believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

13% of College Graduates believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

26% in the Northeast believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

19% in the Midwest believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

25% in the South believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

6% in the West believe Congress should control D.C. local budget

5% of Democrats do not know whether D.C. or Congress should not control D.C. local budget

6% of Republicans do not know whether D.C. or Congress should not control D.C. local budget

6% of Independents do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

5% of Males do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

7% of Females do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

7% with High School or Less do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

4% with Some College do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

7% of College Graduates do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

5% in the Northeast do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

7% in the Midwest do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

7% in the South do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

6% in the West do not know whether D.C. or Congress should control D.C. local budget

METHODOLOGY

National omnibus interviews of 1,007 adults age 18 and older in the continental United States on April 5–9, 2012 conducted via a random digit dialing methodology telephone and cell phone methodology.

The sample consisted of:
—757 interviews from the landline sample
—250 interviews from the cell phone sample
—504 men
—503 women
The data is weighted to reflect the geographic, demographic, and socioeconomic information that are known for the population as well as measured in the survey.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I'm going to talk about health care. I'm a medical doctor. I'm a primary care physician. As a medical doctor, I'm very concerned about where we are going as a Nation.

Back during the debate over the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare, I presented several alternatives to that bill. Most people know in this country that the U.S. Supreme Court a couple of weeks ago, 3 weeks ago, had hearings about the constitutionality of the individual mandate, whether the Federal Government, under the Constitution, can demand that every single person in this country buy health insurance that's dictated by the Federal Government, that the Federal Government actually puts out all the parameters for that health insurance.

We recently saw Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, say that everybody's health insurance in this country is going to have to provide free birth control pills, free pills that are designed for nothing but to cause an abortion and free sterilization for everybody in the country. That's whether you are male or female. Who pays for that? Well, we all will.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about birth control. It's about government control. Because, you see, under ObamaCare, if it stays in place, it's going to be a tool where the Federal Government can mandate every aspect of our lives, what we eat. In fact, Justice Scalia, during the hearings a few weeks ago, said, if it stays in place, couldn't the Federal Government demand everybody in the country eat broccoli? I love broccoli and I eat a lot of it, but it's not the Federal Government's business to mandate that I eat broccoli—or anybody else, for that matter—and he's absolutely right.

In fact, under the auspices of health care, the Federal Government could control every aspect of our lives, could tell us what kinds of cars that we drive. The Federal Government could basically say, We believe everybody should drive a Chevy Volt or a Ford Focus, and if you don't, we're going to fine you.

There are already doctors that are associated with the CDC in my home State of Georgia that say it's a health hazard for people to have private ownership of firearms and it's a particular health hazard to children. They could outlaw private ownership of firearms. They could outlaw anything that the Federal Government decided to do.

ObamaCare is going to be a destroyer. It's going to destroy the doctor-patient relationship. It will destroy the quality of health care, because the Federal Government is going to decide who can get care and who is not. It can decide whether a person is fit to receive surgery or go in the hospital or not. Age is going to be a determining factor, and it's all going to be based on economics, on cost. The high cost of health care today is because of government intrusion into the health care system. In fact, I will just give you two quick examples.

Back when I was practicing medicine down in rural southwest Georgia, in my little office I had a fully automated, quality-controlled laboratory. If a patient came in to see me that had a fever, aching all over, sore ribs, swollen throat, coughing, nose running, I would do a complete blood count, a CBC, to see if they had a bacterial infection which needs to be treated with antibiotics or whether they had a viral infection which is not helped by antibiotics, the patient doesn't need to go spend the money on those antibiotics. The best practice is it is not a good standard of care to treat viral infections with antibiotics. I would do a CBC. I could do it in 5 minutes. I charged 12 bucks.

Congress, in its infinite wisdom, decided that I might make a few pennies off of doing CBCs and, thus, would have an incentive to do too many. Well, they passed CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. Instead of being able to do the test in 5 minutes, 12 bucks, I had to send patients over to the hospital. It took 3 to 4 hours, $75 for one test—from 12 bucks to $75—because of a law that Congress passed.

What do you think that did to everybody's insurance all across this country? What do you think it did to the cost of Medicaid as well as Medicare? It markedly elevated the cost.

The second issue, Congress passed and is now law, HIPAA. It's a totally unneeded act. It has cost the health care industry, alone, billions—billions with a B—billions of dollars, but a totally unneeded act, and it has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches it has created. There are other industries—like the insurance industry, legal industry, accounting industry, and a whole lot of others—that are affected by HIPAA also. It's government intrusion in the health care system.

The President promised us that ObamaCare would not cost over a trillion dollars. They went through a whole lot of budgetary gimmicks to try to get it under a trillion dollars. Just recently, CBO said that ObamaCare is going to cost $1.75 trillion.

The President promises, if you have insurance and you like it, you can keep it.

□ 1630

Nobody is going to be able to afford it. I talked to a businessman, and his insurance went up this year over last year by 43 percent because of the mandates in ObamaCare. Hopefully, the Supreme Court is going to throw out ObamaCare because it's going to destroy the doctor-patient relationship and the quality of medicine. It's also going to destroy budgets. As I've already mentioned, it's very, very expensive. The expansion of Medicaid is going to destroy State budgets. The whole bill is going to destroy the Federal budget and destroy our economy. And as I've already mentioned, it's going to destroy our freedom.

So what's the alternative? What happens if the Supreme Court throws out ObamaCare, as hopefully they will—and they should—because it's blatantly unconstitutional. Well, the first thing, this chart shows us what ObamaCare is like. And this isn't all of the new bureaus and agencies that are created under the plan. Right in the middle is the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Kathleen Sebelius, if she's still in office a year from now, has the potential to be the greatest tyrant to take away our freedom because of this law.

We must get rid of ObamaCare and replace it with something that makes sense economically and we put patients and doctors in the business of making their own decisions.

Well, I introduced a bill a few weeks ago called the Patient Option Act. It's H.R. 4224. What would it do? The first thing, it repeals ObamaCare completely. Gets rid of it, as we should. It also makes health care cheaper for everybody. It will lower your cost of insurance. It makes all health care expenses cheaper for everyone. It will provide coverage for all Americans, and also it will save Medicare from going broke.

Today, I heard some of my Democrat colleagues talk about Republicans want to destroy Medicare as we know it. And that's what their mantra keeps being. But their policy is characterized by four Ds. The first D is that they deny that Medicare and Social Security has any problem whatsoever. The actuaries of both Social Security and Medicare say they're going to go broke within just a few short years—within the life span of almost every American, except for the extreme elderly. So they deny there's a problem.

The second D, they're delaying fixing the problem. Their mantra of let's save Medicare as we know it is going—they deny the problem.

The third D is they're going to destroy Medicare as we know it because it's just totally not feasible to go forward and not fix it. That's what Republicans have been trying to do.

And the fourth thing that my Democrat colleagues do is they demonize all of us who want to try to fix it. The Patient Option Act will fix it, and that's what we need to do. We need to have

policies to give patients, give people a whole lot more options, and that's exactly what I'm trying to do with my Patient Option Act.

So how does it make it cheaper for everyone? The first thing it does is it provides 100 percent tax deductibility for all health care expenses, including insurance. What's this do? Well, most people in this country get their health insurance through their employer—at least working people do. And what this does is it will allow a business to just give the money to their employees and let the employees go out and buy the health insurance that makes the most sense for them and their families. So the employer is not dictating what kind of insurance the employee gets. It's a normal business expense to the employer to give that money to the employee, and then the employee can go out and buy whatever kind of insurance that they want to. In doing so, they can buy health insurance across State lines.

What this will do is it will get rid of all the State mandates because somebody in Georgia can go to Ohio and buy a basic policy without State mandates that are given to the insurance companies in Georgia. Plus, this issue breaks up the monopolies. In every State there are only just a very few health insurance companies that are providing health insurance within that State. They have what's tantamount to a monopoly. By allowing people to work with the insurance agents, they can buy health insurance anywhere in the country and can have a whole lot more options in health insurance—those kind of insurance policies that fit their families' needs the very best at a much lower cost.

It also increases the contribution limits and does patient reforms to the health savings accounts. What my bill does is it allows everybody to contribute up to $10,000 a year into their health savings account, and the employer can help provide the funds so that the employee can fund their health savings accounts. Actually, the employee will own that health savings account, manage it themselves.

Now, my Democrat colleagues seem to think that nobody can manage their own health insurance or their own economic affairs, that we have to have the Federal Government telling all of us how to manage all of our affairs. That seems to be their philosophy. But I trust the American people. I think people can manage their own affairs if we give them the ability to do so, and expanding health savings accounts will do just that. It's not a use-it-or-lose-it situation under the Patient Option Act. That can continue to grow over the lifetime of the individual. And when they die, when they pass it, that health savings account will actually go into their estate and go to their heirs.

So this puts competition into the health insurance industry. It takes away all those mandates and lets patients have multiple options where they can purchase the health insurance at a lower cost that makes sense to them, and their employer will not dictate it and neither will the Federal Government. So it will be a whole lot cheaper for everyone.

Now, it also offers coverage for all Americans. Well, in repealing ObamaCare, the thing about ObamaCare is we were told we need to have health care for everybody. Well, the thing is what is confusing to most Americans is we haven't been talking about health care. We're just talking about health insurance. When ObamaCare says ''provide health care for everybody,'' what they're saying is health insurance for everyone that is mandated by the Federal Government. In fact, the President went on a national address over TV just prior to passing ObamaCare, where he said he wants everybody in this country in one pool. One insurance pool.

What's that mean? That means the Federal Government provides all health care coverage and all health care for everybody. That's socialized medicine. Socialized medicine. And that's exactly what ObamaCare is all about. It's geared towards forcing people out of their private insurance—we already see that happening today—and forcing everybody into a national pool run by the Federal Government, which in itself is going to destroy the quality of health care, and Federal bureaucrats are going to be making decisions for everybody about the kind of surgery that everybody can or cannot have, whether you can get a certain medication or not, whether you can go in the hospital or not. The doctor will not be able to make those decisions.

Already, as a physician, a primary care doctor, the health management corporations as well as the government entity, CMS, determine today whether a patient can go in the hospital or not or whether they can get a certain treatment or not. We've got to stop that. We've got to put patients in control, where they can work with their doctors and get the kind of health care that they need without some bureaucrat—insurance company bureaucrat or government bureaucrat—making the decisions.

But what this does, my Patient Option Act, H.R. 4224, allows businesses or individuals to come together and form an association and have huge insurance pools all across the country. That association could offer multiple insurance products—a Cadillac plan or bare-bones plan or something in between. Whatever the members of that association want to purchase, the association can offer multiple products. Since you will have such huge pools across the land, then the cost is much lower. It spreads the liability across many more people, and so health insurance is a whole lot less expensive for all of us.

□ 1640

In doing so, it will help cover a lot of people who are uninsured today because they can't afford it, and it will also allow people who have preexisting conditions to join those associations and be able to buy health insurance at a price where they can afford it, so it will help cover those people with preexisting conditions. So this will allow those groups to make these associations as well as individuals or businesses to buy the health insurance across State lines. It will provide coverage for virtually everybody.

Well, what about Medicare? And I'm going to come back to coverage for particularly poor people that can't afford insurance even with the lower prices. And I'll tell you what the bill, the Patient Option Act, H.R. 4224, does.

My bill will save Medicare. It will save it from going broke and make it so that our senior citizens not only today, but these children that I see, young people I see in the gallery today, they'll be able to have insurance in the future through Medicare if that's what they want to do. It allows seniors to opt out of Medicare if they want to.

I've got a constituent that worked for a large cable company here in this country. When he retired, the cable company wanted to provide health insurance for him for the rest of his life as an executive of the cable company. But they couldn't do it and he couldn't do it because, under the current law, everybody has to go into Medicare once you turn 65, at least part A. You don't have any option about that. It's mandated.

Of course, mandates like that, I don't think that's freedom, frankly, Mr. Speaker. Everybody is mandated to go into Medicare when they turn 65. Well, my bill will allow them to say, No, I want to buy private insurance; I don't want Medicare; I don't want to be involved in it. So they can use their own insurance, whether it's provided through a company or whether it's something they've bought all along, and it moves Medicare into a more flexible program.

It actually sets up a Medicare health savings account that Medicare will fund. The patient will own that health savings account and will manage the dollars. It won't be managed by some Federal bureaucrat. And if the patient doesn't utilize all those funds before they pass away, those funds actually go into the Medicare recipient's estate and the heirs will get the dollars.

The Medicare recipient will control the money, will control the decisions, can work with their doctor, and it gives the Medicare recipient a lot of options. And it also gives premium support on top of the Medicare health savings account so that the Medicare patient will have comprehensive coverage for any medical emergency or even very costly medical treatments.

So it takes care of Medicare patients. It gives them good quality care. It puts the Medicare patient in control of those decisions, and it will save Medicare from going broke, which it's going to in just a very few short years.

The other thing my bill does, and this will help with those poor people who can't even buy the much-reduced-cost health insurance, even bare-bone policies, and, unfortunately, there are some people in this country that are in that category. In my over four decades of practicing medicine, I have literally given away hundreds of thousands of dollars of my services. That's what most doctors do, particularly in my generation. A lot of the younger doctors aren't doing that as much because of the government diktats to them and because of the requirements that CMS puts upon their practices that they don't have time to give to their patients. They don't have time to try to develop relationships with their patients. They don't have time to give good quality care anymore because of the Federal Government.

If I was accepting Medicare as a physician and I was a preferred provider—that's the providers that are accepting Medicare as a payment. And Medicare, by the way, sets the prices but says you cannot publish those prices. There's no transparency because of Federal diktats, by the way, Federal law.

If I was a preferred provider and a patient came in to see me that was really struggling and trying to make ends meet, they didn't have health insurance, they're trying to pay their bills, and they came in to see me, and I said, Don't worry about the bill—and I have done that to thousands of patients over my four decades of practicing medicine. I said, Don't worry about it. Forget it. I'm glad to give you these services for free. If I did that and I was a preferred provider, Medicare could literally throw me in jail for treating somebody for free. They could throw me in jail and they could fine me.

Doctors today cannot give away their services to somebody who needs, desperately, to get their services. So what my bill does is it stops that, and it gives a physician a tax credit between $2,000 and $8,000 a year for giving away their services. It gives them a tax credit.

I talked to a lot of doctors throughout Georgia and asked them, if we did this, how many doctors would actually see patients for free. Every single one in every single doctors' meeting has held up their hands. And I'll give you an example.

I talked to a urologist who basically practices in a very upscale, wealthy community. He's in his office 4 days a week. It's a retirement community with high-price real estate and homes. And he told me, if I would do this in a bill, he would set aside 2 of the 4 days he's in his office to see nothing but indigent patients. Let me repeat that. This doctor who is working in this area will give half of his time to see indigent patients in his office if we would just give him this tax credit.

And that's what we did in this bill so that doctors are no longer under the threat of being fined and being jailed for just having compassion on poor people, as the Federal Government has stopped that, prevented that and said it's against the law to have compassion on poor people. You have to charge them. You have to try to collect, and you cannot give away your services. This stops all that.

Medicare has no compassion. Medicaid has no compassion. It's all about money and government control.

Another thing that my bill does is it reforms EMTALA, the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act. This is another law that Congress passed that requires every emergency room in this country to see whoever comes in and to treat them. In my area in Georgia, throughout my Tenth Congressional District in Georgia, a person can walk into any emergency room in my district and they will find the emergency room filled with patients who do not need to be in the emergency room, should not be in the emergency room.

I worked for 2 years before I moved to northeast Georgia. I was working at a hospital down in southwest Georgia as the director of emergency services. For 2 years, I worked full-time as an ER doc and directing those emergency services. Way over 90 percent of the patients that came in that emergency room, as they do in most emergency rooms, had no emergency. And, actually, emergency rooms all across this country are filled with illegal aliens that are going there and getting services, utilizing the emergency room in the hospital as their primary care provider; in other words, they're going to see doctors in the emergency room for stumped toes or colds, sore throats, headaches, any medical problem. And they don't have to pay because of EMTALA.

The Federal Government has required the emergency rooms to see and treat everybody who walks in. Whether they can pay or not, whether they are here legally or not, whether they are a citizen or they are an illegal alien, it requires them to do so.

What's happening with EMTALA is there is a tremendous economic burden upon hospitals. We have hospitals, particularly rural hospitals, going broke today so that nobody in their community gets services because of EMTALA.

□ 1650

It's not fair. It's not fair to the people in that community. It's not fair to people who really need to be in the emergency room. It's not fair particularly that we are forcing emergency rooms and hospitals to see illegal aliens. Actually, it's hurting people who have true emergencies because emergency rooms are filled with people who don't need to be there. People can come in with severe injuries or severe medical problems. If it's not blatantly apparent, then people have delayed administering of treatment that they desperately need to keep them well or to save their lives.

What my bill does is it allows hospitals to set up a basic screening process so that the hospital can set up somebody with basic medical knowledge and can screen patients and say to the patient, this is not an emergency, go see your doctor, go to a free clinic, we can't see you. So it reforms EMTALA and makes it so that hospitals don't have this economic burden that's been placed on them because of Federal law and Federal dictate.

I presented this bill to a lot of groups. In fact, I'm very pleased, I did an interview with Forbes magazine recently. They wrote up a blog and this article about my health care bill, the Patient OPTION Act, H.R. 4224.

They said this: Now a new plan has come forth, backed by one of the most influential Tea Party groups—that I'll mention in just a second—that contains some intriguing and original ideas for bringing cheaper health care to more people. This is from Forbes magazine.

BROUN's plan would revolutionize the insurance market by incentivizing companies, particularly smaller ones and startups, to pay their workers directly their wages—so that the wage earner will control their own money. They're earning it, they should get it, and they should make their own health care insurance decisions themselves—and let those workers decide how to pay for their own care.

Forbes magazine. It's not a Tea Party magazine; it's a magazine that I think most Americans know.

The Tea Party group—which a lot of people don't understand Tea Parties and what it's all about, but Freedom Works is a grassroots group, and it's been dubbed a Tea Party group. Actually, Freedom Works has been around for some time. But Freedom Works has endorsed my Patient OPTION Act, and this is what they said:

Congressman BROUN has authored a bold, timely, and principled plan that offers exactly what a majority of Americans want, a patient-centered health care so that patients can make their own decisions, along with their doctors. It makes health care cheaper for everybody. It provides coverage for all Americans. And it will save Medicare from going broke.

Americans need to contact their Senators and Congressmen and the leadership of the House and Senate and demand that we pass the Patient OPTION Act, H.R. 4224.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not refer to occupants of the gallery.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian E. Pate, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–98)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Judiciary, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2012 *National Drug Control Strategy*, which follows through on the commitment made by my Administration to chart a new course in our efforts to reduce illicit drug use and its consequences in the United States. The balanced approach outlined in the Administration's inaugural *National Drug Control Strategy* has yielded significant results, which are detailed in the following pages.

Our Nation still faces serious drug-related challenges, however. Too many Americans need treatment for substance use disorders but do not receive it. Prescription drug abuse continues to claim American lives, and those who take drugs and drive threaten safety on our Nation's roadways. Young people's perceptions of the risks of drug use have declined over the past decade, and research suggests that this often predicts future increases in drug use. There is still much left to do to reform our justice system and break the cycle of drug use and crime. Our commitment to work with partner nations must remain steadfast to reduce drug production, trafficking, and related transnational threats.

Based upon the progress we have achieved over the past three years, I am confident we can address these challenges through concerted action along the entire spectrum of prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice reform, law enforcement, and international cooperation. However, we must match our commitment with the appropriate resources.

Illicit drug use in America contributed to an estimated $193 billion in crime, health, and lost productivity costs in 2007, the year for which the most recent estimate is available. In today's challenging economic environment, we cannot afford such a drain on our economy and public resources. While difficult budget decisions must be made at all levels of government, we must ensure continued support for policies and programs that reduce drug use and its enormous costs to American society. In doing so, we will not only strengthen our economy but also sustain the national character and spirit that has made the United States a world leader.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Congress and Federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial leaders, international partners, and the American people in this important endeavor.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 2012*.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a funeral service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 23, 2012, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5689. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Customer Clearing Documentation, Timing of Acceptance for Clearing, and Clearing Member Risk Management (RIN: 3038-0092, -0094) received April 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5690. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commodity Pool Operators and Commodity Trading Advisors: Compliance Obligations (RIN: 3038-AD30) received March 26, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5691. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; NM; Correction [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0124] received March 26, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5692. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Onion Crop Insurance Provisions [Docket No.: FCIC-11-0004] (RIN: 0563-AC29) received March 26, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5693. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for Fiscal Year 2013, along with proposed plans for FY 2014 through 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5694. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on activities under the Secretary's personnel management demonstration project authorities for the Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories for Calendar Year 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5695. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frank G. Helmick, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5696. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revising Standards Referenced in the Acetylene Standard [Docket No.: OSHA-2011-0183] (RIN: 1218-AC64) received March 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5697. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' final rule — Hazard Communication [Docket No.: OSHA-H022K-2006-0062] (formerly Docket No.: H022K) (RIN: 1218-AC20) received April 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5698. A letter from the Correspondence and Regulations Assistant, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Health Insurance Coverage [CMS-9981-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ95) received March 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5699. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Terrestrial Environmental Studies For Nuclear Power Stations, Regulatory Guide 4.11, Revision 2, received March 26, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5700. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Leakage Tests on Packages for Shipment of Radioactive Material, Regulatory Guide 7.4, Revision 1, received March 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of intent to use FY 10 Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) funds for Global Threat Reduction (GTR) activities in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5702. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Somalia originally declared on April 12, 2010, by Executive Order 13536, is to continue in effect beyond April 12, 2012, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 112—97); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5703. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-343, ''Tenant Security Deposit Clarification Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5704. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-344, ''South Capitol Street Memorial Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5705. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002 Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5706. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a copy of the Peace Corps' Fiscal Year 2011 Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report; to

the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5707. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5708. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Mediare Advantage and the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Programs for Contract Year 2013 and Other Changes [CMS-4157-FC] (RIN: 0938-AQ86) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5709. A letter from the Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's record of the public hearing on ''Chinese State-Owned and State Controlled Enterprises''; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

5710. A letter from the Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's record of the public hearing on ''China's Global Quest for Resources and Implications for the United States''; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1335. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2240. A bill to authorize the exchange of land or interest in land between Lowell National Historical Park and the city of Lowell in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2362. A bill to facilitate economic development by Indian tribes and encourage investment by Turkish enterprises (Rept. 112–451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3452. A bill to provide for the sale of approximately 30 acres of Federal land in Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Salt Lake County, Utah, to permit the establishment of a minimally invasive transportation alternative for skiers, called ''SkiLink'', to connect two ski resorts in the Wasatch Mountains, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 4400. A bill to designate the Salt Pond Visitor Center at Cape Cod National Seashore as the ''Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. Salt Pond Visitor Center'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4401. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to work with non-Federal entities and accept non-Federal funding under strict implementation guidelines to promote efficiencies of the space transportation infrastructure of the Department of Defense in commercial space activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 4402. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness; 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 Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4403. A bill to suspend subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, through the end of fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4404. A bill to create a centralized website on reports issued by the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio):

H.R. 4405. A bill to impose sanctions on persons responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, and for other gross violations of human rights in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial 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. CAMP (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 4406. A bill to compel the Secretary of the Army to complete the Great Lakes Mississippi River Interbasin Study within 18 months and to focus particular attention on the permanent prevention of the spread of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basins; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend the indemnification responsibilities applicable to the Secretary of Defense when Department of Defense property at military installations closed pursuant to a base closure law is conveyed to expand such indemnification responsibilities to include all military installations closed since October 24, 1988; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4408. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements under such Act for land management related to Department of Defense installations and to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate interagency cooperation in conservation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BARROW:

H.R. 4409. A bill to provide for reforming and consolidating agencies of the Federal Government to improve efficiency and save money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4410. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on acrylic or modacrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4411. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on certain polyacrylonitrile tow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4412. A bill to extend temporarily the reduction of duty on certain dyed acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4413. A bill to extend temporarily the reduction of duty on certain undyed acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4414. A bill to extend temporarily the reduction of duty on certain dyed polyacrylonitrile staple; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4415. A bill to extend temporarily the reduction of duty on certain undyed polyacrylonitrile staple; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4416. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic filament tow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4417. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic filament tow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4418. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4419. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic filament tow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4420. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic filament tow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 4421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the separate income tax return form for the earned income credit, to require the information required by that form to be included on the appropriate income tax return forms, and to require the Internal Revenue Service to compute the earned income credit for taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4422. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain staple fibers of

viscose rayon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4423. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on cyan 854 inkjet printing ink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4424. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on cyan 1 RO inkjet printing ink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4425. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on black 661 inkjet printing ink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4426. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on black 820 inkjet printing ink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4427. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phenyl (4,6-dimethoxypyrimidin-2-yl) carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4428. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain mixtures of methyl 2-[[[[[4-(dimethylamino)-6-(2,2,2-trifluoroethoxy)-1,3,5- triazin-2-yl]amino]carbonyl]amino]-sulfonyl]-3-methylbenzoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4429. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on certain lamps used in liquid chromatographs or spectrophotometry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4430. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on Pyrithiobac-sodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4431. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethyl 2-(Isocyanatosulfonyl)benzoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4432. A bill to extend temporarily the suspension of duty on Flutolanil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4433. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Buprofezin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4434. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pyraflufen-ethyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4435. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Triasulfuron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4436. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Phosphoric acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4437. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Thiamethoxam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4438. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on trifloxysulfuron-sodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4439. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fenpyroximate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4440. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Glyoxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4441. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Triflic Anhydride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4442. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Triflic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 4443. A bill to reduce temporarily the rate of duty on parts of frames and mountings for spectacles, goggles, or the like; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 4444. A bill to reduce temporarily the rate of duty on frames and mountings for spectacles, goggles, or the like, the foregoing of plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4445. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4446. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain modacrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4447. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4448. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4449. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4450. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4451. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4452. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4453. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain acrylic staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 4454. A bill to require the approval by the head of an agency for any conference costing more than $25,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 4455. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain bags for toys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 4456. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain infants' products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 4457. A bill to require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to take certain actions to reduce excessive speculation in energy markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4458. A bill to promote Department of the Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrients in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4459. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Thidiazuron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4460. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Fenamidone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4461. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Spirodiclofen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4462. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on 2,4-dichloroaniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4463. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Thiacloprid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4464. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Pyrimethanil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4465. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pyrasulfotole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4466. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fosetyl-Al; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend section 520E of the Public Health Service act to require States and their designees receiving grants for development or implementation of statewide suicide early intervention and prevention strategies to consult with each Federally recognized Indian tribe, tribal organization, and urban Indian organization in the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 4468. A bill to extend the authority to make grants for specified energy property in lieu of tax credits; 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 Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4469. A bill to provide certain counties with the ability to receive television broadcast signals of their choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. WATERS (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 5, United States Code, to require individual and group health insurance coverage and group health plans and Federal employees health benefit plans to provide coverage for routine HIV screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. DENHAM (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. LANKFORD):

H. Res. 623. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prevent duplicative and overlapping government programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 624. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the first Saturday in May as National Explosive Ordnance Disposal Day and for the designation of ''Initial Success or Total Failure'' as the official motto of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal organizations in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 625. A resolution honoring the members of the United States Armed Forces who served in Vietnam; 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 Ms. FUDGE:

H. Res. 626. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of April 16 through April 20, 2012, as National Assistant Principals Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. SIRES):

H. Res. 627. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should work within the framework of the United Nations process with Greece to achieve longstanding United States and United Nations policy goals of finding a mutually acceptable composite name, with a geographical qualifier and for all uses for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H. Res. 628. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should preserve, enhance, and increase access to an open, global Internet; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 629. A resolution condemning violence by the Government of Syria against journalists, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on freedom of the press in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section. 8. Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3 of the United States Constitution, which states in relevant part that, ''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,'' grants Congress the authority to enact this legislation.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 4402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 4405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have the power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with Indian tribes;

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 in which Congress has the explicit authority to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval forces.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4409.

Congress has the power to enact his legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 4420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 4421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Amendment XVI

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 & 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4440.

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: ''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 . . .''

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4441.

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: ''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 . . .''

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4442.

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: ''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 . . .''

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises[,] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations [and] 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. CHABOT:

H.R. 4444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises[,] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations [and] 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. COBLE:

H.R. 4445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 4453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 4454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 4455.

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. HIGGINS:

H.R. 4456.

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. HINCHEY:

H.R. 4457.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 4463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 4464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 4465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 4466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. BACA:
H.R. 4467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 & Clause 18
By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:
H.R. 4468.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, section 7 & 8 of the Constitution of the United States and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. TIPTON:
H.R. 4469.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 To regulate commerce among the several states)
By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 4470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution and
Article 1, Section 8, clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 32: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 192: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 265: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 266: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 267: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 300: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 365: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 374: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 459: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 591: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 616: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 639: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 780: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 808: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 835: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 860: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 893: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 942: Mr. REED, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BERG, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 997: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1004: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1005: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1044: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1048: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1057: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1063: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1116: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1175: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1193: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1242: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1259: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1267: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1283: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1356: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1409: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1418: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1426: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1463: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1464: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1519: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1537: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1543: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1588: Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1620: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1653: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1666: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 1744: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1753: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1755: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1781: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1802: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1821: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1881: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1897: Mr. HIMES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1919: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1946: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2000: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2028: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2033: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2083: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2108: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 2139: Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2151: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2152: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2245: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2288: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2299: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2304: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2366: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2377: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2389: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2446: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2502: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2529: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2555: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2569: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2741: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2765: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2766: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2780: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2809: Ms. HAHN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2810: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 2827: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2900: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2914: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2948: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2951: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2954: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 2969: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2989: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3015: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3032: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 3059: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 3187: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3199: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3238: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3356: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 3357: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3387: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3395: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3423: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3596: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3612: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3661: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3720: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3767: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3795: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3803: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 3808: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3826: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3839: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3849: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DENT, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3862: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3881: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3903: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3993: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4017: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4049: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4051: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4052: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 4077: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4094: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4114: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4115: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4120: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4132: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4134: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4137: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4142: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4153: Mr. DENT and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 4154: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4157: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GIBBS, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 4160: Mr. COBLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4169: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4171: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4175: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4180: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4192: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 4196: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 4201: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4209: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4222: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4232: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 4234: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4235: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4237: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4243: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4249: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4254: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4256: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4259: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4268: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 4269: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 4270: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4271: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4275: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4290: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4296: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 4301: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4313: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4315: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4351: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4367: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 4379: Mr. FILNER, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.J. Res. 103: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. TIPTON.
H.J. Res. 106: Mr. GOSAR.
H.J. Res. 107: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. DEGETTE.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. TIPTON.
H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. LONG.
H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REED, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 137: Mr. GIBSON.
H. Res. 394: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 568: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WOODALL, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 583: Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 592: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 604: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Res. 609: Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 618: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2341: Mr. LANGEVIN.