United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2013 No. 17

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

TUESAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 5, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN M. PALAZZO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, since I was a high school student, I've watched the escalation of the war on drugs, especially marijuana. I slowly became aware of its widespread use. As a freshman legislator in Oregon 40 years ago, my opinion was set by a hog farmer from eastern Oregon who was a State representative named Stafford Hansell.

Stafford held the Oregon House, and the people crowded into the gallery spellbound with his tutorial on marijuana and its comparison to other addictive substances, both legal and illegal. This older gentleman, who didn't smoke, didn't drink alcohol—let alone use marijuana—made his case. He pointed out how tobacco was highly addictive and killed hundreds of thousands of Americans per year. He discussed alcohol, whose damaging properties had once led the country into a foolish, costly and ultimately self-defeating experiment with prohibition. Alcohol use was damaging for some, led to dependency for many, while contributing to tens of thousands of highway deaths every year, and serious health problems for countless others.

By the time Representative Hansell got to marijuana, he'd convinced me that the bill he was advocating—two plant legalization—was not just worthy of my support, which I was already inclined to do, but something that I should advocate that Oregonians should be allowed this choice, less damaging and addicting than tobacco.

We didn't legalize marijuana in 1973, although I was assured that if the 22 of us who had voted for the bill had been supported by the people who used it but voted no, the measure would have passed easily. We did make Oregon the first State to decriminalize the use of marijuana. Possession of a small amount was made a minor infraction, treated like a traffic ticket. Today, 40 years later, the case is even more compelling. Fourteen States have now decriminalized policies like Oregon passed in 1973.

In 1996, California pioneered the legal use of medical marijuana whose therapeutic qualities have long been known and employed. And since then, 18 States and the District of Columbia have approved medical marijuana initiatives, allowing its use to relieve chronic pain, nausea, and other conditions. Notably, two-thirds of these approvals were a result of voter initiatives.

Last fall, voters in Colorado and Washington approved adult recreational use with 55 percent approval margins. Studies show that a majority of Americans now agree that marijuana should be legalized. It is time that the Federal Government revisit its policies. Drugs with less serious classifications, like methamphetamine and cocaine, have more serious health and behavioral impacts; yet marijuana retains its Schedule I classification.

In 2011, two-thirds of a million people were arrested for using a substance that millions use, many more have tried, and a majority of Americans feel should be legal. Because there are stark racial differences in enforcement and incarceration, there are wide disparities in the legal treatment for communities of color versus their white counterparts. Medical marijuana is

Printed on recycled paper.

widely accepted but subject to inherent conflict with Federal law that is unfair, confusing and costly.

A bipartisan group of legislators is developing a comprehensive package of legislation to clarify and reform outdated, ineffective, and unwise Federal policies. In a time of great fiscal stress and a sea change in opinion of voters, this is a unique opportunity to save money on enforcement and incarceration, avoid unnecessary conflict and harsh treatment of users, provide a framework for medical marijuana, and even reduce the deficit—all by honoring the wish of two-thirds of Americans to respect states' rights for marijuana, just like we do for alcohol.

I would invite my colleagues to join this effort in developing a marijuana policy that makes sense for America today.

NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTIONS FOR OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, January is the traditional month in which New Year's resolutions are developed. I'm suggesting that President Obama and Mrs. Obama adopt a resolution in the event they failed to do so in January. President Obama and Mrs. Obama, it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, regard Air Force One very casually; and I believe that on some occasions two planes, at least two planes, have been dispatched to the same destination.

Air Force One, Mr. Speaker, belongs to the President and Mrs. Obama, but Air Force One also belongs to the American taxpayer, and I would welcome a New Year's resolution that would provide a generous lease of all future Air Force One dispatches with prudence, discipline and, last but certainly not least, fiscal austerity. America's taxpayers will be appreciative.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Air Force One, designated by the Air Force as VC–25, incurred an operational cost per hour of $179,750. And on some occasions, additional aircraft accompanied Air Force One, naturally adding to the cost.

I'm going to now, Mr. Speaker, insert my oars into waters that involve the former Secretary of State, Mrs. Clinton, during a recent Senate hearing. A Senator who was examining Secretary Clinton suggested or implied that the administration may have misstated the nature of the Benghazi attack, to which Mrs. Clinton responded: ''What difference at this point does it make?''

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the survivors of the four Americans who were murdered in that attack would welcome any and all information surrounding that infamous invasion. The survivors are grieving, and any information that could illuminate in any way this tragedy that occurred in Benghazi would welcome any and all information, it seems to me.

Yes, Secretary Clinton, at this point it may well make a difference.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the problem of hunger in America. We are the richest, most prosperous Nation in the world. Yet the sad fact is that in 2013 more than 50 million people in this country are considered food insecure by the United States Department of Agriculture. Food insecurity, Mr. Speaker, is a technical term for the hungry. That's right, there are more than 50 million hungry people in this country. We cannot and we should not stand for this. It is time that we end hunger now.

Certainly, our fragile economy has a lot to do with the high levels of hunger. Millions of people either lost their jobs or saw their wages fall. Food and energy prices went up. For many middle- and low-income families, everyday costs like rent, utilities, and food became more difficult. And in many cases, families were forced to choose between things like food and electricity.

□ 1010

But even before the recession started, tens of millions of Americans went hungry at some point during the year. That, too, is unconscionable. And when we turn this economy around, and our economy will rebound, we need to make sure that people do not fall through the cracks again.

We need to end hunger now. We may not be able to wipe out all disease. We probably can't eliminate all war. But we can end hunger now if we make the commitment to do so. We have the resources. We know what it takes. We just have to muster the will to end hunger once and for all. Hunger is a political condition.

It's important to point out that even though over 50 million people were food insecure, the vast majority had a safety net that prevented them from actually starving. That safety net is called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. Formerly known as food stamps, SNAP is a program that provides low-income families with food that they otherwise could not afford to buy.

Last year, over 47 million families relied on SNAP to feed their families. SNAP is literally a lifeline for these 47 million people who struggle to make ends meet. Now, I don't deny that this is a big number, but it's a big number because it's a big problem.

Mr. Speaker, America's hunger problem would be dramatically worse without SNAP. Just imagine what this country would look like if we didn't have the safety net that SNAP provides for low-income families in this country.

Our churches, our synagogues and mosques do their best to help feed families who need help, but they cannot do it on their own. There are nonprofits and food banks that do as much as they can, but they cannot do it on their own. The private sector simply cannot meet the need.

And with the economy not expected to fully recover for some time, we know that there will continue to be those who struggle to afford food. These are the people we need to worry about, the people we must help, the people who need their neighbors to lend a helping hand.

SNAP, Mr. Speaker, is a helping hand. Relying on SNAP is no walk in the park. It is not champagne and caviar. No, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the average SNAP benefit is less than $1.50 per meal. That doesn't buy a whole lot of healthy, nutritious food.

And there's a common misconception—some would say it's a purposeful mischaracterization—that SNAP promotes a culture of dependency. Some detractors even talk about SNAP like it's a golden ticket, that getting on SNAP is like winning the lottery; everything's taken care of forever.

Give me a break. People don't want a handout. They don't want to rely on government assistance. No, Mr. Speaker, people want to provide for themselves and their families. That's why half of all new SNAP participants receive benefits for 10 months or less, and 74 percent actually left the program entirely within 2 years.

Now, I don't know why there is such a vitriolic opposition to this important program by some here in Congress, nor do I understand why some of my colleagues believe we should balance the budget by cutting programs that help the most vulnerable.

The truth is that without SNAP people would go hungry because they are poor. Eighty-three percent of families on SNAP make less than $24,000 a year for a family of four. Less than $24,000 a year. I challenge anyone in this body to live off that income for a year.

Our budgetary challenges are clear. We need to tackle the debt and the deficit, but we need to do so smartly and with reason. There is a reason not a single bipartisan deficit proposal, from Simpson-Bowles to sequester, cuts SNAP. That's because SNAP is the most effective and efficient anti-hunger program we have. That's because cutting SNAP will literally take the food away from families in this country. That's because the authors of these plans, from liberal Democrats to conservative Republicans, all recognize the importance of this program.

Yet there are those who would want to undermine this and other programs that provide a circle of protection for those in need. It is time for a nationwide effort to end the scourge of hunger.

I call on the President of the United States to coordinate a White House conference on food and nutrition so we

can devise a plan. I call on the leaders of Congress to support such an initiative. We need to do more. End hunger now. End hunger now. End hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, we can do this. We must do this.

CONFIRMATION OF SENATOR CHUCK HAGEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I want to thank President Obama for his nomination of Chuck Hagel to be Secretary of Defense.

While we were home last week, I had the opportunity to watch the Senate confirmation hearing, and I was dismayed by the way many of the Republicans in that hearing chastised Mr. Hagel.

Mr. Hagel is a man of integrity. The question from one of the Senators about, do you think the surge worked, and Senator Hagel was such that he didn't want to give him a direct answer. I would have said, no, it didn't work—1,200 Americans killed, I don't know how many Iraqis. And look at the country today. It's totally falling apart. But that was a question toward Senator Hagel.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war was very unnecessary. It was manufactured by the previous administration, and there was a general, Marine General Greg Newbold, who had been working with the Department of Defense, who actually wrote an article in Time after the war started. And one of the points he made that I'm going to share with you, Mr. Speaker, is ''some of the missteps include the distortion of intelligence in the buildup to the war.'' The distortion of intelligence in the buildup to the war.

In the history of Washington, if ever our government needed integrity, it's now. Chuck Hagel is a man of integrity. No one can question his integrity.

I've had the privilege of knowing Senator Hagel since 2005 when I came out against the unnecessary war in Iraq. Senator Hagel reached out to me in support of my position and encouraged me in my journey to find out the truth, if it was necessary or not.

His record speaks for itself. As a noncommissioned officer, he honorably served this Nation in Vietnam, earning two Purple Hearts, served on the Senate Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as the President's Intelligence Advisory Board and the Secretary of Defense Policy Board. No one can argue Chuck Hagel's experience.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Chuck Hagel is the right man to lead the Department of Defense through this very difficult economic time. He's a man that will uphold the Constitution and do what is right for this country. Our military and the American people need Chuck Hagel to be the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I must say that, in my many years here in Washington, 18 years, I have never known a person with more integrity than Senator Hagel, and I hope that the Senate will pass on the confirmation of Chuck Hagel to be the Secretary of Defense because America needs him, our military needs him, and it's time for people of integrity to step up and help us fix this problem facing our Nation. And he will speak freely and honestly about what is needed to keep a strong military.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Catholic Schools Week and to recognize the outstanding contribution that Catholic schools have made to our Nation. Catholic Schools Week was celebrated last week in schools all across the country.

As a proud graduate of St. Symphorosa Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Prep, and a strong supporter of Catholic education, I, once again this year, introduced a resolution honoring Catholic schools. H. Res. 46 expresses support for ''the vital contributions of the thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States'' and ''the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the Nation.'' I'd like to thank the 28 Members who cosponsored this bipartisan resolution with me.

Since 1974, the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops have organized and planned National Catholic Schools Week. This year's theme, ''Catholic Schools Raise the Standards,'' highlights recent initiatives undertaken by Catholic schools across the country to strengthen their already exemplary standards.

America's Catholic schools produce graduates with the skills and integrity needed by our businesses, governments, and communities, emphasizing a well-rounded educational experience and instilling the values of ''giving back to the community'' and ''helping others.'' Nearly every Catholic school has a community service program, and every year their students volunteer half a million hours to their communities. My own decision to pursue a career in public service was fostered, in part, by dedicated teachers throughout my formative years in Catholic schools.

□ 1020

Today over 2 million elementary and secondary students are enrolled in nearly 7,000 Catholic schools. These students typically surpass their peers in math, science, reading, history, and geography in any NAEP test. The graduation rate for Catholic high school students is 99 percent, and 85 percent of graduates enrolled in four-year colleges, rates well above the national average. As we continually hear disturbing reports of our national test scores, these statistics are truly remarkable and should be commended.

Notably, the success of Catholic schools does not depend on selectivity. Catholic schools accept nine out of every 10 students who apply and are highly effective in providing a quality education to students from every socioeconomic category, especially disadvantaged youth in underserved urban communities. Over the past 30 years, the percentage of minority students enrolled in Catholic schools has more than doubled, and today they constitute almost one-third of all Catholic school students. In times of economic hardship, Catholic schools provide an affordable alternative to other forms of private education.

Now, in addition to producing well-rounded students, it is estimated that Catholic schools save taxpayers over $18 billion annually. The importance of these savings is undeniable as we in Congress, and lawmakers across the country, struggle with budget deficits.

I was born and raised in the Chicago Archdiocese, where more than 87,000 students attend 250 schools. In the Joliet Diocese close by, 22,000 students are educated in 48 elementary and 7 high schools. In my district alone, there are nearly a dozen Catholic high schools and more than 50 grammar schools, including one of the best in my home parish, St. John of the Cross in Western Springs, which last year was named a National Blue Ribbon School by the Department of Education.

The focus of this year's Catholic Schools Week, ''Catholic Schools Raise the Standards,'' demonstrates a continued commitment to excellence. The National Catholic Education Association has launched an initiative called the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools which will make sure that standards are consistently high across the country. The dedicated teachers and administrators who work at Catholic schools, many of whom could earn much more elsewhere, are instrumental in upholding these standards. In recognizing Catholic Schools Week, we pay a special tribute to these professionals who sacrifice so much for their students.

During Catholic Schools Week last week, I visited several schools in my district, including St. Dennis in Lockport, St. Cajetan in Chicago, and St. Alphonsus/St. Patrick in Lemont. At each of these schools, I was able to visit with students and witness the excellent Catholic education that was being instilled by teachers, administrators, pastors, and volunteer parents. The dedication of all those involved in educating these children demonstrated why Catholic schools are so successful

not only in my district but across our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me today in honoring Catholic schools and all they contribute to our Nation.

BIDDING FAREWELL TO TWO MEMBERS OF THE LAS VEGAS MIGHTY FIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to bid a solemn and respectful farewell to Mr. Romeo Barreras and Mr. Silverio Cuaresma. Messrs. Barreras and Cuaresma were residents of southern Nevada and members of the Las Vegas Mighty Five, a group of Filipino American World War II veterans denied benefits and recognition for their service to the United States.

Romeo Barreras volunteered for the Philippine Army at age 17 and served with the infantry as a Guerrilla fighter. He earned a Purple Heart for wounds sustained in action and received an honorable discharge for his service to both the Republic of the Philippines and the United States. Romeo passed away last month at the age of 85.

Silverio Cuaresma was a guerrilla intelligence officer who served under Army Colonel Edwin Ramsey in the 26th calvary. It was this unit that made the last horse charge in cavalry history on January 16, 1942. After his discharge, Silverio took up the cause of his fellow denied veterans and fought for their compensation ever since. That fight ended two weeks ago in Las Vegas. Silverio Cuaresma was 100 years old.

They, along with their countrymen, fought and in many instances died under the command of American troops in the Pacific theater of World War II. After helping the Allies win the war in the Pacific, many of these veterans began seeking the benefits promised to them by President Franklin Roosevelt. But on February 18, 1946, President Harry S. Truman signed the Rescission Act of 1946 into law, which denied over 200,000 Filipino World War II veterans the benefits promised to them just five years earlier by President Roosevelt.

Congress finally acknowledged the dedicated service of many of these denied veterans when it established the Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund in 2009. But many of these veterans, as many as 24,000, still have not received compensation due to bureaucratic hurdles and paperwork shuffles over the types of records they hold verifying their service.

The Mighty Five is now reduced to two with the passing of Romeo and Silverio. We lost Augusto Oppus last year as well. I fear many more will pass without ever obtaining the recognition they deserve if this body does not act to remove the barriers preventing these veterans from receiving the benefits they have earned.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation to ensure that the remainder of the Mighty Five and denied Filipino veterans everywhere finally receive the benefits promised to them so many years ago.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. It directs the Department of the Army to certify the service of any Filipino World War II veteran whose name appears on the Approved Revised Reconstructed Guerrilla Roster or has certified documentation from the U.S. Army or Philippine Government attesting to their service.

Simply put, these men fought so that the Allies could defeat the Japanese in the Pacific. If they can show they fought, let's fulfill our promise to them so they can live out their years knowing that the United States has officially recognized their service.

I have met with the Mighty Five many times in Las Vegas. All they want is to be recognized. It's not about the money to them. They want to know that their service was appreciated, that their sacrifices did not go unnoticed.

As I attended Lieutenant Cuaresma's funeral last week, no flag draped his casket, no honor guard was present, and there was no playing of ''Taps.'' There was no official recognition of his dedicated military service. And that, Mr. Speaker, was wrong.

I would like to thank my friends and brother veterans, Romeo and Silverio, for their service to our country. Their passion and dedication to this cause will be missed. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting to ensure these honorable World War II veterans are appropriately recognized.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, ''gender-based violence''—a phrase the world has coined to speak internationally about violence, abuse, rape, assault, and disrespect of women. Women like our mothers, grandmothers, sisters, aunts, nieces, friends, and most especially our children.

Gender-based violence permeates the world, generally in far away countries, far from the civilized democratic world that we communicate with and befriend.

To the women of this Congress and the women of the world, take a moment to imagine trying to survive without a response from the police, without the ability to press charges and being able to actually see your assailant day after day if you are a victim of gender-based violence. Contemplate life without access to medical care to address your physical, mental, and emotional trauma. Imagine having nowhere to hide.

This scenario sounds like 100 years ago in a world far from our country, but in reality it is just a two-hour flight away from my congressional district of Miami, Florida. It actually describes gender-based violence in Haiti. But through smart policy and the strength and courage of Haitian women, it's a reality that's within our power to change.

□ 1030

The 2010 earthquake in Haiti brought a striking increase in incidents of gender-based violence. Nearly half of the victims are girls under 18, and many cases involve the use of weapons, gang rape, and death threats for seeking help from authorities. These threats, coupled with the lack of police presence and equipment, hurts the integrity of Haiti's legal system and denies women and girls their basic dignity.

The National Penitentiary was destroyed in the earthquake, freeing countless violent prisoners who now roam the streets. Through the determination and grace of the Haitian people and smart assistance from the Obama administration and international NGOs, some change is coming to Haiti. Most of the rubble has been removed, more than a million Haitians have moved out of tent camps, jobs have been created, schools have been built, yet core challenges, including gender-based violence, remain severe.

Today, I am introducing a resolution calling attention to the plight of Haitian women and children and calling for action on their behalf. With its Strategy to Prevent Gender-Based Violence, the Obama administration is on the right track. Congress and the administration must ensure robust funding for these initiatives, including the U.S. Agency of International Development's Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy, to meet the continuing need.

For me, this issue is personal. I have seen the tent cities firsthand. I have spoken to the women. I have counseled the victims and witnessed the scars of indignation and pain. I feel the anguish in my bones, but I also feel the hope.

Let's work together to ensure that no woman in Haiti, no woman in this hemisphere or in this world, has to bear the indignity of sexual violence.

SECOND AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States of America was written to put in statute the limits of government's authority over citizens. It does not bestow rights or permit freedoms upon American people; rather, it delimits what government of the people, by the people, and for the people can and cannot do.

Since well before our country's founding, Americans have exercised the right to keep and bear arms, a right formally protected by the ratification of the Second Amendment in

1791. As a lifelong defender of Second Amendment freedoms, I am committed to ensuring that any new proposals considered in Washington do not infringe upon the constitutionally guaranteed rights of law-abiding citizens.

In the wake of devastating tragedies, well-meaning people feel compelled to do something, and the government, likewise, to intercede. But good intentions don't often make good or constitutional laws, and they certainly are no match for those set on being lawless.

The Second Amendment reads:

> A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

If the text alone were not explicit, our Founding Fathers clarified the purpose of the Second Amendment. James Madison wrote, in Federalist No. 46, that Americans possess:

> the advantage of being armed over the people of almost every other nation whose governments are afraid to trust the people with arms.

Even more applicable to our current situation is this excerpt referenced by Thomas Jefferson, which reads:

> Laws that forbid the carrying of arms disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes. Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants.

The rush to action in the wake of tragedies sadly heaps the price of criminal wrongdoing onto law-abiding, responsible gun owners. When such is the case, government flirts with construing the desire to exercise Second Amendment rights as suspect behavior, it deems some Second Amendment utilities superior to others, and it ignores the root causes of mass violence, focusing instead on the means by which violence is accomplished. Those mistakes must never be made. Federal proposals must be well-thought, data-driven, and constitutionally sound.

The right to keep and bear arms is not one for hunters and sportsmen alone. For centuries, it has been a right for every American citizen to arm themselves to defend their property and the people they hold dear. And it is a right that cannot be infringed.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I can't resist saying the Second Amendment right does not preclude background checks to protect the very people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court ruling last summer on the Affordable Care Act was a victory for all American families—and small businesses especially—by ensuring that our constituents have access to affordable, quality health insurance.

The ruling preserved the integrity of Medicaid partnerships between the States and the Federal Government, giving Governors the option of accepting the Federal Government's generous offer to pay the cost for expanding coverage of low-income residents who might otherwise not have access to health insurance.

Though some of my Republican colleagues remain opposed to the act, I'm pleased to see Republican Governors, including those from Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, and now Governor Kasich in Ohio, putting policy ahead of politics to support this expansion of Medicaid. Those Governors have acknowledged that they were motivated not only by the desire to reduce the number of uninsured, but also by the compelling business case.

Medicaid expansion is part of the vision for a new continuum of coverage that will begin in 2014, when the major provisions from the Affordable Care Act take effect. This will fill the long-standing gap in Medicaid coverage for low-income adults by expanding eligibility for those earning up to 133 percent of the Federal poverty level.

As of 2011, there were 48 million non-elderly uninsured in America. As an incentive for States to expand coverage for those folks, the ACA commits the Federal Government to paying 100 percent of the additional costs of covering them, and after 2016, 90 percent thereafter.

I wrote the Republican Governor of my State and the General Assembly membership urging them to join us in extending this critical health care coverage. The Virginia General Assembly is currently divided on the matter, but I was encouraged last week by the announcement from our Republican Lieutenant Governor, who said:

> There is no State better prepared to move forward with this reform and the coverage expansion of it than the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Like me, Lieutenant Governor Bolling understands the economic benefits for Virginia. Expanding Medicaid will help 300,000 Virginians get access to health care coverage who currently have none and invariably wind up accessing health care through the most expensive portal there is: the emergency room. The cost of that uncompensated care is, of course, borne today by hospitals and those who are insured through their premiums.

The Governor's Advisory Commission on Health Reform said expanding Medicaid, coupled with other reforms in the act, would reduce uncompensated care in Virginia by more than half. Under the Affordable Care Act, Virginia would receive more than $9.2 billion in the first 5 years. A recent State analysis shows that during that same time period Virginia would actually save $300 million by expanding coverage. And Virginia's costs for the first 10 years, now estimated at $137 million, are considerably less than originally estimated and a great return on that investment.

Time is running out, and our residents cannot afford for States to miss this opportunity. In fact, I believe they would be making such a historic mistake that I am proposing an additional incentive to help motivate those Governors who might not yet still be convinced.

This week I introduced the Medicaid Expansion Incentive Act. This simple bill adds a ''use it or lose it'' provision. If a State doesn't want to expand Medicaid coverage, then we will ship those dollars to other States who are willing to partner with us to help defray costs and expand their coverage.

□ 1040

Just so the residents of a particular State are fully aware of how their Governor's decision is affecting them, my bill will require HHS to publicize the list of States that are not partnering with us and giving up this opportunity and the amount of money their Governor has left on the table and the number of uninsured people who will thereby not be covered.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and residents of any State should not be penalized because of their Governor's ideological agenda. The choices we face are momentous. Will we move forward together to implement these historic reforms and reverse the unsustainable trajectory of spiraling prices, or will we let slip this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to help those most in need, realize savings, and spur economic activity? I hope more Republican Governors, including my own, will follow the leader of their colleagues elsewhere and put their citizens' health ahead of partisan orthodoxy.

U VISA REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the year 2000, Congress created the U Visa program as a way to allow illegal immigrant crime victims a temporary—a temporary—legal status in order to assist law enforcement in the prosecution of their assailant, which has helped bring thousands of criminals to justice.

However, over time, the U Visa has become a pathway to citizenship for essentially everyone who applies. The rampant abuse of this program is detrimental to law-abiding individuals who seek to immigrate to our country through the proper legal channels.

We are a Nation of immigrants, and we are also a Nation built upon respect for the rule of law. Our heritage and our principles demand of us the courage to reform our broken immigration system so that those who follow the law and want to contribute to the betterment of our Nation will have the opportunity to do so.

That is why I have introduced the U Visa Reform Act of 2013 to stop abuses in the U Visa program. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense piece of legislation.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring note to the fact that for the fourth time in 5 years, President Obama is, once again, late in delivering his budget to Congress and the citizens of America.

Americans throughout this country tell me over and over again that our national debt is unacceptable. They tell me it is holding America back from achieving economic prosperity and robbing their children of the American Dream. They tell me it's time for Washington to pass a budget.

The President has turned a deaf ear to the pleas of these Americans. He has been asked to take this country's economy seriously. He chooses instead to spend his time in other countries, taking family vacations, and playing countless games of golf.

Hardworking taxpayers know that work must come before play, Mr. President. That is the practice of millions of taxpaying Americans who must foot the bill for Presidential vacations while they forfeit their own vacations due to the uncertainty in the economy.

While the President crisscrosses the world avoiding Americans' top priorities, back at home Americans are nervous. Every year that our country goes without a budget, the national debt skyrockets, the uncertainty for American businesses grows and, with that, unemployment goes up. Without a Federal budget, businessowners cannot plan. They cannot plan for the President's new regulations or his unforeseen tax increases; and, therefore, it is all the more difficult for them to expand their businesses and create jobs in America.

To add to the uncertainty, the President's proposed sequestration is set to take effect this March. Despite his promise—his promise—to the American people that it would never actually happen, the President has yet to take any steps to undo this harmful measure. He has shown absolute indifference to the millions of Americans whose livelihoods would be severely impacted by his sequestration.

House Republicans have twice passed legislation to replace the President's sequester with commonsense reforms that would reduce spending and preserve and strengthen our safety net for future generations and ensure our national defense.

This week, the House will not only renew our commitment to the American people to pass a budget, but it will be a responsible budget that will balance. It will be one that will aim to grow the economy, drive down unemployment, expand opportunity and prosperity for the private sector, and ensure that America maintains its leading role in the world as a strong national defender.

Americans can do this. We just need a President to put work before play.

FREEDOM LEADS TO PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to speak today. I have said it before, and I want to say it again: the job of a Member of Congress is to protect the rights of the people, not take them away.

I want to explain what I mean by that. Those rights are outlined in our Declaration of Independence: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These rights were not given to us by a King or developed after extensive debate by a Congress. They come from God. They exist in the same way that gravity exists. They are natural.

But too often what gets left out is why we must protect those rights and why those rights are still relevant today. The reason is simple, and it's as practical today as it was in 1776: we protect those rights because in America we know that freedom leads to prosperity. Our country was built by Forefathers who believed in, and defended, that idea.

Every generation that came after them has followed their lead, rising to tackle whatever challenge came before them in order to protect the freedom of this Nation. Every American generation has left the country a little better off than they found it and handed it to their sons and daughters with the hope that they would do the same.

Thinking both about those who came before us and those who will follow us long after we're gone is in the very DNA of our country. That's why our Constitution's preamble explicitly states that it doesn't secure liberty for just the founding generation but also for prosperity.

Generations don't simply disappear. Instead, like an aging photograph, they kind of fade away until they are all gone. Right now, one of America's greatest generations is doing just that. In World War II, hundreds of thousands of Americans risked their lives on battlefields half a world away while the rest of them worked and sacrificed at home to make sure our troops had everything they needed.

The reason they acted so valiantly was because they understood the truth to American exceptionalism: that freedom leads to prosperity. They knew it, and they fought for it because it had been passed down to them from their parents, who had received it from their parents and so on. To them it was something worth fighting for, it was worth making sacrifices for, and it was worth dying for. Not a day goes by when I don't think about their sacrifices and remember what they did for me and everyone else in this great country.

They deserve to be taken care of. That is why I urge my fellow Members of the House from both parties to join me in supporting the Full Faith and Credit Act. As we work to cure the government's addiction to debt, we must ensure that the Greatest Generation is protected. They have already made their sacrifices in the defense of our ideals. They have already passed down freedom to us and given us a country that is better off.

We cannot be the first generation to fail America. We must follow the path of our Founding Fathers by preserving the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

One great idea to preserve our great Nation was developed by our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER. In the days before the midterm elections of 2010, Speaker BOEHNER proposed ''taking a different approach'' regarding how Congress voted on budgets. He maintained that rather than having a ''comprehensive budget'' that encompasses all—or at least most of—government appropriations, the whole Congress should treat every budget for each Federal agency as an independent spending bill.

Speaker BOEHNER said:

> Members shouldn't have to vote for big spending increases at the Labor Department in order to fund Health and Human Services. Members shouldn't have to vote for big increases at the Commerce Department just because they support NASA. Each Department and Agency should justify itself each year to the full House and Senate and be judged on its own.

That is the kind of leadership that Americans across this great land support. Those are the types of ideas that we need to enact in order to take on the challenges that are ahead. I urge my fellow Congressmen to appeal to the better angels of their nature as we spend the next few months talking about our government's addiction to debt. Let's solve this problem.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

Loving God, You are compassionate and merciful. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

During these days, when the House itself continues to organize itself for the 113th Congress, we ask Your blessing upon the Members of this assembly,

There are many issues which press upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour

forth an abundance of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding upon the Members of Congress and upon Your people so that, together, solutions for the betterment of our Nation might be forged.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WELCH 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.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 52

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Lofgren and Mr. Vargas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE WHITE HOUSE MUST STICK WITHIN A BUDGET

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 4 years since the White House operated under a budget. It's not a coincidence that each of these 4 years has brought a $1 trillion deficit.

Tennesseans are frustrated over the fact that they must stick to a budget in operating their homes and businesses, yet the Obama administration cannot seem to do the same in running the country with our hard-earned tax dollars.

Last Congress, House Republicans passed two responsible budgets while the Administration and their allies in the Democratic-controlled Senate twiddled their thumbs.

In an effort to finally get this administration to act, Republicans have introduced the Require a PLAN Act. This commonsense proposal will mandate the White House produce a balanced budget within a 10-year window or submit a plan explaining in what year the budget would balance.

Unfortunately, it seems that we have no other choice but to force this administration to finally address the debt crisis that is destroying jobs and mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Family and Medical Leave Act, FMLA. After years of hearing talk about family values, it took President Clinton and the 103rd Congress to adopt policies like FMLA that actually value families.

As many people know, FMLA allows up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave per year due to an employee's own illness, to take care of a sick family member, or to be with a new child. For 20 years, this law has recognized the needs of hardworking families, particularly working women who often are heroically trying to balance their job and their role as primary caregiver.

The latest data from the Department of Labor demonstrate the importance of FMLA. In 2011, over 14 million workers took leave under the Act. And this leave is not disruptive to employers, with 40 percent of workers being away from the job for 10 days or fewer.

I know workers around the country are grateful for the protections of FMLA. Now over 20 years they have felt confident they could take time off as needed without fear of losing their job to care for themselves or their family.

As we debate the fiscal and budgetary issues of the day, I hope FMLA serves as a reminder that we can and should be valuing families, not just in our words, but in our deeds as well.

GOT ROBOT?

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 2012, ''Got Robot?'', FTC Team No. 5037, a group of high school students from Elgin, Illinois, won an award at the FIRST Tech Challenge Illinois State Tournament. Now ''Got Robot?'' will represent Illinois in the FIRST World Championships in St. Louis, Missouri, this upcoming April.

Out of 2,500 participating teams around the world, ''Got Robot?'' is one of only 128 to qualify for the World Championships.

At a time when we need to do everything possible to promote science education and basic scientific research, I'm so thrilled to be able to say that I've met this team, seen the robot, and it's fantastic. We are so proud of these students and we wish their team the best of luck.

Go, ''Got Robot?''.

SPENDING AND BUDGET DEFICITS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider a House Republican message bill that makes a point about spending and budget deficits. The problem is all those who support this bill about spending did all the spending: two tax cuts that gave us the worst period of job growth in the past 75 years and our Nation's worst recession; two wars, unpaid for, that took $1.5 trillion out of the American economy; a drug prescription program, unpaid for, cost $1 trillion over ten years.

The big spenders, who falsely claim to be concerned about the job creators are, in fact, the debt and deficit makers.

RESPONSIBLE BUDGETING

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, last week unemployment rose to 7.9 percent, and consumer confidence in the economy fell to a 14-month low. During the last 3 months of 2012, the economy shrank for the first time since the depths of the Great Recession.

All of these indicators confirm what the American people know all so well: the economy is still suffering. And yet the President began the new year by raising taxes on hardworking Americans and by closing down his jobs council, confirming another thing that Americans know all too well as well: that Washington truly is disconnected from the struggles of hardworking families who pay their taxes, work hard, and are struggling just to survive.

Now the President is calling for even more revenues to pay for $4 trillion in new debt that he has heaped on the backs of hardworking Americans during the past 4 years.

More and more, my constituents in south Alabama tell me they don't want to charge more money in their names as taxes rise and red ink pours from the streets of Washington, D.C.

While the House has passed responsible budgets for the last 2 years, it's

time for the President and the Democrat Senate to do the same.

□ 1210

NRA LIST OF ANTI-GUN INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. MORAN. The AARP, the American Medical Association, the Episcopal Church, the Catholic Conference, the Conference of Mayors, Bob Barker, Oprah Winfrey, Tony Bennett, the Kansas City Chiefs, the Sara Lee Corporation, and hundreds of other individuals and organizations all have something in common: they're all targeted on NRA's Web site as holding anti-gun positions.

And what does the NRA consider to be anti-gun? For one, they say that the listed individuals and groups are opposed to the ''repeal of the Brady Act.'' It's not that they support expanding background checks to include all gun sales, which would seem to be reasonable; it's that they're opposed to the repeal of the current Brady Act which would end all background checks.

With over 30,000 Americans killed every year by guns, it seems that this is the time for swift and focused action to mitigate our Nation's gun violence epidemic. It's not time to be drawing up an enemies list of those who support reasonable gun safety measures. I'd suggest to some of my colleagues in the House: with enemies like these, perhaps it's time to rethink who your friends are.

PRAISING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ADELE HALL

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the life and legacy of a personal hero of mine. Adele Hall was one of the kindest, warmest and friendliest people I have ever known. Yesterday, Adele was laid to rest amongst the outpouring of family and friends who were touched and inspired by the heartwarming and graceful life that Adele led.

Called the first lady of Kansas City, Adele and her adoring husband, Don, have been staples of the Kansas City community for a generation, providing irreplaceable leadership in both business and civic affairs.

Her obituary states in part:

> Adele was interested in a broad range of community needs with a special passion for the needs of children. She was tireless working toward those interests in any capacity needed—as a visionary board chairman, energetic champion and catalyst for change, hardworking committee member, dedicated fundraiser or hands-on volunteer.

We will forever miss Adele's good deeds in our community; but, most of all, I will miss her smile. To Adele Hall, thank you for your life of inspirational leadership. You have forever found a place in our hearts.

BATTLE OF THE BUDGETS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. So in the middle of a busy legislative week, the Republicans are going to bring up a bill to require the President to submit a balanced budget. It would be good if first perhaps they looked in the mirror, because this comes from the same House Republicans who in the last Congress passed the Ryan budget which got great accolades from the right.

Unfortunately, the Ryan budget, even with directed scoring, that is, made-up numbers, the pretend ''if you cut taxes, you'll increase revenues,'' wouldn't pretend to balance a budget until 2040—and that was after it did away with Medicare, student financial aid, and a few other domestic programs.

Now let's get real around here. One-third of the deficit is due to high unemployment. We need a strategy to put Americans back to work. That requires investment—investment in education, investment in our roads, bridges, highways, transit systems, jetties, levees, dams, and harbors across the country. That would put Americans back to work. That would get this country moving again, not a bunch of fake bills about a budget that they have no intention of balancing.

UPHOLDING OUR SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, the victims of the recent tragedy in Newtown, Connecticut, and the victims of the other recent shootings deserve our solemn prayers for their loss and our deepest sympathy for their pain.

As a Nation, we should focus our collective grief and attention on finding actual solutions to prevent such tragedies in the future. But gun bans are not the answer. History shows that gun bans only keep guns away from law-abiding citizens, not criminals. Blaming a gun for violence is like blaming a pen for a misspelled word.

Mr. Speaker, this week President Obama hosted his latest in an unfortunate series of anti-gun pep rallies. This Nation does not need more political posturing. Instead, we need a serious discussion about how we address mental health as a Nation, and we need to take action to better protect our children in their schools.

I stand ready to protect the Second Amendment rights of our citizens and work with anyone who will support policies that could actually stop future violence.

HONORING JOAN MULHERN

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

Mr. WELCH. I rise to honor a person whose time was short, but whose contribution was great. Joan Mulhern passed away this past December at the age of 51. Joan graduated from the University of Vermont, and she very quickly made a name for herself as a fierce and extremely effective advocate for the environment in her position with the Vermont Public Interest Research Group.

Although Joan then left Vermont to pursue a law degree here in Washington, D.C., and later went on to a very successful and effective career at Earth Justice, Vermont never left Joan.

The values with which she pursued her passion for a clean environment and for a sustainable environment were ones Vermonters know well. She was relentless, she was tenacious, she was tireless, she was kind, and she was very effective.

As Joan's friends have noted, she would have been uncomfortable with all the tributes that have been paid to her, but she'll have to give us a pass on this one because she certainly lived a life worthy of praise and honor.

ADDRESSING THE BUDGET CRISIS

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, every day, hardworking families and small businessowners from the Second District of Missouri create budgets, set priorities, and live within their means. Yet President Obama and the Senate Democrats keep writing blank checks on the backs of our children and our grandchildren.

Yesterday marked the fourth time in the last 5 years that President Obama has missed his deadline to submit a budget on time to the American people, and the Democrat-led Senate has only exacerbated the debt crisis by not passing a budget in almost 4 years. This is simply unacceptable, and House Republicans stand prepared to address this crisis and offer a responsible budget again this year.

American families deserve better than missed deadlines, more spending, and more debt. They deserve answers and accountability. This week, the House will vote to require the President to show a plan of exactly when and how he would balance the Federal budget.

The 113th Congress was elected to tackle the big problems, and there is no greater problem facing our Nation right now than our out-of-control spending and debt.

HONORING JACK DYSON OF THE RENDEZVOUS

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

Mr. COHEN. Memphis, Tennessee, has an iconic restaurant known worldwide, the Rendezvous. And it's iconic because it's got great ribs, many artifacts about the mid-South, but also a great wait staff that makes everybody feel at home. One of those iconic waiters, Jack Dyson, will be retiring after 45 years.

Jack is 78 years old, and he will retire this week after serving millions of customers from Presidents and First Ladies to the Rolling Stones, to Bill Cosby, and to regular people that come in and are made to feel at home when they come to the Rendezvous for the world-class fare. Jack Dyson has made me feel at home. He's a part of the Rendezvous. When he retires, part of the Rendezvous will go with him.

I thank Jack for his service to his country as a Korean war veteran and to his service to the world at the world-famous Rendezvous.

HONORING BUCKS PROMISE FOR YOUTH AND COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding efforts of an organization in my district in Pennsylvania, Bucks Promise for Youth and Communities. This group is being honored February 7 by the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, which is the Nation's leading substance abuse prevention organization, representing over 5,000 community anti-drug coalitions across the country.

Bucks Promise for Youth and Communities will be receiving the Dose of Prevention Award, an esteemed award which acknowledges community-based organizations that have taken the initiative to raise awareness of the dangers of prescription drug abuse and over-the-counter cough medicine abuse.

Bucks Promise for Youth and Communities consists of individuals who truly exemplify leadership and ingenuity. They have made tremendous strides in educating my district on the dangers of medicine abuse through take-back events and townhall-style community discussions. I congratulate them and applaud the continuous efforts to bring this crucial issue to the forefront of our community.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, later this week, the United States Senate will pick up where Congress left off by passing the Violence Against Women Act. As a cochair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, every day victims' advocates do the hard work of making sure their voices are heard for the assistance of the programs authorized under the Violence Against Women Act.

Last year alone, the Marjaree Mason Center of Fresno, which I have worked with over the years, and the Valley Crisis Center in Merced provided emergency housing for over 1,100 women and children in their time of need.

We have learned a lot from victims' rights advocates and law enforcement since the law was enacted in 1994. It's time we used those lessons to put the safety of all crime victims first and stop playing politics.

Now the House must follow the Senate's lead by quickly adopting this measure to show that protecting victims is a top priority of this Congress.

□ 1220

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the anniversary of the Family and Medical Leave Act, a critical law that has helped Americans balance the demands of work and family for 20 years.

Over these last two decades, FMLA has helped to foster strong family relationships, ensuring parents could take time with a new child, allowing workers to care for older family members, and permitting military families the time to prepare for new deployments. For this, we are all grateful.

But we must remember that FMLA is only the first step to helping our working families. Too many are still without FMLA's protections, and millions who are eligible can't afford to take unpaid leave.

As we reflect on 20 years of great success, let's recommit to improving this program going forward to help keep all American families strong.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, Monday, November 26, 2012, is a great day for the residents of my town. New York City went 24 hours without a single person being injured or killed by gun violence. That day, the Brownsville section of Brooklyn within my district, which has experienced more shooting victims last year than any other part of the city, saw a most-needed reprieve from the violence it experiences on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, women and children are gunned down every day in urban communities across the country by illegal handgun violence. In fact, on average, more than 100,000 people in the United States are shot and killed with a gun annually. This is endemic in communities of color where illegal handgun violence has become a very serious public health issue. These numbers are unacceptable, especially in a State and city with some of the strictest gun laws in the Nation.

Lastly, gun violence is not an inevitable problem, yet it continues to plague our communities. We owe it to the people we represent and to future generations to act with urgency and conviction to put an end to this senseless pattern of gun violence.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues today in Congress, the American people, and our President to say that now is the time to end the senseless gun violence that has plagued our neighborhoods from the streets of Compton and Chicago to the schools and movie theaters in Newtown and Aurora.

Now is the time to pass legislation that is necessary to protect our children and our families from these repeated patterns of senseless gun violence. Our children should not have to live in fear while learning their ABCs or college algebra or innocently waiting at a bus stop after school or seeing a movie. I believe America is ready to take commonsense steps to keep our families and our communities safe.

Today, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to move quickly and support President Obama's comprehensive gun violence prevention plan that calls for universal background checks and a ban on those military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines that have no place in our neighborhoods.

We must continue to take concrete steps toward keeping Americans safe. The time is now.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, there are many details yet to divine as we bring our laws in line with our values in the coming debate over immigration reform, but I caution my colleagues against using additional enforcement and security measures as a condition and a pretext to delay much-needed reform.

While we should always seek to improve the security of this country in ways that are consistent with our Constitution, I remind my colleagues of our efforts and the cost borne by border communities as we have worked to secure the border in the years since 9/11.

After we have spent billions on border walls, seen record-high deportations and record-low immigrant apprehensions, endured endless lines at our international ports of entry that threaten to destroy our economy and our way of life, it is time to focus on immigration reform and the secure, legal flow of people and trade.

The people of El Paso, Texas, a city of immigrants that was recently ranked as the safest in the United States, can tell you this: pass comprehensive immigration reform, and you will have true border security.

THE DANGERS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to caution again about the dangers of sequestration.

In a few short weeks, automatic across-the-board spending cuts will take place. If allowed, they could forestall our economic recovery. Not only will these cuts cripple many effective programs, but across-the-board cuts on top of already large budget reductions will impact the Department of Defense.

Yes, we need to make strategic budget reductions, eliminate or reduce ineffective programs, and begin to bring our budget under control. But we need to do this in a responsible way, and automatic sequestration cuts are irresponsible.

In my community, we will feel an immediate impact. If sequestration hits, programs that are essential to keeping our community safe and secure would face an automatic 8.2 percent cut. The COPS program in Sacramento would lose over $1.5 million in funding, which would hurt local law enforcement and impact our community safety.

Yes, we need to get our budget under control. We need to reduce our deficit and begin paying down our debt. But irresponsible across-the-board sequestration cuts are not the way to do it.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, America's manufacturing sector has played an invaluable role over the last century in propelling our economy and creating a strong and vibrant middle class.

Manufacturing continues to be a bright spot in our economic recovery. Since 2010, the U.S. has added over half a million manufacturing jobs. That's progress. But in a time where millions of Americans continue to struggle, we can and must do more.

Congress should be working every day to rebuild our economy and create good paying jobs right here in America, not overseas. That's why I support the Make it in America agenda, which will strengthen manufacturing and rebuild our infrastructure. It will also maintain our Nation's leadership in innovation and educate a 21st century workforce.

The Make it in America agenda is a real jobs plan for this country. Democrats stand ready to act.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and all Americans cannot wait any longer.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 5, 2013 at 10:58 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 227.

Appointments:

Commission on Long-Term Care.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 444, REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 48

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today, as you heard from the Clerk, on House Resolution 48, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 444, which is the Require a PLAN Act. This is a resolution that will require that the President, if he doesn't submit a budget that ultimately comes to balance, submit then a supplementary budget that shows how he would bring the budget to balance.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we've been grappling with serious budget challenges throughout this President's administration. We go back to FY 2009, the very first year of the administration; the deficit tripled the previous record-high deficit in this country to $1.4 trillion. It was $1.3 trillion in FY 2010, $1.3 trillion in FY 2011, $1.2 trillion in FY 2012. And, Mr. Speaker, there's no plan that the administration has produced to get us from where we are—fiscal irresponsibility—to a point in the future of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we've been doing our part here in the House. We've been proud to work together across the aisle in order to pass budgets that tackle

those hard challenges that are ahead of us. If you read the President's comments, Mr. Speaker, you will see that he recognizes the challenges are hard. The question is: Are we going to deal with those or not?

I hold here, Mr. Speaker, a speech that the President made to the Democratic National Convention on September 6, 2012, where he said this:

> I will use the money that we're no longer spending on war to pay down our debt and put more people back to work.

And my notes here said that it was followed by extended cheers and applause. I expect my friend from Massachusetts supports that spirit wholeheartedly, that, ''I will use the money we're no longer spending on war to pay down our debt and put more people back to work.''

But, Mr. Speaker, I also hold in my hand a transcript from the Budget Committee, on which I have the pleasure of sitting, when we had the President's Treasury Secretary come before the Budget Committee to explain the budget, and I said this:

> Can you tell me just in simple terms—in true or false terms, this budget never, ever, ever reduces the debt, is that right?

Treasury Secretary Geithner:

> Uh, that is correct. It does not go far enough to bring down the debt, not just as a share of the economy, but overall. You're right.

I then said this:

> It doesn't bring down the debt at all.

Mr. Speaker, that's the conflict that we face here as a people, as a country. Not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as a people. On the one hand, what our politicians are saying is we're going to use the money to pay down our debt. But what the reality is is that proposals are coming out today that never, ever, ever pay down a penny of debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to see that for yourself, you can look. The President's budgets each year are posted online on the OMB Web site. In fact, the very first one he submitted—I hold the cover page here—it was called ''A New Era of Responsibility.'' ''A New Era of Responsibility'' is the first budget that the President ever submitted. But as I go through that budget, Mr. Speaker, what I see is projections for 2020, for 2030, for 2040, for 2060, and for 2080.

Mr. Speaker, hear that. You have got young children—2020, 2030, 2040, 2060, and 2080—and in each one of those years, according to the President's budget, not only does the budget never balance under his plan, but it continues to get worse. 2020, 2030, 2040, 2050, 2060, 2080—the President's budget. And I think that comes as news to so many of us, Mr. Speaker, I confess, because I've listened to the speeches, just as my friend from Massachusetts has, where we talk about getting the deficit under control, where we talk about paying down the debt. Only when you get into the plan, do you see that we never pay down one penny.

So this rule today, Mr. Speaker, would allow us to take up a bill that would require the President for the very first time to submit a balanced budget. It doesn't have to balance the way I would balance it. It doesn't have to balance the way you would balance it. But to submit a balanced budget. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, the statute actually required the President submit his budget yesterday. He's going to miss that deadline, but I'm expecting it soon and I'm looking forward to reading it soon. It's so that we actually give the American people a plan.

□ 1310

I want to say—because we heard it in the Rules Committee last night, and I believe my friend from Massachusetts brought it up and he was absolutely right—the history of debt and deficits in this country, Mr. Speaker, is not a mark of shame on the Democratic Party and it is not a mark of shame on the Republican Party; it is a mark of shame on all of us collectively.

Candidly, you and I here, Mr. Speaker, in the big freshman class of 2010, I'm less interested in finding out who to blame and I'm more interested in finding out who has a solution to solve the problem. This House passed a solution to solve the problem. I'd like to see the Senate create a solution. I'd like to see the President create a solution. I'd like to see us discuss that solution as the American people, Mr. Speaker.

There were 14 amendments submitted to this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. We heard testimony on that in the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, six of those 14 amendments were nongermane; we were not able to make those in order. But we did make in order three Republican amendments, one Democratic amendment, and one bipartisan amendment. In fact, all the Members who came to the Rules Committee yesterday to testify on behalf of their amendments, we were able to make those amendments in order.

Mr. Speaker, all this bill does, should it become law, is require that if the President doesn't submit a balanced budget—it's certainly my great hope that he will, but if he doesn't, he share with the American people—again, not in 5 years, not in 10 years—whatever number he believes is the right way to set priorities, tell the American people what steps he will take to get us back on track.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, it's unconscionable that we can look at projections going out to 2080 and have folks never, ever, ever pay down one penny of debt. Contrast that with what we did here in the House of Representatives, where with a budget that passed this House, the bipartisan vote that passed that budget, passed the only budget that passed anywhere in this town, not only would we have balanced the budget in that time frame, Mr. Speaker, we would have paid back every penny of our $16.4 trillion Federal debt.

That's no small conversation. It's a conversation that's long overdue on this House floor. It's a conversation that has been too long ignored by both Democrats and Republicans, and I'm pleased to be here today to take that up with my friend from Massachusetts, and then later on, the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this restrictive rule and to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

The process here is awful. The bill before us was not even considered by the Budget Committee. They didn't hold a single hearing, no markup, and on a party-line vote last night the Rules Committee denied Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the opportunity to offer a meaningful substitute. The Rules Committee also, on a party line, voted against an open rule. To all of the Republican freshmen and sophomores who campaigned on the need for openness and transparency, by voting for this rule, you are officially part of the problem.

This bill before us isn't a meaningful attempt to address the budget; it's a gimmick wrapped in talking points inside a press release.

Two weeks ago, this House passed the so-called ''No Budget, No Pay Act,'' then they went on another recess. There wasn't a holiday, mind you. I guess it was the Super Bowl recess. Now they're back with today's bill. It calls on the President to tell Congress when his budget will come into balance. If his budget doesn't say when it will come into balance, then he must submit a supplemental statement telling Congress when it will come into balance.

Why are we doing this? Because the President is late submitting his budget for the next fiscal year. Okay, fine. The President should submit a budget on time, and I support that. But lost in all of this Republican budget Kabuki theater is the truth: the reason the administration is late with their budget is because they just spent months trying to avert the disaster that was the fiscal cliff.

As the Speaker was trying in vain to corral House Republicans into doing the right thing, we had Plan B and Plan C and Plan—who knows what. Finally, we reached a deal on January 1, technically after we went over the cliff. In the meantime, back in the real world, we are less than 24 calendar days away from the disastrous sequester taking effect—less than 24 calendar days from massive, arbitrary, and devastating cuts to defense and nondefense

discretionary programs, cuts to jobs programs and medical research and education, cuts to military personnel and law enforcement, cuts that will cost jobs and do real harm to the American economy as it struggles to recover.

And the reality is that we don't even have that much time. We only have 9 legislative days left in February to address the issue, 9 days to negotiate a trillion-dollar deal with the Senate and the President. And instead of a meaningful plan to address the crisis that we need to avert, we have this nonsense before us today. This is no way to govern.

The disturbing truth is that many Republicans seem downright giddy when it comes to the sequester cuts. There is news story after news story about how the Republicans are going to allow the sequester to take effect. In the Rules Committee last night, the author of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, couldn't support these cuts fast enough. I was shocked.

Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that the economic numbers for the fourth quarter of 2012 were released. Unexpectedly, we saw a contraction in those numbers, a contraction fueled by a massive reduction in defense spending. What do you know: huge cuts in government spending during a fragile economic recovery damage economic growth. The Republican response is to double down on this stupid.

These Republican games of Russian roulette with the American economy must come to an end. It is time to replace short-term partisan political interests with the greater good.

The President today is asking us to consider a thoughtful, balanced plan to stop the sequester. I urge the Republican leadership to bring that plan to the floor of the House for a vote as soon as possible. That's what the American people want and that's what they deserve: a real plan. The bill before us today isn't it, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Massachusetts because he's highlighting exactly what our challenges are and exactly why it's so important that we pass both the rule and H.R. 444 today. He went through item after item after item that have absolutely tied our economy up in knots. Short-term problems and short-term solutions are trumping the discussion of long-term problems and long-term solutions.

The sequester that he mentioned, Mr. Speaker, do you know that it was the month of May last year that this House first passed a replacement to the sequester? Now, as you know and as history has recorded, the Senate never acted on any replacement of a sequester, and now we talk about what happened on January 1 as if it was something that was created by this House, as if that fiscal cliff was something that this House invented. In fact, we have a very proud history, bipartisan history, of looking further down the road to try to find the best answers and the best solutions to very serious problems. But we can't do it alone, Mr. Speaker.

One of the great successes we've had just early in this year—and by ''we,'' I mean this entire House, the people's House—is that we appear to have persuaded the Senate to pass a budget for the first time in 4 years. All indication is that this year, unlike last year and the year before that and the year before that, this year they're going to pass a budget to lay out their plan.

But what does it say, Mr. Speaker, about this House, about this process, about the future of this country that it's controversial whether or not the President of the United States should introduce a budget that balances ever? That's the debate today, Mr. Speaker. That's how out of touch Washington has become. That's how confused the speeches have been written. We're debating whether or not the President should introduce a budget that ever balances. I'm advocating, yes, he should. Others are advocating, no, that shouldn't be a requirement; when you take the oath to fully execute the laws of the land, when you take the oath to faithfully protect and defend the United States of America, it shouldn't be a requirement that you balance budgets. In fact, you should be free, not just for 10 years, not just for 20 years, not just for 40 years, not just for 80 years, but forever to deficit spend, to borrow from a generation of children and a generation of grandchildren to pay for our wants today, taking away from their needs tomorrow.

□ 1320

This rule debate is going to come to a close in 40 minutes and we're going to vote. Then if the rule passes, we're going to go into a vote on the underlying bill. There are going to be ''no'' votes on the board that say, no, the President should never have to explain to the American people how we're going to make our fiscal tomorrow better than our fiscal today.

I would like to change his mind, Mr. Speaker, but for now I'm going to focus on changing the minds right here in this Chamber. Because if there is anything that unites us in this body, rather than divides us, it is a true love of this country. And I challenge anyone, Mr. Speaker, to define their love of our freedoms and of our country in a way that allows us to continue borrowing from the next generation forever.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter sent to the Honorable PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, from the Executive Office of the President in the Office of Management and Budget which explains why the President's budget for this year is delayed—because of the theatrics that my friends on the other side forced us to go through to avoid going over a fiscal cliff. So I think it's understandable why the budget may be a little late.

And I would say to the gentleman, submitting a budget is not controversial. What is controversial to me is the fact that so many of my friends on the other side want to go over this sequester cliff in which millions of jobs will be lost. That to me is controversial. We should be about protecting jobs and creating jobs.

My friends have budgetary plans that would throw people out of work, and I find that unconscionable. I find that unconscionable. We should be about lifting this country up, not trying to put people down.

And the plans that have been proposed by my friends on the other side, including this kind of giddiness about the prospect of going over the sequestration cliff, would cost millions of people in this country jobs. It would hurt our economy.

That's not the way we want to govern. That's what is controversial on our side. We don't want people to lose their jobs. We want people to keep their jobs, and we want to create an economy that creates more jobs.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter dated January 9, 2013, requesting information on when the Administration will submit the President's fiscal year (FY) 2014 Budget.

For over a year and a half, the Administration has been working with Congress to forge agreement on a plan that would both grow our economy and significantly reduce the deficit. The Administration continues to seek a balanced approach to further deficit reduction that cuts spending in a responsible way while also raising revenues.

As you know, the protracted ''fiscal cliff'' negotiations that led to enactment of H.R. 8, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, created considerable uncertainty about revenue and spending for 2013 and beyond. The Act resolved a significant portion of this uncertainty by making permanent the temporary rates on taxable income at or below $400,000 for individual filers and $450,000 for married individuals filing jointly; permanently indexing the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption to the Consumer Price Index; extending emergency unemployment benefits and Federal finding for extended benefits for unemployed workers for one year; continuing current Medicare payment rates for physicians' services through December 31, 2013; extending farm bill policies and programs through September 30, 2013; and providing a postponement of the Budget Control Act's sequestration for two months. However, because these issues were not resolved until the American Taxpayer Relief Act was enacted on January 2, 2013, the Administration was forced to delay some of its FY 2014 Budget preparations, which in turn will delay the Budget's submission to Congress.

The Administration is working diligently on our budget request. We will submit it to Congress as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. ZIENTS,
Deputy Director for Management.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do love my country, and my country is begging me, as I'm sure it is all other Members of Congress, to for heaven's sake get some of this taken care of and have some certainty.

Talking with constituents just this morning, they were saying they simply don't know what to do. And what we're doing here again is just theater, as my colleague pointed out. This isn't a plan. It's a gimmick, and it has wasted valuable time.

CBS News reported last year that it cost $24 million a week to operate the House of Representatives. On behalf of the taxpayers who pay those bills, we should be debating some serious legislation and come up with serious answers to our Nation's problems.

And everybody has known from their grammar school days that the way we pass a bill is that the House proposes a bill, the Senate proposes a bill, they go through the committee processes, they are passed on through the committee, the subcommittees, then the major committee, then to the Rules Committee, in our case, and then we have a conference and we send it to the President. We don't do that anymore.

The last two bills we dealt with on this floor just came directly to the Rules Committee. There was no committee action whatsoever, there was no discussion, there was no input.

And yesterday, what really I think grieves me most is that there was a wonderful substitute put forward with great sincerity by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think he's respected by all sides, and most of this country, for his wisdom and for his acuity. But could they put his substitute in order? No. They said they had to have a waiver. Well, that's what the Rules Committee is for. That's what the Rules Committee does.

The Budget Committee itself has had at least 18 waivers in the last term. It just defies imagination. But this is $24 million again this week, where we're brought in from all of the corners of the United States at an expense to stand here and do absolutely nothing.

If they want to know what the President wants to do, they should call him up and ask him. We don't have to do a resolution or a bill on the floor of the House to find that out if that's so important. What a crazy thing that we could do in this time of communication to say this is the way we're going to try to find out something—and find out what?

The drastic across-the-board spending cuts are going to take effect on March 1. Now, the week after next we're taking another week off. We work about two and a half days here. It's really unfortunate. I think I can use that word without being called down, but I have much stronger words in my head. But instead of solving that looming crisis, again, they propose legislation that tries to change the subject. Try as they might, they can't hide from the fact that they are failing to provide help when American people need it most.

Mr. Speaker, we are days away from a serious self-inflicted wound.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you.

If the pending sequester were to take effect, there will be such drastic cuts to important programs, not only domestically, but as you heard Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense, say, it would ''hollow out'' the military and leave our military fighting with one hand tied behind its back. Why would we do that? For no earthly reason why in the world would we put the United States through that? Taken together, these cuts, as was said before, would destroy jobs, reverse our economic recovery, just reverse it, and destroy the middle class.

To get a glimpse of what drastic spending cuts would do to our economy, just look back to the end of 2012. As leading economists of the White House Council of Economic Advisers and President Obama have all pointed out, the drastic spending cuts at the end of last year are the leading causes—the leading causes—of our recent economic stagnation. Should the sequester take effect, our economy would suffer even more, and jobs would be lost as deeper and deeper spending cuts take effect.

Is that the path the majority wants to walk down? Because if they keep spending our time debating stupid legislation like this, we're going to find ourselves on that path before too long.

I agree with Mr. MCGOVERN that many of our colleagues seem to want to go off that cliff for some kind of foolish exercise, knowing full well what is going to happen, and that is really shameful.

Yesterday, our Democratic colleagues and I proposed legislation that would stop the sequester with Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute, but, no, they would not do that. It was simply tossed aside.

The majority chose to move forward with this restrictive and partisan process, closed rule again, that ignores the problems before us and moves forward with a political gimmick.

As the clock continues to tick, I urge my colleagues to stop those gimmicks and get back to work. Again, the people I spoke with just today are saying over and over again some certainty has to be in this government. People have to know what the economic situation is going to be. We do not want to play Russian roulette in here with the American economy day after day and week after week.

I urge my colleagues to stop wasting valuable time and let's provide that certainty.

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

I just want to say to my friend from New York, for whom I do have tremendous respect and value her counsel, to call this a stupid piece of legislation I think really misses the point about what we're doing here.

I would encourage you to ask your constituents in New York, and, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage you to ask your constituents back home, do folks realize, because I didn't, that in the four years that the President has been President of the United States, the budgets that he has introduced come to balance never?

My friends on the other side are making a persuasive case, Mr. Speaker, for why it is they would support doing things with different priorities than I would support doing things. And that's absolutely going to be true. When we debate the budget resolution, we're going to have different approaches for getting to balance. But the President's budgets never get there. If we give him every spending cut he asks for, if we give him every tax increase he asks for, if we do absolutely everything that the budget that he is required by law to submit requests, we will begin to pay down the first penny of debt never.

□ 1330

In fact, if we do absolutely everything that the budget he is required by law to submit to us asks, the debt will continue to grow forever.

I agree with so much of what my friends on the other side are saying about the sequester, about the fiscal cliff. That's why we acted in May in this body. That's why we acted in August in this body on this tax bill. That's why we passed another sequester replacement in August. That's why we passed another one in December. I agree. But can't we also agree that if you're going to be Commander in Chief of America, if you're going to be the President of the United States, if you're going to uphold and defend the Constitution—and we have our former Joint Chief of Staff Chairman telling us that our greatest national security threat is our growing debt—shouldn't it be fair to ask the President to tell us when, if ever, he plans to begin paying back the first penny?

Mr. Speaker, it's not a stupid piece of legislation that we're dealing with today. What's almost laughably ridiculous is that it's controversial.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I believe the gentleman has much more time. I will be happy to reserve the balance of my time, though, and allow my friend to control.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I see a number of my colleagues have come to speak, so I'm going to be as brief as I can.

I know that the chair of the Budget Committee has said that he can balance the budget in 10 years, which most economists and people say would certainly throw us into the worst depression, worse than 1929.

I believe that what we are doing here—I can't prove it—but my suspicions are that this is something intended to cover that. They're trying to get the President into that trick box or something to try to do the same thing.

Don't go, Mr. President. We can do better than that.

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

The issue is not whether the President should submit a budget. He should. And he would have submitted a budget by now, but because of the theatrics that my friends on the other side put us through dealing with the fiscal cliff, which was just solved on January 1, things are a little bit delayed. The issue is why is the House wasting time on this while the sword of the sequester hangs over the American people?

The President can submit any budget he wants. That's what the President has the right to do, just like George Bush submitted whatever budget he wanted to do.

We have a job here in this House, and that is to address this looming fiscal crisis called the sequester. What we're doing here today is doing nothing at all to move that ball forward.

In less than a month, arbitrary cuts are going to go into effect, people are going to lose their jobs, and this economy is going to go into a deeper slump. For the life of me, I can't understand why there's not more urgency. We shouldn't be taking vacations. We actually should be working here and trying to resolve this. This is stupid legislation because it is not addressing the crisis. It is doing nothing to advance the cause of trying to get to a solution. This is just a press release. This is yet another gimmick.

I think the reason why Congress and especially the House of Representatives is held in such low regard is because we spend so much time on trivial matters debating passionately, and we skip over debating the important things. We ought to be doing something important here today. We ought to be trying to avert this sequestration. We ought to be trying to keep people in their jobs. And we ought to be trying to create an economy that will create more jobs, not this theater.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there's a reason that we're spending so much time talking about things other than the underlying bill, other than the rule. The reason is because the rule is a good rule, and the bill is a good bill. We can use this time for the political theater that my friend from Massachusetts appears to disdain, but I would say he's got a talent for it and he should not disdain it so rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, we handled the sequester in May. I hope whenever my friend from Massachusetts refers to his friends on the other side, he means the other side of the Chamber, not the other side of this House, because we, you and I, acted, Mr. Speaker, to solve those issues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is the 113th Congress. We haven't done one thing to solve this fiscal crisis that's looming on March 1st. This is the 113th.

Under the Constitution, when a new Congress begins, we have to start all over again. Okay?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, my friend is exactly right. Of all of the multiple efforts that we did last year that were all rejected by the other side, we have not recreated those efforts again this year. He's exactly right.

What we have done, however, is created a pathway that's going to produce the first budget on the Senate side, the first opportunity for the bodies to come together in conference.

My friend from New York tells us about, I'm just a bill and what schoolchildren are learning all over America. Mr. Speaker, they're going to have to learn on TV because they have not seen it in this town. We can't. We can't go to conference on a budget unless the Senate passes one. And this year, Mr. Speaker, as governed by the rule book, the United States Constitution that I have right here in my hand, we're going to be able to get that done. That's the kind of work this House is doing. That's the groundwork that we're laying.

My friend from New York is exactly right, Mr. Speaker, when she says that this body, led by Chairman RYAN on the Budget Committee, is going to produce a budget so serious and so responsible, it's going to come to balance, the balance the American people are demanding, faster than any other budget we have seen in this President's administration.

All we're asking, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't it seem reasonable to let the President submit any budget he wants to? We don't want to change the budget he's submitting at all, but just to share with the American people because they don't know when they come to balance.

Who knew, Mr. Speaker, when the budget was entitled a ''New Era of Responsibility,'' that it wasn't going to come to balance in 80 years? Who knew? I didn't. There are people in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, who did not know that in 4 years of his Presidency, this President has never, ever—assuming a world where he gets everything that he wants—crafted a plan that begins to pay back the very first penny of our debt. That's dangerous, Mr. Speaker.

This bill can put a stop to that process. That is why I know it's going to get support here in the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing. It does absolutely nothing. It's a press release.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's replacement for the sequester, which was blocked yesterday in the Rules Committee.

My friend from Georgia talks about this being a good rule and a good process. This bill was not even considered by the Budget Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction. It had no hearing. It had no markup. It mysteriously appeared at the Rules Committee. We wanted an open rule, and we were denied an open rule. Mr. VAN HOLLEN actually had a substantive amendment to replace the sequester. That was denied.

So I want to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, to discuss his amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, who said it exactly right. This unfortunately is another political gimmick we've seen from our Republican colleagues, and it is exactly why the American people hate this Congress so much.

Rather than doing something to create jobs, rather than doing something to help support the economy, this does absolutely nothing other than point fingers at the President because his budget is a little late and then tell the President that he has to submit a budget that meets the Republican requirements rather than what we've done with every other President, which gives them the ability to present the budget they like.

With respect to the delay, our Republican colleagues know very well what the cause of that delay was. The cause of the delay was we were working very hard to try and avoid the fiscal cliff, which would have hurt jobs and the economy.

I'm not surprised some of our Republican House colleagues have forgotten about that because they overwhelmingly voted against the fiscal cliff agreement, which by the way was supported by the overwhelming majority of Senate Republicans. But here in the House, Republicans in great numbers said that they would rather risk the economy and risk jobs than ask the very wealthiest Americans to pay a little bit more.

□ 1340

That's why the fiscal cliff agreement took so long. We didn't get it done until January 2. I would hope my colleagues on the Budget Committee

know, if you're putting together a budget, you need to know what you're spending, but you also need to know what your revenues are. Until we were able to get that agreement, the President didn't know what the revenues were. Nonpartisan groups, like the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax, were also delayed in their assessments. These are nonpartisan groups.

Now, the shame of it is, instead of playing these political games, we should do what my colleagues have said we should do in that we should be focused on avoiding the sequester—the meat-ax, across-the-board cuts. This House has taken no action in this Congress, in this 113th Congress, to deal with that, so we on the Democratic side said, Hey, let's give our Members an opportunity to vote on something to replace the sequester and to do it in a balanced way so that we don't hurt the economy and so that we don't put jobs at risk.

We brought a substitute amendment to the Rules Committee that would have prevented those across-the-board cuts, that would have replaced them with balanced and sensible alternatives like, for example, eliminating direct payments in agricultural subsidies, like getting rid of the taxpayer subsidies for big oil companies, that we would replace the across-the-board, meat-ax cuts, which would do great harm to our economy, with those sensible measures.

The response from our Republican colleagues: You don't get a vote. You don't get a vote. They rushed to the floor a measure that hadn't had a single hearing, that did not go through the regular order; and in keeping with that philosophy, we don't even get a vote on something that is important to the American people, which is to replace the across-the-board sequester, which we know is going to hurt jobs because we just heard from the last quarter economic report that even the fear of those across-the-board cuts was having a damaging impact on the economy, even the fear of it. Now, within less than a month, it's going to happen, and here we're talking about a political gimmick bill instead of something that does something real, and we are not even allowed a chance to vote on a proposal to replace the sequester.

Vote against it if you want. Vote against it. That's the way the democratic process works, but allow this House to work its will.

When this House worked its will, we were able to get a fiscal agreement passed and were able to avoid going over the cliff and hurting the economy. Let's do the same thing now. Let's just have a vote, up or down, on the merits of a substitute proposal rather than playing games with this very unfortunate proposal that does nothing but play politics.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friends that I haven't actually mentioned that the President's budget was late. You're exactly right. He did miss the statutory deadline. He's not going to make it on time. In fact, the story is that it's not going to get here until March. In the years that I've had a voting card, he has never submitted a budget on time. I'm not asking him to get it here on time. I am only asking him, when it gets here, would he tell us when it's going to balance.

With that, I would like to yield 4 minutes to a colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is an important discussion that we're having today, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and to vote for the underlying bill that follows.

Look, the President is going to be here talking to us next week. He'll deliver his State of the Union address. He will do so without a plan on the table. There will be no budget. We will not know about the proposals that are put forward as to whether or not they're reasonable in the context of outlays and allocations. We just simply don't know.

The underlying bill that is being discussed today is that, when the President does submit that plan, when the administration does submit that plan, if that plan does not come into balance within a reasonable period of time—10 years, I think, any American would say would be a reasonable period of time—give us an idea as to when you think that will happen. After all, when there was a campaign being run in 2008, the Presidential candidate for the Democrats said that he'd cut the deficit in half in 4 years, and we're still waiting. We would like to see the plan that is going to achieve these goals.

We're also hearing a lot of talk today about the sequester. It's not the purpose of this legislation to deal with the sequester. We did have reconciliation bills on the floor of this House in May and then again in December. We had a bill dealing with the expiration of the Tax Codes right before the August recess. So there were opportunities to talk about the fiscal cliff. I, for one, felt that the delay in the sequester on January 1 was not in the country's best interest.

These were the cuts that the Congress promised to the American people. When the debt limit was raised in August of 2011, this was the promise that was made, and it was a promise that was made by the President. It was proposed by people within the administration. The bill was signed into law by the President. The President cannot now come back and retroactively veto a bill that has already been signed. This is settled law, and these are cuts on which the American people are depending. They're depending on us to keep our word.

It's very difficult to cut spending. It's very difficult to cut the budget. Every line in the Federal budget has a constituency. Every line in every appropriations bill has a constituency somewhere that cares deeply about that language being retained. So, when all else fails, an across-the-board cut may be the only way that you can ever achieve that spending restraint.

Now, I understand that the White House does not agree with the Republican House that there is a spending problem. They think it's a revenue problem. Well, great. Put that in writing. Put it in the budget. Tell us when that revenue that you wish to achieve will bring this budget into balance. I, for one, don't think it's possible, but I would like to see the academic exercise of their at least trying to get it to balance at some point in the future.

Then, finally, Mr. Speaker, may I just say—and I hate to give a history lesson—when the Republicans were in the minority in this House, there was a very large bill that was passed, and it was called the Affordable Care Act. This was a bill that did not receive a hearing in the House of Representatives. To be sure, H.R. 3200 had received a markup in a hearing in the House, but H.R. 3590, although it had a House bill number, was not a House bill. It was a housing bill that passed the House of Representatives in July of 2009 and went over to the Senate. It was completely changed in the Senate Finance Committee, and this was the bill that came to the House of Representatives on which we had to vote in a very short period of time. No amendments were allowed. It was a very closed process. I was in the Rules Committee that night. I remember the ranking member being there, and the good ideas that I thought I brought forward were all excluded from discussion.

So don't lecture me about the process that this bill was rushed and didn't have a hearing. For heaven's sake, we have a bill that is now signed law that will cost $2.6 trillion over the next 10 years that never had a hearing in this House. That's the travesty, and that's why we have to deal with spending.

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

Let me just respond to the gentleman from Texas by saying he's wrong. He's on the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Affordable Care Act had hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee—and markups. There were multiple hearings on that bill. I'm not sure what he's talking about.

Then to the gentleman from Georgia who says that he didn't mention the fact that the President missed the deadline, I thought he did, but the bill that he's touting here mentions it in these very political, inspired findings. Read your own bill. It's three pages long. I know that may be too much, but we're all told to read the bill.

Look, rather than being here and telling the President what to do—he's going to submit a budget—we've got to do our job. Our job is to avoid this sequestration because, if we don't, there are millions of people in this country who will be without work. There are

programs that will be arbitrarily cut, and this economy will be hurt. Now, if you want sequestration, then you can continue to take your recesses and do this kind of trivial stuff on the House floor, but we ought to be finding a way to avoid going over this sequestration cliff.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. What most of America is waiting for is for us to address the very abyss that we've put ourselves in, the cliff that we've put ourselves in—the fact that we became hostage to this idea of a commission that was necessary because we could not get Members on both sides of the aisle to be able to work together on what should be cut. It was particularly because my friends on the other side of the aisle had Members who did not understand how government functioned. Republicans did not understand that government, in fact, is a rainy-day umbrella, that we are supposed to serve the American people.

So, while we are fiddling, one could say that Rome is burning, or maybe they could say that the cities and towns of America are asking us to finally answer the question. Under the laws that we adhere to, the President has a right to submit his budget. That should be very clear. No legislation here on the floor is going to dictate the President's budget.

□ 1350

There is a law that says it is supposed to be the first Monday in February. We will admit that. But what President has ever had the hostage-taking of the debt ceiling so that you can't write a budget if there are individuals in the Congress that won't do the normal business, which is to raise the debt ceiling so that the American people can be taken care of?

As we speak, however, the President has introduced, today, a short-term fix to avert the sequester. The Democrats have offered a way of averting the sequester. We have nothing from the Republicans except a resolution that says a request for a plan, the very plan that the President knows by law he is going to submit as long as he knows what the amount of money is we have to work on. And, of course, the budgeting process is going through the House. The chairman of the Budget, Mr. RYAN, the ranking member of the Budget, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, we all know the regular order, and we're going to do our work.

But putting us on the floor today and ignoring what we should be doing, I'm saddened that my amendment that indicated that I wanted to make sure that the most vulnerable in any budget process, 15.1 percent of Americans living below the poverty line, which includes 21 percent of our Nation's children, I wanted to have a sense of Congress that whatever we did, we would not do anything to harm these vulnerable children who, through no fault of their own that they may be suffering from the kind of economy, or their parents are suffering so that they live in poverty, whatever we do, we should not do anything more to make their life more devastating.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My other amendment had to do with the estate tax to raise revenue, and that would have been a reasonable debate to address what we can do to make the lives of Americans better.

Request a plan; a plan is not action. The President does a budget; we do a budget. Mr. Speaker, let's do our work and help the American people and avoid the sequester.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my colleague that I share her great passion for America's children and protecting America's children. And I would say to my friend that I don't believe we can continue to operate under budgets that borrow from those children, not just this year, not just next year, but forever, and candidly say that we're protecting them. We're putting our most vulnerable at risk with these deficits, and we have to make the tough decisions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say, I don't think anyone on this side of the aisle is not prepared to work collaboratively on the question of the deficit, on the question of growing America's economy and working with our children. Can we find common ground that indicates that we must invest in our children at the same time that we are likewise talking about debt and deficit? And that's what the Democrats are talking about, investing in our children, making their lives better.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all want to make sure that our children are protected, but embracing a sequester that cuts things like Head Start, that's no way to protect our children.

At this point, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 23 days, by law, an indiscriminate chain saw is going to go through all quarters, all sectors of the American Government.

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta on Sunday, along with General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, very bluntly warned this country that if sequestration goes into effect, America's military readiness is going to be damaged in a very critical way. The Navy has told us specifically what this means: 23 ships whose repairs are scheduled will be cancelled; 55 percent of flying hours on aircraft carriers will be cancelled; 22 percent of steaming days for the rest of the U.S. fleet will be cancelled; submarine deployments will be cancelled.

Today, right now, we have the USS *Stennis* and the USS *Eisenhower* stationed in the Middle East making sure that our allies, Israel, Turkey, critical missions like protecting the Straits of Hormuz, they have to have aircraft that can fly. They can't cancel 55 percent of their flight time and expect to carry out their mission. Yet in 23 days, because of inaction by this Chamber, we are putting, again, America's national security interests at risk.

The Bipartisan Policy Center, founded by Bob Dole and Tom Daschle, has told us we will lose a million jobs if sequestration goes through. So those shipyards that are planning to do that repair work, they're basically going to get layoff slips.

And we are debating a bill today that has absolutely no connection to those realities. This is a pure political stunt. It has no bearing in terms of whether or not the military readiness of this country or the economic recovery that's headed in the right direction right now is going to be protected and preserved. That's our job. That's what we should be focused on here today. And denying the Van Hollen amendment, which would replace that sequestration, is why this rule must be defeated.

I urge Members of this Chamber to vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to read from the President's inaugural address. It took place just outside our backdoor here. He said:

> We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit.

He didn't say we should make the easy choices, because there aren't any easy choices left to make. Every single one of them is hard. And I have such great respect for Members of this body who have taken the hard votes and made those hard decisions.

All this bill says is: Mr. President, put your budget where your speeches are. Make the hard choices, any of the choices you want to make to balance, anytime you want to balance, but we can't begin to pay down the debt until we stop running up the debt. And we have yet to see a budget from this President that puts us on that path.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today disappointed that my amendment to the Require a PLAN Act has been left out of this rule.

This bill is bad political theater. Not even the devastatingly dangerous Ryan budget could achieve the balanced budget in 2014 this bill demands of the President.

Setting this silliness aside, my amendment would address a separate issue: this bill's use of the phrase ''unified budget'' and the inclusion of Social Security as part of that unified budget. This is a blatant attempt to nullify Social Security's historic independence from the Federal budget. Social Security is funded by the payroll tax. It was created with its own revenue stream so these hard-earned benefits would never fall victim to the political shenanigans of a Congress like this one.

As President Franklin Roosevelt said:

> With those taxes in there, no damn politician can ever scrap my Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security is not an item in the budget. It is social insurance that protects all Americans against destitution due to old age, a disability or illness, or the death of a breadwinner.

Workers have built up $2.7 trillion in the Social Security trust fund which ensures that benefits will be paid in full at least until the mid-2030s. I have called for small adjustments to strengthen Social Security for the long term, and I'm ready to have that debate. But to put Social Security on the general budget's ledger as America's largest generation retires is simply beyond the pale.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, puts Social Security on the GOP chopping block. This is a dangerous precedent. We cannot allow the accounting tricks in this bad legislation to endanger the Social Security that keeps so many Americans financially secure.

President Truman said:

> Social Security is not a dole or a device for giving everybody something for nothing. True Social Security must consist of rights which are earned rights that are guaranteed by the law of the land.

Today, Mr. Speaker, these earned rights of millions of Americans are in jeopardy, as is that guarantee. We must vote down this rule and we must vote down this bad bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend that I know his commitment to Social Security is heartfelt, and it's one that I share. I hope it gives him comfort to know that there is absolutely nothing in this legislation that changes any of those commitments that he read there on the House floor. In fact, I would say the opposite is true. As someone who's going to retire after Social Security is projected to have gone bankrupt, I think it is critically important that every budget we look at looks at how it is we're going to pay back all of those government bonds that this Congress has swapped the cash in the Social Security trust fund for. Without paying back those bonds, there is no Social Security check to go out the door.

The reason we talk about balanced budgets is because numbers are important. We talk about balanced budgets because commitments are important. And we cannot, we cannot meet our Medicare commitments. We cannot meet our Social Security commitments, and everyone in this body knows it.

□ 1400

Every budget the President produces shows it. But we can do better; and working together, we will do better, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia how many more speakers he has.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd say to my friend, I'm prepared to close.

Mr. McGOVERN. I'm prepared to close as well, Mr. Speaker. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very frustrating debate, in large part because it's much ado about nothing. What we're doing here today is a press release. It's doing nothing at all to avoid this prospect of sequestration in which arbitrary cuts will go into play. This is just more talk and talk and talk and talk.

Again, that's one of the reasons why the American people are so frustrated with this place. They want less talk and more work. We should be working. We should be coming to some sort of agreement to avoid the catastrophe of sequestration; but, instead, we're doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put some things in perspective. The Center for American Progress reported that since the start of fiscal year 2011, President Obama has signed into law approximately $2.4 trillion of deficit reduction for the years 2013 through 2022. Nearly three-quarters of that deficit reduction is in the form of spending cuts, while the remaining one-quarter comes from revenue increases. Congress and the President have cut about $1.5 trillion in programmatic spending, raised about $630 billion in new revenue, and generated about $300 billion in interest savings, for a combined total of more than $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. That's a quote from the Center for American Progress.

So three-fourths of the deficit reduction we've achieved so far was from spending cuts. But my friends on the other side have the nerve to continue to claim that Democrats are ''loathe'' to agree to spending cuts. I mean, give me a break, Mr. Speaker. Give me a break.

The CBO projects the Federal deficit to be about $845 billion, which I think is very high; but it's the first time the nonpartisan office forecast a deficit below $1 trillion. So we are going in the right direction, and the President wants to continue to move in that right direction in a fair and balanced way.

Now, here's the deal. My friends keep on referring to what they did last year which, again, was last year. We have to get them to think about this year because they have to act now; it's a new Congress.

But last year the proposals they came up with to try to bring our budget into balance were all about lowering the quality of life for our citizens. Their budget proposal ended Medicare as we know it. Ended Medicare. It's gone.

My friend from Florida talked about Social Security. Their plan for Social Security is to privatize it. And deep reductions and cuts that provide support for people who are most vulnerable. That's their plan.

And now, we see, because we're not trying to address this latest fiscal cliff, I think they really do want the sequestration to go into effect. I think that is outrageous. I think it's going to be dangerous to our economy. But their plan, by allowing sequestration to go into effect, is basically to try to balance the budget by making more people unemployed.

You know, we will lose jobs. In the defense sector that's already happening. But then we're going to see losses in jobs in other areas. There'll be cuts in education. Police grants are cut. Payments to Medicare providers are cut. And The New York Times reports that even the aid just approved for victims of Hurricane Sandy will fall under the sequester's axe.

I mean, this is how we're going to solve our budgetary problems?

Yes, we do have a big debt. A lot of it has to do with these unpaid-for wars, with these tax cuts that weren't paid for; and it's going to take us a while to get out of it. But as we get out of it, we can't destroy our country. We need a balanced approach. We need to cut where we can cut, we need to raise revenues where we need to raise revenues, but we also need to invest.

Cutting the National Institutes of Health, which will happen if sequestration goes into effect, will not only cost jobs, but it will prolong human suffering. If we could find a cure to Parkinson's disease or Alzheimer's disease, not only will we prevent a lot of human suffering, you would end up solving the budgetary challenges of Medicare and Medicaid. There's a value in investing in these things, not arbitrarily cutting them.

Now, last night in the Rules Committee, we tried to bring some substance to this debate. Mr. VAN HOLLEN had his amendment, which was blocked. The one substantive thing that we could have done here today to avoid sequestration was blocked.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's replacement for the sequester which was, again, blocked last night in the Rules Committee.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I would urge my colleagues to reject this rule which, again, is illustrative of how closed this process has become in this House. We ought to reject the rule because it is not open. The Budget Committee never even considered this bill.

But we ought to also reject the underlying bill because this is nonsense at a time when we should be doing something real to avoid a real catastrophe in this country, to avoid something that will have an adverse impact on our economy. Instead, you know, we're all fiddling while Rome is burning.

This is outrageous. We can do so much better. We ought to work. You know, you're passing resolutions asking the President to do X, Y, and Z. We ought to pass a resolution to instruct us to do our job, and that's what we ought to do. That's what the American people expect.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to thank my friend from Massachusetts for being down here with me today to get this rule to a place where we can vote on it. I always look to my friend from Massachusetts to find those things that we agree on, and we certainly agree that Congress has an awfully low approval rating.

I would disagree with my friend though, Mr. Speaker, and say it's a low approval rating because we don't deal with important issues like this. It's a low approval rating because folks will say Republicans want to privatize Social Security, even though our budget did no such thing.

It's a low approval rating because folks will say our budget destroys Medicare forever, even though our budget did no such thing. It's a low approval rating because folks say they want to grapple with the tough challenges of the country, and yet they continue to borrow and spend as they always have.

But I'm an optimist, Mr. Speaker. I really do believe that we've come to a place—not just in this country, not just in this House—I think we've come to a place in each individual in this country, where folks are prepared to do those things that must be done to ensure that our children's tomorrow is better than their today.

Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about their deep love and affection for the next generation and how they want to ensure that the most vulnerable are taken care of, they mean it from the heart. They mean it from the heart.

But when the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tells us that our biggest national security concern is our growing debt and deficits, how much love can you show to the next generation, Mr. Speaker, when you continue to dig into their pockets instead of your own?

It's not incumbent upon us to decide how our children set their priorities. It's incumbent upon us to set our priorities so that they don't have to make those tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, if we went out in the street in front of this Capitol and asked every man and woman who brought their family here to visit the Nation's Capitol how many of them knew that in not one budget, and for not 1 year does the President ever propose that we come to balance, that would be shocking, shocking news. And yet it's the truth.

Mr. Speaker, title 31 lays out in intricate detail congressional requirements for the President's budget. Congressional requirements for the President's budget. H.R. 444 would incorporate those requirements and add one more and, that is, that in this time of economic challenge, you be honest with the American people about the tough choices that we're all facing.

Mr. Speaker, if it was easy, they'd have done it before you and I got here. It's hard, and it's getting worse every single day any one of us fails to deal with it.

We can deal with it today, Mr. Speaker. I know our Budget Committee is committed to dealing with it. I know this House is committed to deal with it. Let's make the President a partner in that today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the resolution. I urge strong support for the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 48 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment in the nature of a substitute received for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative VAN HOLLEN of Maryland or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were 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 the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Black
Cicilline
Conyers
Costa
Crawford
DeLauro
Farr
Gabbard
McNerney
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Young (FL)

□ 1430

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Messrs. HONDA, PAYNE, POLIS, Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. CASTOR of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 444, REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 189, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Cicilline
Conyers
Crawford
DeLauro
Farr
Gabbard
McDermott
McNerney
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Young (FL)

□ 1440

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 34 I missed the vote because I was meeting with a constituent in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of February 5, 2013, upon request of a leave of absence, a series of votes were held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have cast the following votes: On Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 48, Providing for consideration of H.R. 444, to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (rollcall No. 33)—I vote "nay." On Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 48, Providing for consideration of H.R. 444, to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (rollcall No. 34)—I vote "no."

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 53

Resolved, That the following Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Cole, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Ribble, Mr. Flores, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Woodall, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Nunnelee, Mr. Renacci, Mr. Rigell, Mrs. Hartzler, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Messer, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, and Mr. Williams.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut

REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 444.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1447

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1450

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I commend Congressman PRICE for introducing this bill, and I join my colleagues in supporting its passage, but I wish it hadn't come to this.

President Obama has a legal and a moral obligation to offer solutions to our fiscal challenges. So far, that hasn't happened. In using the numbers from his last budget proposal, the Federal budget would not have achieved balance ever, and, just yesterday, he missed the statutory deadline to submit his budget for the fourth time in 5 years. Since this administration started, we've added nearly $6 trillion to our national debt. That's the largest increase in history.

Look, we can't keep this up, Mr. Chairman. We have to budget responsibly so that we can keep our commitments and expand opportunity. All we

are simply saying here is that we need to put our plans on the table.

House Republicans have shown our solutions. The Senate hasn't passed a budget in 4 years. The President hasn't even submitted a budget yet even though it's past the deadline, and when he has submitted a budget, it has proposed that it never, ever, ever balances the budget. Isn't that what budgeting is—showing how you'll get your budget under control so that your expenditures and your revenues eventually, one day, meet? That, unfortunately, hasn't been happening. As a result, we have a debt crisis on our horizon.

In this bill, we don't say what policies the President must propose; we realize that he'll have his own. All we're saying is that he needs to bring ideas to the table. Show us how you'll balance the budget and when you'll balance the budget. It says to simply bring a plan, and show us how you'll balance the budget so that we can have the kind of honest debate we need to have.

The way things ought to be, the way the Framers intended things to be, was that the House passes its solution and that the Senate passes theirs, and in the budget process, the President offers his. When people put their solutions on the table, that's how you find common ground, that's how you get things done. But if it's a one-way conversation in which all you have is one side of the aisle putting solutions on the table and the other side of the aisle simply offering criticisms and no solutions to ever balance the budget, that gets you no progress. Unfortunately, that's precisely where we are today. That's why we're calling for this legislation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the remainder of my time and the ability to control such time to the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just have to say to my colleagues that, in looking at this bill, it represents exactly what the American people hate most about this body and this Congress. It's a political gimmick that does absolutely nothing to help create jobs. It does nothing to help boost economic growth. If you read the bill, it is another finger-pointing exercise: blaming the President for the late submission of the 2014 budget and demanding not that the President submit a budget—the President is going to submit a budget—but that he submit it in a form dictated by House Republicans rather than dictated by current law.

Now, our Republican colleagues know very well why the President's 2014 budget is late. It's late because we had a big debate in this country over how to avoid the fiscal cliff, and it wasn't until January 2 that this House and the Senate were able to resolve that issue. If we'd gone over the fiscal cliff, it would have created huge economic problems. It would have created a huge contraction. It would have created a huge loss of jobs.

Now, even though a majority of Republican Senators voted for the agreement to prevent us from going over that fiscal cliff, our House Republican colleagues argued against it and against it, and at the end of the day, they were prepared to let the economy go over that cliff in order to protect tax breaks for very wealthy people. A great majority of our Republican colleagues here in the House voted against that fiscal agreement, but we got it done despite that fact. As a result, the economy has continued to move. Now we need to work to make it move faster, but this bill does absolutely nothing to help do that. That's why the budget is a little late, because most Americans know that, unless you know both what your expenditures are going to be and your revenues, you can't submit a budget, and we didn't know until January 2 what the revenue number would be going forward.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the nonpartisan Joint Tax Committee have also been delayed in presenting their backgrounds, which have just come out today but were delayed from when they had planned to do it, and it was because of that very reason.

What's really a shame is that here we are on the floor of the House, debating this gimmick, when we should be doing things to help the economy and help grow jobs. On March 1, less than 1 month from today, we're going to see these automatic across-the-board, meat-ax cuts take place to both defense and non-defense. Now, those across-the-board cuts are going to do great damage to jobs and the economy.

You don't have to take my word for it. Here are the words of the Republican House leader, Mr. CANTOR, just a few months ago: ''Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made.'' According to a study which he referred to, ''The jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians in my home State are on the line.''

And that's just jobs in Virginia. He was just talking about jobs lost from the defense cuts. If we don't act to replace the sequester, you're going to see jobs lost around the country. In fact, we're already seeing what would happen from even the threat of the sequester, because, in the last quarter, we saw the economy slowing. Many analysts have said it's because of the fear of these across-the-board cuts—and not just many analysts. The Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. MCKEON, said this in referring to the last quarter economic report: ''This is just the first indicator of the extraordinary economic damage defense cuts will do.''

Mr. MCKEON is right. So why are we spending our time today on a bill that doesn't address that at all?

We have not in this Congress, the 113th Congress, had any debate on any measure to replace the sequester—our Republican colleagues haven't brought that to the floor—but it gets worse. Even though our Republican colleagues haven't brought their proposal to the floor of this House to replace the sequester in this Congress, we presented an alternative to the Rules Committee to replace the sequester and to do it in a balanced way, and we were denied an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote here in this Chamber today on that proposal to replace the sequester for the remainder of this fiscal year so that we would avoid those across-the-board, meat-ax cuts and avoid the job losses that both Mr. CANTOR and Mr. MCKEON talked about.

We had a proposal to avoid all that—not even a vote today—and we proposed to do it in a balanced way, Mr. Chairman: to make some cuts to some of the big agriculture subsidies' direct payments, also with some revenue by closing taxpayer breaks for the big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues continue to stick to the position that they won't close one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not one. They conceded in the last election that very wealthy individuals benefit from those tax breaks disproportionately, but they don't want to eliminate one of them for the purpose of reducing the deficit in a balanced way, combined with additional spending cuts, which is what our substitute amendment would do. It's important for the people to know that we didn't have a chance to vote on it.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's a sad reflection on this body that we are here debating a meaningless political action and ignoring the real work of the American people in this country to deal with the sequester in a balanced way and to prevent the job losses which Republican Members of this Congress have themselves said are on the horizon if we don't take that action.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Maryland makes some interesting points. The problem with many of them is that they simply aren't true.

For example, the Congressional Budget Office gave their report on the economic situation today, and they have met their deadline, so contrary to what the gentleman from Maryland said.

The gentleman also knows that the amendment that he offered, that he just cited that wasn't to be made in order, was not germane. The rules of the House precluded that.

And then he spent the majority of his time, Mr. Chairman, talking about the sequester, which is an important issue, there's no doubt about it, but it's not this issue. In fact, House Republicans passed a reconciliation bill last year that outlined the spending priorities that we would have, the spending reduction priorities that we would place in place of the sequester, and that sat over in the Senate. So the ball is in the Senate's court, the ball is in the President's court.

Today we're talking about H.R. 444, which is a bill that simply says to the President, Mr. President, when you submit your budget, just let us know when it balances—10 years, 20 years, 40 years, 75 years. When does is it balance? Just be honest and transparent with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are the minority party here in Washington. Yes, we have the majority in the House, but we don't have the majority in the Senate. We certainly don't control the White House. One of the roles of the minority is to provide accountability to the other side and to provide a contrast.

Well, as Mr. RYAN said in his opening remarks, it's tough to have a contrast when you have specific legislation and you're comparing it to a speech. It doesn't work. The American people can't tell who's telling the truth and whose policies they would prefer. That's why we believe it's imperative—in fact, it's the only fair thing to do—to have the President, when he submits his budget, to say, in fact, this is when it balances.

And it's instructive to know, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, that the past four budgets that the President has proposed have never come to balance, never. That's important information, Mr. Chairman. It's time for the President to admit that.

So the record of the President isn't great, as you well know, on this: $6 trillion of new debt on his watch, 4 straight years of trillion-dollar-plus annual deficits, more borrowing, more spending, more debt, more dreams crushed.

House Republicans have done our job. We put forward two budgets over the past 2 years when we've been in the majority in which we have said this is exactly how we would reform, save, strengthen, and secure the programs that are so necessary for this country, but also how we would get this country on a path to balance, not for balance's sake, but because families do it, businesses do it, and economies that don't demonstrate balance cannot be vibrant, cannot create jobs, cannot allow individuals to realize their dreams. So, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 444 is a commonsense piece of legislation.

The gentleman from Maryland talked a lot about what the American people want. The polling industry, just earlier last month, said 72 percent of the Americans say that reducing the budget deficit is a, quote, top priority for the President and the Congress this year. It should be. Seventy-two percent.

Mr. Chairman, we're on the side of the American people. It's time for the President to show us a budget that balances or to state simply when his budget balances.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There's no doubt that it's a priority of the American people, 72 percent of the American people, to reduce the deficit. We need to reduce the deficit.

In fact, in the last election, both candidates talked about their plans for how to reduce that deficit in a smart and measured way. The American people spoke, and they said they preferred the balanced approach that the President has laid out that includes a combination of cuts. And, by the way, we did more than $1.5 trillion of cuts through the combination of the Budget Control Act and the supplementals in the last 2 or 3 years. We've already done that. We need to keep making more cuts. And, in fact, our substitute proposal includes additional cuts.

But in the last election, the American people also said that we should close some of these tax breaks for special interests and very wealthy people. And yet our Republican colleagues have taken the position, the ironclad position, that you can't close or eliminate one of those tax breaks that their Presidential candidate and Vice Presidential candidate talked about if you want to use that for the purpose of reducing the deficit. You can't do it.

So, yes, we need to reduce the deficit. The President has a plan to do it. He just doesn't do it the way our Republican colleagues would do it, which is by whacking Social Security and Medicaid, and by shortchanging important investments in our education and in our kids' future.

So, yes, reduce the deficit, but let's do it in a sensible way. And the President has the prerogative of getting to put forward his budget the way he would like to present it to Congress, and then Congress can do its work however it wants.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague from Maryland, and someone who has been very focused on reducing our deficits in a responsible way, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia said what the American people want. What the American people don't want is games. This is a game. This is a sham. This is a shame.

What the American people want is honest legislation to address the challenges that confront us. In 23 or 24 days, we are going do face a sequester. That sequester, as has been pointed out, Mr. CANTOR and I agree on, it will have devastating, adverse, negative consequences for our economy, for the American people, and for the confidence of America.

But we are not spending time to avoid the sequester. Mr. PRICE of Georgia, in fact, says this is not about the sequester. He's right.

Mr. RYAN said the Founding Fathers. The Founding Fathers had no idea and no intention the President of the United States would be involved in the budgeting process, period, none. Read the Constitution, my friends. I've heard a lot about that. The Founding Fathers thought it would be the legislative body, and the legislative body alone, that would have responsibility. It wasn't, frankly, until the last century that the President played a significant role in the budget, because the Founding Fathers, if you read the Constitution, thought, under Article I, we were responsible.

And now, my friends, we have a game. My friend from Georgia, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, said that we want a contrast. You have a contrast. You didn't want a contrast. You didn't make it in order, because you don't want the contrast.

What you want is your political messaging bill that at the end of the day will do zip, nada, zero to address the problems confronting America. It's a game. Sadly, it's a game because the American people deserve and need better from us—more responsibility, more reality, more honesty in the actions we take on this floor. This is a political messaging bill. It's not even a very big bill.

By the way, the bill to which the gentleman from Georgia referred is not before this Congress. It was the last Congress. That Congress, I tell the gentleman, is over. But we have a responsibility in the 113th Congress to act responsibly, not just to point to what was or was not done in the 112th Congress.

This is a political messaging bill, Mr. Chairman, pure and simple. It does nothing to solve the most immediate problem we are now facing that is the looming sequester and all the uncertainty it is causing.

What we ought to be working on this week is a bipartisan solution to the sequester that averts the negative cuts, the adverse consequences that will take place, as I said, 23 to 24 days from now. Instead, Mr. Chairman, we hear not only silence from many on the Republican side, but irresponsible acquiescence.

Yesterday Republicans brought consideration of an amendment by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, that would replace the sequester with spending cuts and additional revenue, a balanced package. Now, my Republican friends probably would have voted against that, but they didn't even allow the contrast of which the gentleman from Georgia speaks. Why? Because they want a unilateral message for their hardline constituents. That is why, Mr.

Chairman. And it's a shame, because the American people and our economy are suffering because of these actions.

□ 1510

This is very disappointing, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN's amendment is exactly the approach we ought to consider on this floor.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. And the President of the United States, for contrast, I tell my friend from Georgia, supports this exact alternative.

Will he support others in a compromise? He will. But this is the alternative that he supports, so it's the contrast that the gentleman seeks.

I suggest perhaps we ask unanimous consent that they change their mind. To do so would be devastating, if we don't fix the sequester, to our economy and our ability to create opportunities for America.

It's time that our friends in the majority in this House stop pretending that the sequester is not dangerous or that it can be a viable tool to achieve the fiscal discipline we need. It's not that tool and, in fact, it's very dangerous.

As we move closer toward the March 1 deadline, I want to tell my friend from Georgia, whom I respect, that I would hope that we could engage in a positive discussion and consideration on this floor of an alternative like Mr. VAN HOLLEN's, not because you will support it, but because it is a viable, effective alternative, and then you provide an effective alternative. There is no alternative in the bill you provide on this floor today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to that debate as well, but that's not the debate that we're having today. The debate that we're having today is a serious debate about whether or not we're going to get our fiscal house in order and whether or not the President's going to engage in a positive way. The President has put forward budgets that have not shown balance at all, ever.

This is a serious debate. This is not a game. This is a serious debate about a serious issue. The same words were used by the gentleman on the bill that we had on the floor 2 weeks ago, the No Budget, No Pay Act. That was such a game that the Senate passed it and the President signed it.

No, Mr. Chairman, this is serious business, and the American people know it, and they know that it's time for the President and the Democratic-controlled Senate to step up and do their job.

I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding and for bringing forward the Require a PLAN Act.

You know, when our colleagues on the other side talk about games and all of these things that are frustrating and angering the American people, what angers them the most is when they don't see Washington doing their job.

The law says the President, the House, and the Senate have to produce a budget. Now, the House has met its legal obligation the last 2 years; the Senate, they've failed to produce a budget in 4 years; and the President has missed his legal deadline 4 of the last 5 years.

One of my colleagues said that somehow it's the Republicans' fault this year that the President didn't produce the budget on time. Okay. If that's the case, then that means 3 of the other 4 years is he going to blame, like, maybe the dog ate his homework, or maybe blame it on President Bush? At some point, this President's got to take responsibility and live by the same laws that American families live by.

You know, American families, at the end of each year, they sit around the house kitchen table and they do a budget. They actually figure out what their priorities are going to be. And they look to Washington and they see a President and a Senate that literally ignore the law and say they're not going to produce a budget. They're not going to produce a budget that balances. They're not going to produce a budget that sets priorities. They're just going to keep borrowing money from China and sending the bill to our kids and our grandkids. And then the President wants to come and demand that Congress give him another credit card.

We absolutely have to pay off the debts of the past. But when the President says not only pay those debts off, but give him another credit card so he can keep spending money, but he doesn't even lay out a plan of how he's going to spend the money—and, oh, by the way, whatever he produces never ever balances.

Is it too much just to ask the President when is your budget going to finally get to balance? If it's not next year, if it's not 10 years from now, if it's not 20 years from now, at least put that transparency out there in public.

He said he was going to be the most transparent President ever, and yet, when it comes time to actually deliver, to produce and to show something to the American people, he always wants to blame somebody else.

We've got to stop living crisis to crisis, and one of the ways you stop this crisis of the moment is to finally produce a plan, lay something out. Let's debate it. We can have disagreements over it, but you have to start with a plan, and that's what this bill does. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 21 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Chairman, we've heard the criticism, this is a game. Well, any family that has found themselves in a financial crisis knows this is not a game. I'm one of those families.

Eighteen years ago, I lost my job in a corporate merger. After 48 hours of depression, my wife and I woke up, made a pot of coffee, drew a line down the middle of the page, and on one side we wrote down, this is what we have coming in, on the other side we wrote down, this is how we're going to spend it.

In an economy when far too many of our friends and family members are out of work, there's no question in my mind that while we're debating this, there are families that are going through that exact exercise. Those families that are making those tough decisions in their family budgets have every reason to expect their policymakers to do the same.

We shed tears around the kitchen table that morning. Those families are shedding tears around the kitchen table right now. They know that's not a game. They expect Washington to come up with a budget, and that's what this bill does.

This bill says, Mr. President, give us a budget. Show us when it balances. Tell us when you have a balanced budget. We ask the President to do the same thing that American families are doing.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), a new Member of the House.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, and commend my colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, for his hard work on this issue.

I've been surprised by some of the testimony on the other side of the aisle today. This bill says one very simple thing, that the President, when he submits a budget, must say when or whether it balances. The American people deserve to know when the budget proposed by the President will budget. That's all this bill requires.

It doesn't say the President has to balance the budget, though he should. It doesn't say he needs to stop sending money we don't have, though we must. It just asks him to tell the American people, when, if at all, the budget proposal will not be in deficit.

This should not be a partisan issue. Past Presidents should have submitted balanced budgets. Our current President should submit a balanced budget. Future Presidents should do the same.

The Require a PLAN Act is a straightforward, commonsense step in

the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Require a PLAN Act. Each year, law requires the President to submit a budget by the first Monday in February. Yesterday President Obama missed this deadline for the fourth time in 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the American people know what it's like to work through tough times and to live on a budget. When my wife and I started our small business, we made only $50 the first month. We worked hard and made sacrifices to live within our means. Families across this great Nation are still doing that, and it's embarrassing that the President and Senate Democrats refuse to put forth a plan.

Republicans have produced a budget that made tough choices but reduces our debt and achieves fiscal responsibility. The Require a PLAN Act demands that the President explain to the American people how he intends to do the same. The great people of our Nation deserve at least that.

□ 1520

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his exceptional work on this particular act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the PLAN Act. For the past few years, our government has been operating off of stopgap measures that have led to frequent partisan debates and negotiations, threatening government shutdowns, and withholding pay from our men and women in uniform. At a time when our country is more than $16 trillion in debt, all of which is saddled on our children and grandchildren, we must act on the years upon years of rampant, runaway Federal spending that has occurred under both political parties. To be effective, we must create a plan for how we spend the hard-earned taxpayers' dollars. That plan is a budget—a budget that needs to balance over time.

The House has passed legislation each year that would work to balance our budget. Since the Senate will not take up our legislation that the country and the people of Florida so desperately need, we are calling upon the President to do his job: to propose a solution that will balance our budget throughout the next 10 years.

The Senate has not passed a budget in nearly 4 years. On Monday, this President, for the fourth time, missed his legally obligated deadline for filing his budget request. We're requiring the Senate and the President to show some leadership by submitting a budget plan to preserve America's future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire, as I understand, we're doing half of the total time tomorrow. Would the chairman know how much time remains today on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has a maximum of 16½ minutes. The gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes. The Chair cannot enforce informal agreements, and it is up to the gentlemen how much time they wish to consume today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we're each going to take 15 minutes' time, which would allow the gentleman 1½ minutes, and our side will take 1 minute. And I have no more speakers, other than myself to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That's my understanding, too.

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a couple comments which are 100 percent accurate, just so people watching this can understand what we're all talking about, since there's a lot of confusion. The President is going to submit a budget. He has submitted a budget every year of his 4 years. Our Republican colleagues don't like the budgets that he submits, but they're free to look at them. They're transparent. They're on the Internet. The President was late this year because we worked frantically to avoid the fiscal cliff and reach an agreement on January 2. You need to know what your revenues are going to be before you can put together a budget, number one.

Number two, the House can take whatever action it wants on the President's budget. You can tell the people you don't like it and you can have your own alternative, as you will. But he's going to submit a budget that's transparent, which is why we shouldn't be wasting time talking about this on the floor of the House when in less than 1 month we're going to see these across-the-board meat-ax cuts take place that our Republican colleagues themselves have acknowledged are going to hurt jobs and hurt the economy, which is why we proposed an alternative, a substitute to prevent those meat-ax cuts from taking place. And, unfortunately, our colleagues who keep saying they want an open and transparent process, put the gavel down and said, no, that this House of Representatives isn't going to have a chance to vote on something to prevent the across-the-board sequester cuts. Instead, they just want to keep on whistling by this problem. They haven't taken it up in this Congress.

So I urge my colleagues to get serious, come back with a plan like ours and that will demonstrate, Mr. Chairman, that we're serious.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is what it's about. This is the debt of our country right down here. The red path is where we're headed under this President's proposals. The red path results in extreme hardship to all Americans, but especially those at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

We believe that it's extremely important for the Nation to know that the positive, principled, fair, caring solutions that the Republicans put forward to save, strengthen, and secure the programs are in contrast to a specific proposal from the other side. And to date, we haven't seen that proposal. We've seen a lot of speeches. We've heard a lot of wonderful words. But the American people need to know when the President's budget balances. And this bill simply says, Mr. President, tell us when your budget balances. Very common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONGRATULATING DAN FISHER ON HIS RETIREMENT

(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, today I rise to congratulate Dan Fisher, the superintendent for the Bald Eagle School District in Centre County, Pennsylvania, on his upcoming retirement and for his 40 years of education service. Dan Fisher began his education career at Bald Eagle Area School District as a teacher in 1973. I had the privilege of having Mr. Fisher as a teacher, where I first learned the workings of government in a constitutional Republic. Dan later went on to become the assistant principal in 1982, the assistant superintendent in 1985, and the district superintendent in 1989, where he served for 23 years.

I have had the honor of serving on the Bald Eagle Area School Board with Mr. Fisher's leadership as superintendent. Dan has been a visionary for education and improving educational

outcomes. Superintendent Fisher has tirelessly served as a leader in our community for the past 40 years.

Thank you, Dan, for being such a tireless advocate for our kids. Thank you for being a friend to me and also my family. I wish you the very best in retirement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

197. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Epoxy Polymer; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0615; FRL-9369-7] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

198. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9360-8] (RIN: 2070-AJ59) received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

199. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Sulfur Emissions from Stationary Boilers [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0763; FRL-9772-6] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

200. A letter from the Program Manager, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting the Centers' final rule — Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus Remaining Service-Life Indicator Performance Requirements [Docket No.: CDC-2012-0009; NIOSH-285] (RIN: 0920-AA38) received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

201. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Microwave Ovens [Docket No.: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0011] (RIN: 1904-AB78) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

202. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Regional Haze Rule Requirements for Mandatory Class I Areas under 40 CFR 51.309; Correction [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0114; FRL-9771-9] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

203. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0849; FRL-9760-4] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and New Hampshire; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0433; EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0149; A-1-FRL-9754-6] received January 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

205. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama; Redesignation of the Birmingham 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0316; FRL-9771-1] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

206. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama; Redesignation of the Birmingham 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0043; FRL-9771-2] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

207. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0611; FRL-9755-9] received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

208. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Revision to Increase Public Availability of the Administrative Record File [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2012-0738; FRL-9772-9] (RIN: 2050-AG73) received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines; New Source Performance Standards for Stationary Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0708; FRL-9756-4] (RIN: 2060-AQ58) received January 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

210. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Financial Report of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

211. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Title VI of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Commission's Report to Congress on FY 2012 Competitive Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

212. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded $5 million for the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3356-EM in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

213. A letter from the General Counsel, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Representation Procedures and Rulemaking Authority [Docket No.: C-7034] (RIN: 3140-ZA01) received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

214. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Guidance in Notice 2011-14 and Rev. Proc. 2011-55 for Participants in the HFA Hardest Hit Fund, the Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program, and Substantially Similar State Programs [Notice 2013-7] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

215. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2013 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to Certain Tax Items (Rev. Proc. 2013-15) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

216. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Retroactive Increase in Excludible Transit Benefits [Notice 2013-8] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 493. A bill to prohibit funds appropriated for the Department of Homeland Security from being used to pay for an abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 495. A bill to make the Internal Revenue Service Free File Program permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 496. A bill to require amounts remaining in Members' representational allowances at the end of a fiscal year to be used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 497. A bill to allow that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that lead to recognized postsecondary credentials; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 498. A bill to provide for programs and activities with respect to the prevention of underage drinking; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 499. A bill to decriminalize marijuana at the Federal level, to leave to the States a power to regulate marijuana that is similar to the power they have to regulate alcohol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 500. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for any citizen or permanent resident of the United States to buy into Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 502. A bill to create an electronic employment eligibility verification system to ensure that all workers in the United States are legally able to work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JONES, Mr. COOK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 503. A bill to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 504. A bill to save at least $10,000,000,000 by consolidating some duplicative and overlapping Government programs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 505. A bill to repeal sequester while achieving balance in deficit reduction between revenue and cuts, and between non-defense cuts and defense cuts, to invest in job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. COHEN (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 506. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 507. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. DUFFY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 508. A bill to extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program for five years; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to authorize grants for the transition of youths with significant disabilities to adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 510. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to make improvements to the individualized education program under that Act and facilitate the transition of children with disabilities to adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 511. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 to provide assistance to States for development and implementation of an individual transition plan for each individual with a developmental disability in the State who is making the transition from the secondary school system into adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 512. A bill to encourage students from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands to become civically engaged through local and Federal government fellowships; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 513. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate overpayments of income tax for disaster relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 515. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 516. A bill to extend the payroll tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 517. A bill to provide that 4 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CHU, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 for the purposes of extending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 through 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DENT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote family unity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 520. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 52. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 53. A resolution electing Members to a standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BONNER):

H. Res. 54. A resolution observing the 100th birthday of civil rights icon Rosa Parks and commemorating her legacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 55. A resolution honoring the life of Trayvon Martin, urging the repeal of Stand Your Ground laws, and calling on the United States Government to address the crisis of racial profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes,'' and Article I, Section 7, which states ''All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 500.

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. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8:

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 which states in part: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 12, 13, 14, and 18

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 508.

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. HARPER:

H.R. 509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress. Also this legislation can be enacted under the authority granted in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 517.

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. MARKEY:

H.R. 518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 22: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 55: Mr. JONES and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 57: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 61: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 93: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 111: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 137: Ms. HAHN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FARR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. CHU, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 138: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 141: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 142: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 168: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 182: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 203: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 217: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 258: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 260: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 262: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 268: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 300: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 301: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 303: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 312: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 317: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 318: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 320: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 321: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 322: Mr. ISSA and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 324: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 334: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 352: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 360: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HAHN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 367: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 375: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 376: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 400: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 403: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 411: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 425: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 431: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 437: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. CHU, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 444: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HALL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 455: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 475: Mr. NEAL.

H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 30: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 31: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 36: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H. Res. 50: Mr. MCGOVERN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proprosed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 444

OFFERED BY: MR. VAN HOLLEN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Balanced Approach to Deficit Reduction''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION
Sec. 101. Repeal and replace the 2013 sequester.
Sec. 102. Protecting veterans programs from sequester.
TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS
Sec. 201. One-year extension of agricultural commodity programs, except direct payment programs.
TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES
Sec. 301. Limitation on section 199 deduction attributable to oil, natural gas, or primary products thereof.
Sec. 302. Prohibition on using last-in, first-out accounting for major integrated oil companies.
Sec. 303. Modifications of foreign tax credit rules applicable to major integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers.
TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE
Sec. 401. Fair share tax on high-income taxpayers.
TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE
Sec. 501. Sense of the House on the need for a fair, balanced and bipartisan approach to long-term deficit reduction.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION

SEC. 101. REPEAL AND REPLACE THE 2013 SEQUESTER.

(a) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DIRECT SPENDING.—Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

(c) SAVINGS.—The savings set forth by the enactment of title II shall achieve the savings that would otherwise have occurred as a result of the sequestration under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 102. PROTECTING VETERANS PROGRAMS FROM SEQUESTER.

Section 256(e)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

SEC. 201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROGRAMS, EXCEPT DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided by each provision of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651) and each amendment made by that title (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2013, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until September 30, 2014.

(b) TERMINATION OF DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COVERED COMMODITIES.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1103 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713).

(2) PEANUTS.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7953).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) September 30, 2013.

TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

SEC. 301. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) for the taxable year, the term 'domestic production gross receipts' shall not include gross receipts from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 302. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year ending after December 31, 2013—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 303. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

''(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

''(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

''(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

''(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

''(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'generally applicable income tax' means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

''(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

''(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE

SEC. 401. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''SEC. 59B. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) PHASE-IN OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2014, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such taxes are attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during the taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 26(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (X) as subparagraphs (D) through (Y), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) section 59B (relating to fair share tax),''.

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

''Part VII—Fair Share Tax on High-Income Taxpayers''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE NEED FOR A FAIR, BALANCED AND BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO LONG-TERM DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) The House finds that—

(1) every bipartisan commission has recommended—and the majority of Americans agree—that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

(b) It is the sense of the House that the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.