United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 2014 No. 55

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 7, 2014, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. There are many important issues to be considered, with multiple interests and priorities dividing the House in its deliberations.

May the inertia of habit that has solidified various blocs of opinion be stirred to productive action, and grant that a new light might shine on creative solutions to longstanding and vexing disagreement.

The benefit of so many Americans depends on the creativity and intentions of those who serve here. May their hopes and prayers for constructive legislation be satisfied to Your divine grace and the goodwill of all in this Chamber.

May all that is done this day 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 Georgia (Mr. BARROW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches.

RECOGNIZING BELL STREET MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bell Street Middle School in Clinton, South Carolina, for the outstanding accomplishment of winning their 12th consecutive Science Olympiad State Championship.

You hear a lot about sports teams, but this is a science olympiad team. Each year, the South Carolina Science Olympiad competition brings together schools from all over the State to compete in science-related contests, with the goal of changing the way science is perceived and taught.

Bell Street Middle School has repeatedly excelled in the competition, leading the State for over a decade. This year, Bell Street finished first in 12 of the 20 individual competitions in the State tournament.

Last year, the school placed in the top six in the Dynamic Planet competition in the Science Olympiad national tournament.

We are very proud of these students and what they accomplished. I am confident they will go on to represent South Carolina well in the national competition.

I want to thank the students, teachers, the parents, and the volunteers who have worked tirelessly to make the dream a reality.

I wish the team great success in the upcoming national competition and continued success in the State tournament for years to come.

RAISE THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the urgent need to raise the Federal minimum wage to $10.10 per hour.

Since 2009, we have had the same $7.25 per hour minimum wage. Over the last 5 years, inflation rates caused the value of that to decrease by an average of 13.6 cents per year.

Today, $7.25 is worth 9 percent less than it was in 2009. For someone working full time on minimum wage, this is like getting a $26 decrease in pay. Meanwhile, the cost of everyday necessities continues to increase. Between

Printed on recycled paper.

basic needs like gas, milk, heat, and electricity, Americans are paying $23.19 more per month.

Many times, I have urged my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do the right thing and allow a vote to ensure American families can have the comfort of a livable wage.

For those who are not working and struggling to keep afloat in these tough times, let's vote to extend the unemployment benefits that expired.

I urge my colleagues to stop brushing working Americans under the rug and pass a fair minimum wage.

SAVE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the problems with ObamaCare never seem to stop hurting families and individuals in Missouri's Eighth District. They are experiencing huge increases in their monthly premiums, and bureaucrats are continuing to get between doctors and patients.

Additionally, workers are seeing reduced hours because of the 30-hour rule contained in ObamaCare. The Save American Workers Act will repeal ObamaCare's 30-hour rule.

Because of this legislation, small businesses will no longer be forced to choose between providing health insurance to part-time workers or drastically cutting jobs or even eliminating employees.

A recent study estimated a 30-hour workweek rule could cost as many as 2.6 million Americans jobs.

Make no mistake, I am still fighting to fully repeal ObamaCare, but the Save American Workers Act will not fix every problem with the ObamaCare health care mandate, but it will immediately save millions of American jobs, and it will help families who are struggling to make ends meet.

BARROW'S BOOKWORMS CHALLENGE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the elementary school students in my district in Georgia who are part of the inaugural class of Barrow's Bookworms.

Last fall, I challenged students in my district to read 20 books over the course of the semester. Upon completion, they would be recognized for their good work with a ceremony in the district.

For this first-ever Barrow's Bookworms program, more than 1,300 students in Georgia's 12th District accepted the challenge and completed the program, collectively reading more than 27,000 books.

As part of this program, students were also asked to create a bookmark that would be distributed to all of the participants. Bekah McCord, an outstanding third grade student at Southwest Laurens Elementary School in Dublin, successfully completed the Barrow's Bookworms reading program and was selected as the winner of our first bookmark design contest. Bekah is an exceptional student and a great example to peers.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Bekah and all of the students who participated this year, and I look forward to next year's Barrow's Bookworms challenge.

CONDOLENCES FOR THE TRAGEDY AT FORT HOOD

(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, I rise today to offer my thoughts and prayers to the individuals, families, and loved ones of those affected by the tragedy at Fort Hood. To have this happen a second time adds more heartbreak to a community still grieving from the tragic events of 2009.

There are still a lot of questions to be answered. Assuredly, like many cases where suicide is involved, we may never know the motive. Undoubtedly, the gunman's mental wellbeing, along with many other variables, continue under investigation.

Not until we know more from the leadership in charge of the investigation would it be appropriate to speculate facts or other variables.

Yes, given a preliminary description of events, it is hard not to place a tragedy in perspective—in the context of the grave challenge our Nation faces when it comes to better addressing issues of behavioral health, mental illness, and suicide.

For now, we pray. For now, we praise. For now, we honor each individual and each sacred life lost.

A TRIBUTE TO MARLAN BOURNS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marlan Bourns, a local Riverside County inventor and philanthropist who recently passed away at the age of 93.

Marlan and his wife Rosemary founded what was then known as Bourns Laboratories out of their garage in Michigan, but its quick growth propelled their relocation to my hometown of Riverside, California.

There, Mr. Bourns' business grew to becomes a significant contributor in the fields of engineering and technology. His inventions would be used by NASA, the medical device industry, telecommunication companies, and personal computer manufacturers.

His fair pay for employees and respectful treatment of them are several of the reasons why some stayed with the company for 50 years. He was able to pour much of his success back into the community through his generous endowment for the University of California at Riverside, which is now home to the Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering.

His friends and family will always remember a creative and inventive man who carried with him an incredibly gentle nature and giving spirit. He will be greatly missed.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NEW CASTLE RED HURRICANES

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer congratulations to the New Castle Red Hurricanes for winning their first-ever Pennsylvania AAAA State championship, with an undefeated 31–0 record.

The 'Canes pulled this off with a 52–39 victory over Philadelphia's La Salle College High School 2 weeks ago in Hershey, Pennsylvania, making them only the fourth undefeated Pennsylvania class AAAA boys' basketball champions in State history.

I send a special congratulations to the players' families, as well as head coach Ralph Blundo and New Castle superintendent John Sarandrea.

According to the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the day after the 'Canes won, Coach Blundo told a group of kindergartners that the 'Canes aren't special because they won the State championship.

He says they are special because of their good grades and the fact that every one of his seniors are going to college next year. He says his players just do things the right way. I couldn't agree more. Go 'Canes.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING'S ASSASSINATION

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 46th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King being gunned down in Memphis, Tennessee.

Dr. King is well-known for his speech, ''I Have a Dream,'' about civil rights and social justice. When he died, he was fighting for economic justice. He was fighting for the right to organize and for better wages for human beings and to attack poverty.

Unfortunately, in this House, too often we hear about opposition to jobs bills, opposition to the minimum wage, opposition to health care for individuals who cannot afford it.

We even see the voting rights bill being struck down by the Supreme Court and the difficulty of getting a new one in this House, and we see people in the other Chamber who even

question the need for the civil rights bill.

Dr. King's dream is still just that, a dream. Many of us share that dream. One day, all of us will wake up and see reality, that the dream must be fulfilled. I hope that day comes soon.

In Memphis, it is a holiday for Dr. King. It should be a holiday for everyone, and we remember a great man and his great works.

CONGRATULATING WOMEN VETERANS CHAMPIONS OF CHANGE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an inspiring leader from Illinois' 14th District. For her exemplary service last month, Erica Borggren was named one of only 10 of the White House's Women Veterans Champions of Change.

Since August 2011, Erica has served as director for Illinois' Department of Veterans Affairs. Under her leadership, IDVA has launched, among other successful programs, the nationally acclaimed Illinois Joining Forces, which connects veterans with more than 200 veterans-serving organization.

She is a Rhodes scholar, Truman scholar, and was valedictorian at West Point. Her military service spans from South Korea, as an Army Medical Service Corps officer, to Iraq, as commanding General David Petraeus' trusted speech writer.

General Petraeus calls her:

> One of the most talented officers with whom I have ever served and exemplary in every respect.

Erica's strong leadership and record of excellence ensures a bright future for Illinois' military servicemembers and veterans.

REMEMBERING THE PASSAGE OF THE BRADY HANDGUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, February of this year marked the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act. Since becoming law, it is credited with stopping more than 2.1 million gun sales to prohibited purchasers, including convicted felons, domestic abusers, and fugitives.

The recent tragedy of 2 days ago at Fort Hood brings to light again the issues of PTSD, mental illness, and what our men and women in uniform have suffered throughout all of our wars, and I mean all of our wars.

We cannot continue to ignore Virginia Tech; Fort Hood; what our colleagues Gabby Gifford and RON BARBER endured; Aurora, Colorado; Sandy Hook; Washington Navy Yard; Littleton; and Fort Hood again, just to name a few. These incidents—the families, communities, the friends—cry for action.

Mr. Speaker, let us act by at least bringing H.R. 1565, the King-Thompson bill, to this floor.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1874, PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1871, BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1872, BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 539 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 539

Resolved, That at any time after 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. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation. 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill and the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further 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 further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1871) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1872) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 0915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a big day for me down here on the House floor. I don't know if you were catching every word of the rule as it was being read, but what you've got here in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, is a rule that makes in order absolutely every germane amendment that was offered, not to one budget reform bill, not to two budget reform bills, but to three budget process reform bills.

We talk so much about numbers in this institution, Mr. Speaker. We talk about baselines. We talk about CBO scores. We also talk a lot about people. We talk a lot about families. We talk about why what we do here matters in the lives of folks back home.

Father Conroy prayed this morning, Mr. Speaker, that we could get out of some of our old habits that the inertia leads us to disagree and find those things around on which we do agree. There is one thing that is undisputed in this Chamber—in fact, on Capitol

Hill; in fact, in this entire town—Mr. Speaker, when it comes to budget process, and that is that every time we decide we are going to spend money today, we get a little boost in the economy, and that boost comes from a mortgaged future. We can get a little today at the expense of a little tomorrow, or, conversely, we can lose a little bit today in exchange for gaining a little bit tomorrow.

There is no free lunch when it comes to budgeting, Mr. Speaker. I only get to spend each dollar once in this institution, and I can either raise that dollar from today's taxpayers or I can borrow that dollar from tomorrow's taxpayers. There are arguments on both sides. Daniel Patrick Moynihan was fond of saying: Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

What these three budget process bills before us today, Mr. Speaker, will do is make sure we are working from the same shared set of facts. Now, again, this rule, Mr. Speaker, provides for these three bills. It is H. Res. 539. It is a structured rule for H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. That is going to be on the floor today immediately following this rule. If we are able to secure passage, and I certainly hope that we can, we will be debating H.R. 1874.

H.R. 1874 will instruct the Congressional Budget Office to calculate, when we make these decisions, whether we are going to spend a little today and mortgage tomorrow or whether we are going to save a little bit today in exchange for growth tomorrow, to calculate that impact. It is not enough to spend the dollar, it is not enough to save the dollar. We have to explain, not just to our colleagues, but to the American people, what the benefit or the burden of that decision is going to be. H.R. 1874 brings some clarity to that decision.

One of my personal favorite bills, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 1871. H.R. 1871 and H.R. 1872 are also made in order by this bill. H.R. 1871 happens to be the Woodall bill, Mr. Speaker. It is the Baseline Reform bill. Candidly, I can't claim credit for it. I want to, pride of authorship and all. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth is it is the gentleman from the great State of Texas. Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT has been fighting for this bill long before I arrived in this institution. I happened to get a seat on the Budget Committee; he happens to serve elsewhere; so I am carrying this language. I couldn't be prouder to do it, but I want to give credit where credit is due.

The fight that the gentleman from Texas has been making over the years—and it is not a fight against one another; it is a fight against inertia, as Father Conroy talked about this morning—is to say that it is just crazy in today's tight economic environment to assume that if the government spent X dollars this year, we are going to give them X plus 3 percent next year, that irrespective of what your mission is, irrespective of what your productivity is, irrespective of what your success is, we are just going to assume that your agency is going to get more money next year than it got this year. That is not the way anybody operates at home. That is not what we do around the dinner table. That is not what any business in America does. That is not what we should be doing.

So H.R. 1871 says we are going to assume you are going to get next year what you got this year, with absolutely no inflation whatsoever.

Now, this is not an area of wide agreement. I would argue what you get next year ought to be less than what you get this year, because we ought to expect some productivity increases from you. It is fair in the industrious society in which we live that we expect you to do more with less next year. But we are not trying to achieve all of that today. We are just saying that what you get next year is going to be what you get this year. Eliminate those automatic inflaters that bias us towards less productivity and more cost.

Finally, H.R. 1872, Mr. Speaker, that is a bill from my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT). That bill says we ought to have accurate accounting, fair cost accounting, of government loan programs.

We are in the business of guaranteeing a whole lot of loans in this institution, Mr. Speaker, loans for all sorts of meritorious activities that we would agree on both sides of the aisle are worthy of being carried on, but the question is how do we account for that in the budget process.

Today we assume that those loans will never go bad—that those loans will never go bad—and that we will only reflect a cost of the American taxpayer guaranteeing those loans when and if those loans do go bad. But that is not what happens in the real world. That is not what we ask of our bankers down on Main Street. That is not what we ask of any financial institution. We would run you right out of town if you tried to do your accounting that way in the real world, Mr. Speaker.

So what Mr. GARRETT says is: Why can't we apply real world accounting to this institution? Why can't we hold ourselves to the same high standard that we hold folks back home? I applaud him for that. I think that is something, again, that brings us together rather than divides us.

What I like most about this rule, though, Mr. Speaker, is that when the amendments were offered—and that is the way the process goes, for folks who don't watch the Rules Committee as closely as my friend from Florida and I do. Members of Congress come; they submit their amendments to the Rules Committee; and the Rules Committee decides what is made in order. But we do that in consultation with the Parliamentarians. We need to make sure that amendments are germane. We want to make sure that the conversation is on the topic that the bill is on. We don't allow nongermane amendments most of the time, but sometimes Members submit amendments in good faith that don't comply with the rules as they were submitted, but they can be worked on to make them better.

What I am particularly proud of, Mr. Speaker, is that, when we received some amendments that were not quite within the four corners of the rules, rather than just rejecting those amendments out of hand, which would have been a perfectly appropriate response, we didn't do what was appropriate; we did what was right. And that was to go and work with those Members to improve those amendments, get them within the four corners of the parliamentary process, and make those in order today.

So, again, every single germane amendment that was submitted to the Rules Committee on each of these three bills was made in order for debate under the bill. We will do the first of those bills today. If this rule passes, we will do the remaining two next week, and all done in the name of transparency and accurate information for the American people.

It is perfectly legitimate to have your own opinion about what the Federal budget ought to look like, but you are not entitled to your own facts about what the impact of those decisions will be.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and underlying bills.

In my friend's commentary, I perceived him as being very reasonable, particularly when he gets to the part of the rule that deals with those amendments that were made in order that are germane. It is a particular concern that he has demonstrated in the period that he has been on the Rules Committee. He also is an advocate for open rules.

That said, one of the down sides to our process, in my judgment, is that I would imagine that at least a significant portion of this body—not the majority—don't even know what we are debating today and won't know until they come here to vote. For that reason, we should make open rules; whereas, ideas that germinate during the course of the debate could be put forward by Members under our rules process.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of three bills. Before getting into it, normally when people leave our offices or when we complete the process of debating a measure and want to give kudos to the staff, we do so at the end of the process. But today I want to recognize the rather extraordinary staff on both sides of the Rules

Committee, and particularly the young man seated next to me, Ian Wolf, who labors actively to help me put words together to come here with, and two young men that are working in the office with me: Tom Carnes, who recently came to me as a Phi Beta Kappa graduate from Maine, and Mike Sykes, a wounded warrior. Many of the words that I will speak henceforth are from those three gentlemen, and I thank them for that.

Normally, like my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), we both are, in my judgment, good extemporaneous speakers. But today, I am going to stick to the script because of these two young men. Then, if I am provoked by my friend from Georgia, I will speak extemporaneously.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of three bills, all of which impose tortuous new rules on an already convoluted budget process and attempt to embed Republican dogma into what is intended to be an objective analysis based on reality, not fantasy.

The bouquet of imagery to explain this latest budgetary behavior is certainly painful: Yogi Berra and déjà vu all over again; Groundhog Day with Bill Murray's character, Phil Connors, doomed to repeat the same day over and over again; Sisyphus sentenced for his hubris to push a boulder up a mountain only to see it careen to the bottom and have to start all over again.

We have seen these proposals before, Mr. Speaker. Yet, once again, my friends across the aisle try their best to throw up smokescreens right and further right. Once again, my friends, led by Chairman PAUL RYAN, present reforms that are not common sense but that are actually nonsense. Once again, Republicans propose budget process changes that are nothing more than gimmicks to eliminate the spending on essential government services and to dress up tax cuts for the wealthy. Once again, we have to waste time considering budgetary gimmicks like ''dynamic scoring'' and whether we should factor in inflation when accounting for future spending instead of dealing with the important issues of the day.

The need for immigration reform isn't going anywhere, friends. The need for investment in our infrastructure isn't going anywhere. The need to provide health care for our veterans is not going anywhere, and will I tell you that your budget gimmicks aren't going anywhere either, and you know it. You can pass these gimmicks all day long. You are in the majority. You can pass them all day—24 hours a day—and twice and three times on Sunday, but you know that they are dead on arrival in the Senate.

So let's turn to serious business, business the American people would like us to take up, rather than wasting our time and the time of millions of Americans. The changes envisioned within these bills tie Congress and the Congressional Budget Office up in knots in an effort to prove that conservative ideology about taxes and spending is going to grow our Nation's economy—not create more jobs, not stimulate demand, not invest in infrastructure or in education or in any of the many endeavors that are critical to improving the lives of all Americans.

In H.R. 1871—Mr. WOODALL's favorite bill and for good reason as he is the author of this iteration of it, and he gave attribution to the person who has struggled to put this measure forward—it is proposed that the Congressional Budget Office not include annual inflation when making its budget baselines. This seems like a rather mundane, technical change, but it isn't.

I would be pleased to support this, Mr. Speaker, because it means that, in making my own personal budget projections, I can simply ignore the fact that the costs for everyday items and activities tend to go up every year. I can just assume that what I am paying today I can keep paying 10 years from now and still expect the exact same number of goods and services. But, of course, we all know that isn't true. Simply wishing away inflation won't make it so. Fuzzy math, as it has been described by some, does not equal fiscal responsibility.

By eliminating inflation adjustments from discretionary spending projections, Republicans are actually reducing the funding for a Federal program. Since the dollar amount would stay the same every year, the number of services that could be covered would decrease. I hasten to add that I agree with my friend Mr. WOODALL that accountability ought to be factored in and that these programs should be able to perform in a way that is accountable to the public. When they do not, they should be dispensed with, and that is a prerogative that we can exercise, but it doesn't have to be done the way that it is put forward. It is our responsibility to have the oversight of these structures in our government.

Over the long term, this results in a massive decrease in essential services that millions of Americans rely on. This technical change then is actually a backdoor effort to slowly starve necessary government programs. Rather than be up front about which programs my friends on the other side want to eliminate, they would rather put sneaky rules into place to guarantee the outcome they want without having to have an open debate.

Through H.R. 1874, Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to introduce dynamic scoring into the CBO's projection process. Dynamic scoring? Take a closer look. It is more like dynamic stealing. By implementing this fantasy math, the Republicans artificially inflate the costs of important programs as a way to steal them out from underneath those who are most in need of them. They tweak the CBO's analysis so that tax cuts for the wealthy seem like they grow the economy while investments in programs that help everyday Americans do not. Let me repeat that. They tweak the CBO's analysis so that tax cuts for the wealthy seem like they grow the economy while investments in programs that help everyday Americans do not. I have lived here long enough to see ''trickle down'' fail repeatedly. Republicans make it easier to cut taxes for the rich rather than to build bridges and schools for the rest of us.

This bill specifically instructs the CBO to ignore the positive economic effects that would come about from investments in things like infrastructure and education. I want to underscore the word ''infrastructure.'' We talk about it all the time around here, and a decade ago, one of our colleagues spent a portion of his career here asking us to spend money on bridges. When I came here in 1992, we had 14,000 bridges in this Nation that were in need of repair, and we have not addressed the circumstances surrounding that, and we need to and we can. It is as if dealing with infrastructure and education—as if spending on things that Americans want and need—won't boost the economy, which is the way their approach suggests.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are at it again with H.R. 1872. This proposal seeks to significantly change how the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office calculate the costs of government loans and loan guarantees. This bill would just add an extra price tag to programs based on what an individual would pay for a loan in the private market. Never mind the fact that the United States Government is not an individual acting in a private credit market.

What this bill really represents is another attempt by the Republicans to make important programs for the poor and middle class families appear too expensive to be continued—programs meant to help young people get an education, programs that help struggling families afford homes, programs that help the elderly in their need of security in their failing health, programs that help farmers and small businesses grow this economy. By artificially inflating the costs of these programs, the Republicans hope to fool us into thinking that we can't afford them.

But as far as I know, April Fool's Day started and ended on Tuesday. I will tell you this: I am not going to be fooled; my constituents aren't going to be fooled; and the American people aren't going to be fooled by your gimmicks—and these budget bills are only the appetizers.

The entree was served up by Chairman RYAN when he recently introduced his next budget, which he dubbed—and I was reading it last night—the Path to Prosperity, but it would be more accurately called a path to poverty. As much as I had hoped for the opportunity to turn down a path where we consider meaningful legislation, we are again forced to battle against Chairman RYAN's latest march down his

path to poverty, and since we have already adopted top-line numbers for the next two budget cycles, there is no reason for this budget beyond feeding the political base of my friends on the other side.

We will see the bumper stickers. We will hear the talk. We will hear the echo chamber recite the mantra of those who would feed their base. I suppose this budget is a solid start for a 10-minute standup set at your local yuck-yucks, but that is about the best that I can say for it.

I mean, you are going to cut spending by $966 billion over the next 10 years by cutting funding for food stamps, by cutting funding for income assistance to help needy families, by cutting Pell grants for kids to go to college. You can't be serious. You are going to implement draconian cuts to programs millions of Americans rely upon, but you make sure that we increase defense spending. You can't be serious.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans are really showing us here is their blueprint for America's future. You don't even have to look that closely to see that this blueprint creates nothing but structural integrity problems for our economy. The Republicans' blueprint lays bare their full frontal assault on middle class families and the poor. Their blueprint calls for turning Medicare into a voucher program. They will describe it differently, but it comes out to nothing more than a voucher program. Their blueprint calls for non-defense discretionary spending to be cut to the tune of $791 billion. This will result in draconian cuts to education, public works, medical research, and the list continues. It goes on and on.

Do you want to better yourself by obtaining a college degree? RYAN's road to ruin is going to make sure that there is no money there for you to do so.

Do you want to help grow our economy by shipping your goods on our roads and bridges? Good luck, since your goods will undoubtedly be held up at one of the many Ryan roadblocks to prosperity that will strip the budget of much-needed infrastructure investments.

Are you or is any member of your family suffering from a disease, the cure for which would certainly be furthered by Federal medical research dollars? Sorry, but with this Republican budget proposed by Mr. RYAN, you have found yourself on Mr. RYAN's fast track to despair.

Rather than using the budget process to lead this country into a new era of economic growth, Republicans want to cut taxes for the rich, cut programs for everyone else, and then feel like they have set this country on the right track. This is no way to run an economy, no way to run a budget process, and it is no way to stick up for the millions of struggling Americans, as my friends on the Democratic side are doing and have done for years, who need us to focus on improving the economy.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I thank Mike and Tim and Ian and the Rules Committee staff who are working with me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to thank my friend from Florida for laying out exactly what the case is that needs to be made today.

It just so happens all of those spending priorities that the gentleman from Florida mentioned are spending priorities I share—investments in education; investments in roads and bridges; investments in cutting-edge research that makes a difference in people's lives, not just in terms of treatments, but in terms of cures.

In the absence of crystal-clear budgeting, in the absence of the reforms that we have proposed here today, the $5 trillion that the Budget Committee passed that proposes to reduce Federal spending over the next 10 years is exactly the same as the interest that that very same budget proposes to pay over the next 10 years.

I want you to hear that, Mr. Speaker. Every single reduction in spending that the gentleman just laid out is necessitated because, dollar for dollar, we are wasting those same amounts on paying the debts that previous Congresses have racked up.

That is a Budget Committee-passed budget. The President's budget, Mr. Speaker, proposes to spend $6 trillion over the next 10 years on interest alone—interest alone.

Mr. Speaker, by not taking responsibility today, not only are we mortgaging our children's future by piling these debts on them, we are trading away opportunities to make a difference in their future.

Because those dollars that we are sending to the Chinese and Germans who loan us money and the money that we are spending to pay our debts is money that we could be spending on those shared investment priorities that the gentleman from Florida and I have in common.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. NUGENT), one of the great members of the Rules Committee, a former sheriff.

Mr. NUGENT. Thank you, Mr. WOODALL. I certainly do appreciate it; and to my colleague from Florida on the other side of the aisle, once again, it is always a pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, only in Washington can politicians pat themselves on the back for cutting spending while actually increasing spending. That is a novel idea.

Say, for example, we spent $100 on a program 1 year. The next year, we automatically assume that we are going to spend $103 on that same program, due to inflation. If we only end up spending $102 versus the $103, according to official government accounting, we have cut spending, but we increased spending by $2.

In the real world—at least back home—you can't simultaneously cut spending while increasing spending and then say you cut spending. You can't do both. It is one or the other.

Families don't budget this way. Businesses don't budget this way. It would have made my life a whole lot easier as sheriff if my budget automatically increased 3 percent because of inflation that may or may not exist within the program.

If you change the baseline every year by inflation, no one has to justify what their increase is; but then, again, we live in this fantasy world called Washington, D.C. This is where we live today.

The fantasy is that we can spend more money than you take in, and it will all work out in the end. We can be $17 trillion in debt today, but don't worry about it because it will get better on its own.

How does it work? It doesn't work that way. Mr. Speaker, our current budget process is broken. By assuming automatic increases in spending, our system favors more and more spending without any accountability.

Under this scenario, programs don't receive a real examination as to whether or not they deserve the increases. They just get it anyway. Just because they exist, they get more money; not that they need it, not that they can show folks that they absolutely have to have it, we just get it.

As Chairman RYAN pointed out last night in the Rules Committee, our current budget process has not been significantly reformed since the Budget Control Act of 1974. That is 40 years ago. We haven't done a thing. Given our fiscal situation, it is about time we do something to try to get this on the right track.

I appreciate the committee's work, and I particularly appreciate Mr. WOODALL's bill today. These are important steps to refine and reform the budget process.

You hear folks from the other side of the aisle say that these are gimmicks. Well, I will tell you that, back home, it is not a gimmick when I stand there and have to justify why I need more money in my budget as sheriff.

I had to stand there with the appropriators and say: Here are the reasons why I need more money; and by the way, here is what we have done with the money.

So we show that we have actually earned it, and the taxpayers can see that there was a reward at the end of the day and that they got what they paid for.

There is none of that up here. I sit in committee meetings, day in and day out, in regards to seeing money being spent by government. Nobody is held accountable. We give people five-digit bonuses, Mr. Speaker, for doing a lousy job, but that is the way government works. We reward mediocrity.

This budget idea, if enacted, actually reins that in and makes people accountable for the dollars they are given from the American public so they can say: Listen, we are not talking about it; we are doing it.

So to Mr. WOODALL and to Mr. RYAN, I do appreciate all their hard work and what they have done and where they are trying to move this process forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, I turn to the extemporaneous side. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening of next week, my friend Mr. WOODALL and I will be in the Rules Committee, and we will be taking up the Ryan budget. I might add that we use the names of individuals.

I have great respect for PAUL RYAN. I think he is a brilliant young man; and clearly, ideologically, he and I have our differences.

I remember being on the floor and hearing the two best speeches in the 21 years I have been here that were made pertaining to issues of the moment. One was made by Ron Dellums, chairman of Armed Services at the time, and the other by John Kasich, who is now the Governor of Ohio.

I still consider those two speeches to be the best that I have heard in the time that I am here, mine and Mr. WOODALL's notwithstanding.

On that night that Mr. Kasich made his remarks, I listened very intently to him. I forget the exact numbers that the budget was proposing, but after he finished his remarks, I went up to him and congratulated him on his remarks

I then said to him what I will say to Mr. RYAN at some point in the future: I understand what it is that you want to spend, and I believe that we would probably spend right at or about the same amount of money. The difference is what you want to spend it on and what I want to spend it on.

That is what I said to John that night. I find myself in that situation repeatedly through the years. I myself, and certainly many others, am a champion of those who are less fortunate in our society, and I don't believe that my friends are unmindful of the great need that our constituents have, be they Republican, Democrat, Independent, or otherwise situated politically.

The simple fact of the matter is that there are people in this country who are not as well off as some others in the country. There should be nothing to decry the fact that there are some in our society who have done exceedingly well, even during recessions.

I have a friend that is a billionaire. He told me he made money during the Depression, he made money before the Second World War, after the Second World War, and made money after every recession, largely for the reason that he knows how to make money; and I don't begrudge him that.

But that same individual told me that any amount of taxes that he paid, he would prefer to see that it goes to educating our children appropriately, and if it required him to pay more taxes, he would have no problem doing so, and toward that end, I feel the same way.

People think that those of us up here in Congress live a life of luxury with a high salary of $174,000 a year. Well, the simple fact of the matter is—and rightly, perhaps—we have not had a raise for Congress Members for 5 years.

At the very same time, if I use myself as an example, my rent here in this town has gone up $600 during that period of time. My salary didn't go up. So where was I supposed to meet these needs?

The simple fact is that, when we talk about a household budget, that is an entirely different set of circumstances than a Federal budget or a State budget or a city budget. They do not operate the same, and we should stop making that analogy.

It is not like I sit down and fill out my budget. This is an extremely complex process. The Congressional Budget Office only gives us the numbers that we tell them that the policy is going to be, and they tell us what the numbers are going to look like. They don't provide the numbers. They don't do the oversight on the programs that we make here.

We don't have to just give them the money, but if we set a baseline and if we do allow for inflation, when those programs have failed or those that are sunsetting—and more of them should sunset and too many of them have failed—then that is our responsibility.

When we cut poor people, when we cut middle class people in this country—that is the base of this country, that is the bedrock of this country. It has been and will continue to be.

If we go the path that my friends want us to pass through, what we will do is allow for those people that are better off in our society—who could afford to help more the poor and the middle class—to get richer, and it will cause more middle class people to become poorer; and then the needs will be greater. If we don't see ourselves as a better society than that, then something is drastically wrong with us.

I don't begrudge a single rich person on Earth, but I do feel strongly responsible for those that are poor and not poor necessarily by virtue of their circumstances.

What we tend to do to poor people here is, rather than ask them what we can do with them to lift them out of poverty, we do things to them. That is why most of us know that they won't vote at voting time, largely for the reason that they have the most reasons to vote and, at the same time, have the relative least reasons to vote.

The insufferable triumvirate of inadequate jobs, inadequate housing, inadequate educational opportunity persists in this country, and the fact of the matter is that we can do better—and we should do better—by those that are poor. We should do something meaningful to create jobs.

After Monday of next week, when we talk about this budget, I defy my friends to tell me that they are going to put that budget on the floor. When we vote on it Wednesday, I say let's go into debate Thursday and debate it until its conclusion and then vote on it.

I guarantee you we are not going to vote on the Ryan budget, everybody knows that, and I challenge my friends to bring it forth any day after next Monday when we do the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

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

It never surprises me how much I have in common with my friend from Florida. We come from very different parts of the world, Mr. Speaker. If you go to many events in this town, they will generally have a Southeastern State section and a Florida section. Florida is a little bit different from the rest of those Southeastern States. Our constituencies may not look the same demographically, may not look the same on paper, but when it comes to caring about one another, I have no doubt that our communities are incredibly similar, as the gentleman from Florida and I are very similar.

The debate is not about whether or not we have an obligation to our neighbors. We do. The question is are we meeting our obligation to our neighbors, and I will tell you that we are not. The pathway up in this country is what our obligation is here. I would say to my friends that providing a safety net that has no ladder out is a cruel and unsatisfactory path for this House.

I was talking with a gentleman down in southeast D.C., Mr. Speaker, and he runs a project that takes folks from homelessness and drug addiction to employment. He said: The problem with you Republicans is all you do is offer people hope: pick yourself up by your bootstraps; tomorrow will be better than today. He said hope in the absence of access is futile. He said: But Democrats offer help. If you are naked, I will clothe you. If you are hungry, I will feed you. If you are in prison, I will visit you. But he said help in the absence of a pathway out is to condemn someone to a life of poverty. He said: What you all have to do is to come together. You have to provide that help to meet people's immediate needs, but you have to provide that pathway out.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care if you are rich today; I care whether or not the

opportunity exists in America for you to be rich tomorrow. And I don't mean rich by having six figures or seven figures or eight figures; I mean rich because you have got a roof over your head and you can feed your family.

The American Dream, Mr. Speaker, is not to be the next Bill Gates. I don't know where that ever got started. The American Dream is to be able, by the sweat of your brow and the power of your ideas, to be your own man or woman, to make your own decisions.

I listened deeply to the words of my friend and I looked for where we might find that common ground, because, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Florida, if you go into any public housing facility in my district, they will tell you that the Federal Government prevents them from succeeding. The residents would say: You have got to let us kick the bad actors out. The residents would say: We have got folks here who are trying to make a difference, and we have got folks here who are bringing us down. You have got to give us the ability to keep our kids safe. You have got to give us the ability to keep our community safe. You have got to give us the ability to run our lives.

But Federal law says no, Mr. Speaker. Federal law says we know what is fair; we know what is best.

But I know the gentleman from Florida and I share a heart for letting folks in these communities take control of their lives, make those choices that will enable tomorrow to be better than today.

Mr. Speaker, with this budget—again, I can't make this point sharply enough—the President proposes to spend $6 trillion on interest alone over the next 10 years—$6 trillion. Now, at the President's spending levels, Mr. Speaker, that is almost 18 months of running this country. Understand that because of the borrowing patterns of past Congresses and administrations, we are losing 18 months of the very services the gentleman from Florida proposes that we provide. Eighteen months are eroded out of the next 10 years with interest alone.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act does, for example, is say you have got to project out over 40 years.

You will remember, when the President proposed his health care bill, no question, his intention was to help folks; no question, his intention was to make life better for folks. We can absolutely debate whether or not those were successes or failures, but this is the way that budget sorted itself out. He said: I am not going to spend more than $1 trillion on this program.

Now, I don't know when in the world, Mr. Speaker, $1 trillion became the low number that we decided would be tolerable as a program, but he said: I don't want to spend more than $1 trillion on this program.

So, instead of creating a 10-year program, he created a 6-year program, put the implementation off for 4 years. Critical health care services, absolutely necessary we provide these services to the American people, but they can wait 4 years. We have got families in need, families that don't have options, families that don't have choices, but I am not going to help them get choices for another 4 years. Six-year program, $1 trillion.

The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act says we need to look at programs over 40 years because that $1 trillion, 6-year program explodes in years 7 and 8 and 9 and 10. And it may be money well spent. I hope that is what the gentleman from Florida believes because I know he supported the program. I don't believe it is money well spent. I think we are losing trillions of dollars in health care costs that could be better controlled. I think we are losing trillions of dollars in care that could have been provided to folks but, instead, is being lost in an inefficient health care system.

But we don't have those answers when those bills come to the floor of this House for a vote. Who is it that opposes that, Mr. Speaker? Who is it that opposes, when we make trillion-dollar decisions that are multigenerational, that we don't have access to long-term data?

The gentleman from Florida says it seems disingenuous for us to pretend inflation does not exist. That is not what I am proposing, but disingenuous to pretend that it does. I think it is similarly odd to pretend that the program stops after 10 years instead of it continuing on in perpetuity, as these programs do. These bills do nothing but provide us with other information.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. My experience in this House with a voting card began in 2011. And while the gentleman is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, when he talks about inflation and how services can be eroded, my experience in this House, your experience in this House, Mr. Speaker, is that we spent less in 2011 than we did in 2010, not more. Inflation was there, but we spent less. My experience, Mr. Speaker, is that we spent less in 2012 than we did in 2011, less in 2013 than we did in 2012, less in 2014 than we did in 2013. Every year I have been here we have spent less. I think that is what our constituency expects from us, not to cut critical service programs, but to increase our productivity and prioritize their dollars, prioritize their dollars to those places where they can do the most good.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire and ask the Speaker to inquire if my colleague is prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to my friend from Florida, Mr. Speaker, I, too, am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

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

My colleague just concluded his remarks by saying in 2011, 2012, 2013 they spent less, and he is correct. But in 2011, more people needed food stamps; in 2012, more people needed housing; in 2013, more people needed to get across safe bridges and safe roads. So I am not sure where the twain meets.

I agree with my colleague that he and I have more in common than we do differences, but I hearken back to my earlier comment. He wants to spend or not spend on what he wants to spend or not spend, and I want to spend or not spend on what I want to spend or not spend.

I want to spend on roads. I want to spend on children's education. I want to spend on people who are hungry. And I believe he does as well, but you cannot do that if you keep cutting everything all the time.

Mr. Speaker, these bills and Chairman RYAN's budget are nothing more than base attempts to rally the fringe of the Republican Party, and I stand steadfastly against each one of these attempts to drag us down a Ryan road to ruin.

To quote the great American poet, Robert Frost:

> I shall be telling this with a sigh somewhere ages and ages hence. Two roads diverged in a wood and I took the one less traveled, and that has made all the difference.

Mr. Speaker, friends, today we stand before two roads: one, a road to ruin paved with pummeling cuts to hurt the poor and attack middle class families, simply put, to protect the better off in our society, the real rich; the other road, a road that helps the poor ascend out from poverty, not a ladder out that has its ladder rungs with holes in it, as my friend discussed that ladder out, a road that helps middle class families more fully achieve their dreams, a road that helps our businesses and economy grow, a road that embraces our veterans and fights for them as vigorously as they fought for us. And if Fort Hood doesn't teach us anything about the mental health of our soldiers and our society, then I don't know what will.

Unfortunately, I believe this latter road traveled by my fellow Democrats and by me today will be the road less traveled, and this fact will certainly make a significant difference for the millions of Americans trying to fully realize their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1010, our bill to raise the Federal minimum wage to $10.10 an hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Two paths diverged in the wood, and I took the path less traveled, and that has made all the difference.

Mr. Speaker, this is Washington, D.C. There is a term called ''Washington, D.C., math,'' which, as my friend from Florida, the sheriff, described earlier is when you can raise spending by $5 and call it a cut. That is Washington, D.C., math.

The path less traveled in this town is the path of fiscal responsibility; the path less traveled in this town is the path of accountability; the path less traveled in this town is the path of transparency, and that is what these three measures before us today propose, Mr. Speaker.

I held a townhall meeting, Mr. Speaker, about 12 months ago. They asked if I was going to support the congressional pay raise. I said: Well, we are not going to do a congressional pay raise this year, but I hope one day to come home and tell you that I have earned it.

I do. I want to show up back home, Mr. Speaker, and tell folks that, dadgummit: I have earned it. Be proud of what we have done in Washington, D.C. I have earned it.

I think that is true of every dime of spending the Federal Government does. I don't think we ought to assume, as the current baseline does, that every single Federal agency is going to have their budget increase next year by the cost of inflation. I think those agencies should come to this institution, as they do in an annual appropriation process, and say: I have earned it. I have earned it.

I am not just talking about making a difference in people's lives; here are the results. I am not just talking about lifting people up; here are the results.

The hardest thing to end in this town, Mr. Speaker, is a Federal program. Once they get started, they seem to last forever. Mission creep. If they solve one mission, they are going to adopt a new mission, roll right on down the line. Nobody wants to work themselves out of a job.

Is it so outrageous, is it the role only of the fringe, as my friend from Florida proposed, to suggest that, if we are going to borrow and spend more of our children's money, we should come and justify it?

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, that kind of budget transparency has become relevant only to the fringe of America. It is not the America I know.

I tell the young people—and I try to start every day back home with young people, Mr. Speaker. I say, listen, just tell me what you want in terms of support for higher education because the only dollars I am going to spend, I am going to borrow from you. I am borrowing it from you.

We all love our children. We all want our children to succeed. But we are borrowing from them. Every decision we make. These three bills ask for three things, and three things only before we make the decision to borrow from our children:

Number one, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. It asks that for those programs that are going to have a big impact on our economy, that we look not just at what the 1-year impact is, not just at what the 10-year impact is, but that we look at a generation of impact.

Before we start down that road less traveled, Mr. Speaker, we should know what it is going to cost us and how it is going to benefit us. We don't get that information today, as the gentleman from Florida, the sheriff, noted. We have not reformed the Congressional Budget Act since 1974. That kind of multigenerational information is worthy of this body. This bill would provide it to us for the very first time.

The Budget and Accounting Transparency Act. If you are going to lend money, you ought to account for it; you ought to evaluate it.

We often talk about our $17.5 trillion debt, Mr. Speaker. That comes from Washington math because if we were anywhere else other than this town, we would have to evaluate all the promises that we have made. I mean, you know how Social Security is funded, for example, Mr. Speaker. It is today's workers that are paying for today's retirees. There is not a dime set aside for today's workers when they retire.

The true cost of government, the true national debt, as recently calculated by Dr. Larry Kotlikoff of Boston University, not a conservative by any stretch of the imagination, is over $200 trillion—$200 trillion. ''Trillion''—we throw these words around as if they are nothing—that is 1 million millions. We have not had 1 million days since the birth of Christ, Mr. Speaker. We won't for another 730 years. Mr. Speaker, 1 million millions is 1 trillion. We have borrowed and promised on behalf of our children $200 trillion.

The fair value accounting request is only that we be honest with the American people. I am prepared to live by whatever decision the American people make. I believe in our Republic. But we cannot ask people to make decisions without providing people with good information. This bill does that.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill, again, sponsored by my good friend from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT, a long champion that I have the privilege of serving with in this Congress, the Baseline Reform Act. The Baseline Reform Act says, if you are going to raise spending by $1, you are actually raising spending by $1.

I know it sounds radical, Mr. Speaker. I know it sounds like the province of the fringe, but it is not. If you are going to raise spending by $1, you should say you are going to raise spending by $1. Dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, I can't even have a town hall meeting these days and talk about budget numbers—because I am a budget guy—I can't talk about budget numbers without someone raising their hand and saying, now, ROB, when you talk about spending reductions, is that really a spending reduction, or is that just a reduction in the rate of growth? That is how it has become.

For 4 years in this institution, we have spent less each and every succeeding year. Now, I would argue, contrary to what my friend from Florida suggested, that we are prioritizing spending on shared goals, and we are deprioritizing spending on which we do not have those shared goals. It seems fair in these difficult economic times, as we are taking those dollars from hardworking American taxpayers across the country, that we identify high-priority spending and low-priority spending.

I will take the work at NIH, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker. That is high-priority spending. That is basic research that is going to make a difference in people's lives and not a difference in something minor, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps a life-and-death difference. It is a goal that we share. It is a goal that the Appropriations Committee shares. It is a goal that we are going to be able to realize.

But I don't think there is a single man or woman at NIH, I don't think there is a single professor at NIH, I don't think there is a single Ph.D. candidate at NIH who is embarrassed to come up here and say, I have done well. I am a good steward of the taxpayers' money. Trust me again.

Mr. Speaker, that is where I want to take us with these budget bills. I want to have folks proud of how they are spending the dollars, proud to come and share that with us here in this Congress and have the American people proud to get onboard with renewing those dollars once again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this rule. This rule has made in order every amendment that was germane to these three bills. I ask them to support this rule so that we can begin voting these bills this very day.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 539 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

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 Democratic minority 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.''

The Republican majority may 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. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 193, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—222

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
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
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Amodei
Brady (TX)
Castor (FL)
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Lankford
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Rangel
Salmon
Smith (WA)
Waxman
Wolf

□ 1047

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

Messrs. POSEY and LONG changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 220, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—220

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

NOES—194

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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
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
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Brady (TX)
Castor (FL)
Duncan (TN)
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Lankford
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Rangel
Salmon
Smith (WA)
Webster (FL)
Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1054

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.

PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1874.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539 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. 1874.

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

□ 1057

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. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I want to thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for his tireless work and activity, especially in the area of budget process reform. He understands, as we all do, that the budget process is broken, clearly by the results that we have had or have not had here in Congress over the past number of years. I also want to commend the Budget staff and my staff for the work that they have done on bringing this bill forward and the work they have done on the commonsense kinds of reforms that are necessary in the budget process.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple and a commonsense piece of legislation.

□ 1100

What we do here has consequences. What we do in Congress has consequences. Some of them are good; some of them are bad.

This amendment, when adopted, will allow us to have more information upon which to make decisions here in Congress. This is especially helpful in the area of economic activity. Economists from across the political spectrum agree that legislation considered by Congress can have significant effects on economic growth, what happens in the real world.

Major legislation, such as the tax reform legislation that is being discussed right now, is likely to have longer-term macroeconomic effects that will increase growth and, as a result, produce increased revenues, reduce spending, or some combination of the two. For example, the Congressional Budget Office's, CBO's, prior macroeconomic work has shown that deficit reduction has positive economic effects. I will quote from one of their reports:

> Over the medium term and long term, when economic output is determined by the supply of labor and capital in the productivity of those inputs, the reduction in Federal borrowing that would result from smaller deficits would induce greater national saving and investment and, thereby, increase output and income.

In another report, Congressional Budget Office work concluded that:

> Higher marginal tax rates tend to discourage some economic activity.

Now, while the current law that we operate under requires that the Congressional Budget Office provide Congress with information on the fiscal impact—what something costs—of all legislation reported from a committee, there is no systematic requirement for analysis of the economic impact, the realistic effects in the real world out there in the economy. This bill remedies that shortcoming.

This bill would require that the Congressional Budget Office provide a macroeconomic impact analysis for legislation that the CBO—that the Congressional Budget Office—estimates would have a budgetary impact of more than .25 percent of the annual gross domestic product. That is about $43 billion. In addition, the bill would require that the Congressional Budget Office provide a statement of the critical assumptions and sources of data underlying their estimate.

This new macroeconomic impact analysis would not, Mr. Chairman—would not—replace the current work that CBO does, but it would provide more important information. I can't imagine anybody in this House who desires us not to have more information on the pieces of legislation that we are dealing with.

So, again, this is a simple, commonsense, and, I hope, bipartisan bill that we will be talking about and voting on today. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

I was interested to hear my colleague from Georgia end his comments by saying we should have more information rather than less. As I look at this legislation, on page 3, they say they want more information on the dynamic effects of different policies but specifically exclude, for example, the Committee on Appropriations; investments that we might make in our kids' education; or investments that we might make in other areas to power our economy—research and development, for example.

It is particularly interesting because the Republican budget that was just released and voted on the other night in the Budget Committee, according to CBO, in the next couple of years will create a drag on the economy, will actually hurt jobs in the next couple of years. Why is that? That is, in part, due to the fact that they make deep cuts in parts of the budget for investment in research and development and other areas that help power our economy. So it is kind of interesting, Mr. Chairman, that they specifically excluded the CBO from doing an analysis on that.

Now, a couple of my colleagues will have amendments to the bill, and if our Republican colleagues don't somehow mean to ignore those important investments, hopefully they will join us in supporting those amendments.

If you were the CEO of a company and you were projecting your growth and you were projecting your income, you would want to look at how much you are going to make from certain investments you make in your workforce and those kinds of investments. According to this bill, you don't want that. What this bill is after is simply to do an analysis primarily on a tax policy. It is motivated primarily by this idea that, if you provide big tax breaks to people at the very high end of the income ladder, it will trickle down and lift up all the boats, everybody else, trickle-down theory.

We saw how well that worked in the 2000s. We had big tax cuts in 2001 and 2003. A few years later, for a variety of reasons, the economy tanked. You heard the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve who predicted that those tax cuts would generate growth come back and say, you know, he was wrong.

So, I am all for additional information. On that point, I want to say to my colleagues that, on the most recent tax reform proposal that came out of the Ways and Means Committee, you actually do have a number of scores from the Joint Tax Committee, from our nonpartisan scores.

They have eight. They have eight scenarios. One projects .1 percent growth; one projects 1.6 percent growth. That is, of course, the one that Chairman CAMP ran with in all the information he put out. But what he failed to mention is they came up with eight scenarios. The reason they came up with eight scenarios is because they couldn't boil it down to say this will be the dynamic impact of that particular legislation because there are too many unknown variables. That is why they had eight.

Now you want them to somehow come up with one when they have repeatedly informed this Congress that it depends so much on the different assumptions that you make, that you can't make one prediction on that kind of legislation.

I have trouble with this legislation for a variety of reasons; one being, when it comes to tax policy, we have been informed by the experts that it is hard to pinpoint one number and boil it down to a growth figure. Then, as I mentioned, my colleagues have left out the benefits of investing in things like infrastructure, things like our kids' education, things like scientific research, so they are certainly not asking for more information when it comes to those important investments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I urge my friend from Maryland to read the bill. Read the bill. This isn't about tax increases or tax decreases specifically.

Page 4, the macroeconomic impact analysis. An estimate of the changes of economic output: employment, interest rates, capital stock, tax revenues, all. In fact, the kinds of things that the gentleman points to in infrastructure or education, if they have an economic impact of greater than .25 percent of the gross domestic product, they would be evaluated and we would get a report from CBO on that.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah, CHRIS STEWART.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. PRICE, who is one of the really bright lights here in Congress, for his leadership on this.

Imagine the CEO of a business telling the board of directors that he would like to buy a new piece of equipment. Unfortunately, this piece of equipment is fairly expensive. But there is good news, and that is, by buying and making this investment, they are going to become more profitable; they are going to improve their cash flow; they are going to be able to hire more people and grow the business. That is a beautiful thing.

But then imagine that the board of directors goes back to the CEO and says, yes, you have to consider the cost of this equipment but you cannot consider the benefits of buying this piece of equipment, so it messes up entirely his profit projections. They are not able to consider the higher revenue and the growth that this company would undertake. That would be absurd and, of course, that wouldn't be a sound business decision. But that is exactly the situation that we find ourselves in right now.

The Congressional Budget Office does not have the ability to account for economic growth, specifically, the impact on GDP when it comes from tax cuts. CBO is, unfortunately, in the role of the board of directors telling the businessowner—or the business CEO, in

my example—that it can't use the full toolkit of economic modeling in making projections upon which to make these critical decisions.

I have a degree in economics. I was a small business owner. I understand this isn't rocket science. The modeling of this is relatively simple. It is certainly something that we could do, and we hurt ourselves when we don't allow us to take advantage of this modeling.

There is something that Members from both sides of the aisle can agree upon, and it is that many times the numbers provided by CBO are simply not accurate. This is a way that will fix that. Part of the reason they object, frankly, is that it underestimates the impact of tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that could help us make better decisions. I implore Members to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, look, the gentleman who just spoke mentioned some important examples. If you are a CEO, you want to know when you buy a piece of equipment or capital what the economic dividend is going to be on that. But I go back to the fact, on page 3, our Republican colleagues are asking for information on economic growth impacts of all sorts of things, but they specifically exclude anything that comes out of the Appropriations Committee.

It is not a surprise, because the Congressional Budget Office, in its analysis of the Republican budget, says that during the next couple of years it will actually slow down economic growth. In fact, if you look at their proposal, it calls for deep cuts in important investments. CBO says that will have a negative economic impact over the next couple of years. So it is not surprising that they don't want that information provided as part of this analysis.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1874 and to explain to my Republican colleagues why their tax policies have not worked and will not work to produce economic growth and jobs.

I am a scientist who has spent over 20 years at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory conducting research and a successful businessman before that, and a scientist proceeds on the basis of facts. The historical facts on Republican tax policies are clear.

Tax policies during the Clinton years, predicted by the Republicans to restrict economic growth, in fact generated the strongest uninterrupted period of job growth in our lifetimes—over 22 million new American jobs in 8 years.

Then the Bush tax cuts enacted in 2001 reversed those policies, and in the following 8 years, the net number of new jobs was essentially zero—actually, slightly negative. Twenty million Americans entered the workforce during the Bush years, and the Republican policies produced zero net jobs for them, opening up a jobs gap of over 20 million jobs, a jobs gap that we are still closing today.

So to the extent that there is a causal link between tax policies and job creation, the data is clear: Republican policies have destroyed jobs and Democratic policies have created them.

I will now attempt to explain why this is and why the simplified macroeconomic modeling promoted by this legislation will fail to match the real world.

Generally speaking, Democratic tax breaks deliver benefits to the middle class while Republican tax breaks deliver benefits to the very wealthy, and, as it turns out, the very wealthy spend and invest their money very differently than the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, the macroeconomic models promoted in this legislation typically model our economy with a single aggregated consumer. Like the Republicans, they pretend that giving an extra dollar to a billionaire is no different than giving an extra dollar to a working class family. However, if you give an extra dollar to a middle class family, they will spend it in the local economy, increasing local economic growth, or they will invest it in some of the highest return investments available to anyone, investing in their children's college education or, perhaps, buying a second car so that their spouse can get a job.

Now, if you give that same dollar to a very wealthy individual, they will not change their spending habits because they are already spending as much as they feel like spending and this will not change, so there will be no local economic growth.

The investments of the very wealthy are also very different since they no longer have available to themselves the high-return investments available to the middle class. The very wealthy have already spent everything they can to send their children to the finest schools. They already have seven Cadillacs in their garages. So the marginal investments of the wealthy are intrinsically less productive due to the basic principle of economics known as the ''law of diminishing returns.''

Since economic growth is equal to investments times return on investment—sorry about the equation—the economic growth from channeling money to the wealthy is far less than the same relief being given to the middle class.

□ 1115

Democratic middle class policies are pro-growth policies, and Republican policies are not.

Mr. Chairman, there is also another important effect not captured by the single-consumer macroeconomic models in this legislation, which is the increasing propensity for wealthy people to move their money offshore.

If you give an extra dollar to wealthy people, they will turn it over to their money managers, who look around for high yields and who will increasingly invest those dollars overseas, perhaps increasing the net worth of the wealthy investors but competing with and destroying American jobs. Had that same dollar been given in tax relief to middle class families, it would have been much more likely to stay in America.

So, in the real world, Republican policies trickle down, but they trickle down to jobs in China, and that is why the Bush tax cuts have generated zero jobs in the 8 years after having been enacted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee and an individual who knows well the imperative of reforming the budget process.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the vice chair of the Budget Committee for bringing this bill forward and for his hard work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is really pretty simple. It will help Members understand how legislation affects the economy. Under current law, the CBO doesn't have to provide that kind of big picture analysis. It usually assumes the economy will stay the same no matter how much in government taxes is spent. Think about that. We all know that that is not true. People respond to incentives. Federal policy changes the economy, and under this administration, the economy has consistently failed to meet expectations.

This is the chart that the CBO has shown over the years where they have consistently lowered their economic outlook. This has had a huge effect on our budget, and it has made balancing the budget that much harder. Traditionally, our economy has grown at about 3 percent a year, but over the past 4 years, it has grown only by 2 percent a year. It has grown less than half the average rate of other recoveries since World War II. The labor force participation rate has fallen to 63 percent. That is close to the lowest level in over 35 years. There are 10.5 million Americans who are now unemployed, and 7.2 million Americans are working part time for economic reasons. Those who are working have seen meager growth in their wages. The typical household income for families has actually declined. In fact, it is at the lowest level since 1995.

This weak recovery isn't something that just happened to us. It is not just by accident. It is clear that now that we are 5 years into this that the President's policies are weighing down the

economy and are hurting the budget outlook.

The Congressional Budget Office now expects us to take in much less revenue, and that makes it much harder to balance the budget because of this poor economy. Since just last year, the baseline deficit has grown by $1.2 trillion. The top line shows you last year's estimate, and the bottom red line shows you this year's estimate. Just from last year's estimate of where the economy was heading to this year's estimate of where the economy is heading by the Congressional Budget Office, it tells us there will be $1.2 trillion in more deficits because of these failed economic policies.

We want to stop the failure. We want to get this economy growing. The CBO knows that if you actually have a better policy that actually grows the economy, you will help the budget outlook, and you will help get people back to work. You will help increase take-home pay. Just as a weak economy can drag us into the red, a good budget can push the economy forward. That is why Members need to know this before they vote on legislation. They need to know what the world might look like under a new law. It is common sense to ask how legislation will affect the economy.

This bill requires the CBO to give Members just that estimate. We are asking the CBO to give the same kind of analysis that we use in our own budget. In an analysis provided by the CBO, they find the deficit reduction like we are proposing will help the economy grow. In 2024, economic output will be 1.8 percent higher per person than it otherwise would be. That is about $1,100 per person. That is a pretty crucial piece of information. So we are adding to the toolkit. We are not taking anything away.

To the criticism I am hearing from others that, gosh, you are not doing this on every piece of legislation, you need to do this for the appropriations process, do you have any idea how many thousands of estimates come from the Appropriations Committee? If you actually gummed up the works like that, you would bring this place and the estimating agencies to a screeching halt. That is why there is an important threshold that is for significant pieces of legislation, legislation that is a quarter a point of the economy or higher, so that we can be well informed on big pieces of fiscal policy and so that we don't gum up the works and bring this agency and this institution to a screeching halt.

We think this hits the fine balance between the two. We think it is important that Members of Congress have a sense of how their votes will be affecting the economy. That is only common sense, and I urge the adoption of this bill.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for actually bringing this to our attention.

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

Just to respond to the last point of the chairman of the Budget Committee with respect to the appropriations process, as I indicated earlier, this bill specifically exempts those pieces of legislation even if they meet the threshold with respect to the other legislation in here.

Again, it is, perhaps, not surprising. I think the American public knows that we have a short-term budget agreement, the Murray-Ryan agreement, but if you look at the budget that Republicans in Congress are proposing, it calls for a 24 percent cut to the current services in the recent bipartisan legislation over a 10-year period.

Let's just take one category of investments—in our kids. That means about an $18 billion cut in early education. It means about an $80 billion cut in K–12 education. It means about a $205 billion cut in current policy higher education. It calls for charging college students higher interest rates for the period of time when they are in college. That raises about $40 billion at a time when that same budget doesn't ask for anything from the highest-income individuals and doesn't raise one penny to reduce the deficit from closing special interest tax breaks.

So it is no surprise to me that they would want to exclude the economic impacts of those investments that they are dramatically cutting. As I said earlier, the CBO, in its most recent analysis of the House Republican budget, says it will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. It is very interesting that they don't want that quantified with respect to the appropriations bills. At the same time our Republican colleagues are saying they want more information, they specifically limit the information to certain areas.

The other thing I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, is immigration reform. We want the CBO to give us an analysis, when they have a specific bill, so they can determine the economic benefit and the impact of it. That is a good thing, and the CBO has done that for immigration reform. In fact, of all of the pieces of legislation that are before this House right now, one of the things that could have the most immediate economic growth benefit is the bipartisan immigration bill before this House.

The Congressional Budget Office has looked at that. They say that will generate a lot more economic activity. In fact, they say, over year 10, it will actually boost economic growth by 5 percent compared to what it would otherwise be. They say it will reduce the deficit in this 10-year window by almost $200 billion and, in the 20-year window, by almost $1 trillion. That is an analysis that we all should benefit from.

Interestingly, while that would provide great economic growth, based on CBO reports, and when Democrats the other night proposed an amendment in the House Budget Committee to adopt that bipartisan immigration reform bill which would generate economic growth, all of our Republican colleagues voted ''no.'' We want more information—the more the better—but it needs to be information that the economists say they can usefully provide us.

I get back to the fact that, when it comes to the tax reform proposal, for example, that Chairman CAMP put in, they said that they couldn't narrow it down to one answer. They gave eight different models based on different assumptions. Our Republican colleagues are trying to say to professional economists, We really don't care what you say; you come up with a particular answer. Whereas, we think we should be asking for information in every case where it can be plausibly provided. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues don't want it everywhere it can be plausibly provided because they specifically exclude the economic benefit of important investments in our economy and jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a very productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is whether we are going to continue to ignore the economic consequences of the major actions that we take or whether we are going to start recognizing that incentives matter and that the legislation we pass has profound economic consequences that must be taken into account.

Why does Amsterdam have the narrowest houses on Earth? It is because they tax by street frontage.

Incentives matter.

What happens to our revenues if we tax all of a person's $100,000 income? The static scoring on which we now exclusively depend says that that would raise us $100,000, but we all know the correct answer is that we would raise zero dollars because that person now has no incentive to work.

Macroeconomics gives us tools to anticipate the real-world effect of major policy changes, and we ought not to be blind to them. It is not perfect, but it comes far closer to the mark than does a static model that assumes that people are mindless automatons whose behavior never varies despite major changes in the economic environment that our laws create.

This measure doesn't presume to tell the CBO how to do its job or what formula to use in its analysis. We will still get all of the static scoring the same as before, but on major legislation that greatly impacts the overall economy, this bill says: give us the complete picture. If a proposal is going to affect the economy by more than a quarter percent for good or ill, then

tell us. Tell us what you think, and show us why you think so.

For too long, Congress has blundered from one economic policy to another with its eyes wide shut, and it is time we got the complete picture and took into account the real-world consequences of our actions.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 17½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I really want to thank the vice chairman of our Budget Committee for his leadership in trying to continually protect the working family budget from the onslaught of the Federal budget.

I am a little bit in disbelief, Mr. Chairman, from what I hear on the floor. Rarely has there been a more commonsense bill that has come to this floor. It simply says two things. As we make important legislative decisions in this body, we should have more information instead of less, and we should think longer term as opposed to shorter term. Yet it is opposed by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I am somewhat incredulous. I would say, if my Democratic colleagues don't want the information, maybe they don't have to pay attention to the information. I have heard, Well, not all of the information I want is going to come from this particular piece of legislation. I would encourage the distinguished gentleman from Maryland to encourage his staff to provide him then with the information that he wants.

What is really important here, Mr. Chairman, is that we understand in an economy in which millions of our fellow countrymen are unemployed or are underemployed how major pieces of legislation will impact the economy and their hopes, their dreams, their aspirations as they lay awake at night, wondering how they are going to make ends meet. I just wonder if one of the reasons that our Democratic colleagues are opposing this bill is that they know the Congressional Budget Office has now told us that ObamaCare is going to cost this economy 2.5 million jobs that otherwise we would have had.

□ 1130

What if we had that information before the bill instead of after the bill? Maybe the crown jewel would not have appeared.

So maybe they don't want the American people or Members of Congress to have that information, but the American people deserve this information, and we demand it on their behalf.

We need to support this commonsense bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing our Republican colleagues say they want the ''complete picture'' and ''more information is better than less.'' We agree. This is why it is so interesting, that they specifically exclude information based on bills that come out of the Appropriations Committee that call for investments in our economy and in areas that can help promote job growth.

They say they want more information, but their bill says they want it only in one area and not in another.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I guess I am not surprised, given the fact that the budget that the Republicans just voted out of the Budget Committee and expect to be on the floor next week makes dramatic, historic cuts to important investments that this country has made in the past. In fact, it is 40 percent below the lowest investments as a share of the economy we have made since the 1950s.

This country has been able to compete and has been an economic powerhouse, in part, because of the great investments we have made as a Nation in important areas like science, research, infrastructure, and education; and yet Republicans want to exclude that in this bill.

Again, it is not surprising because the Congressional Budget Office, the very entity that they say they want to provide us this analysis, has said, over the next couple of years, their budget is going to slow down the economy and economic growth, in part, because of the deep cuts they make in this one area of budget that they don't want this information about. Surprise, surprise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from the State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished ranking member and the manager of this bill.

I want to associate myself with Mr. VAN HOLLEN's analysis and add some other thoughts.

We are on the floor today, April 4, and might I make mention of two points that are not particularly related, but I do want to, again, acknowledge the men and women at Fort Hood, Texas.

I was there in 2009 to mourn with those families. Today, I mourn as well with those families whose loved ones have lost their lives and those who suffer. It is important for us as a Nation to be responsive to their needs. I know that we will do so in a bipartisan manner.

I also want to make mention that today is the date of the assassination of one of the greatest peacemakers in the world, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Besides his concern for those who did not have equal rights, he was also an economist, to the extent that his advocacy was to extinguish poverty.

The last days of his life were spent planning the Poor People's March in 1968 to raise incomes and the quality of life of men and women across America.

So I raise the question of where we are in 2014. This is not a conversation that we easily engage with our friends on the other side of the aisle.

As you are passing the budget resolution, the process that you are in, to my knowledge, there was no effort to include an increase to the minimum wage.

There was no effort to ensure that 164,000 persons in the State of Texas would get an unemployment insurance extension, thereby ceasing them from losing their homes or being evicted from their rental properties or literally not being able to support their families.

Now, we have on the floor of the House legislation that simply exacerbates the circumstance of those who are aspiring to be in the middle class. It is a push toward dynamic scoring.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the microeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen and continue to pop up everywhere. In fact, it was even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the supercommittee, which, by the way, with no condemnation, did not work. It could not get a common ground.

You would wonder why Republicans are pushing this dynamic scoring bill. It is because they claim the traditional cost estimates prepared by the CBO are not enough, when we have used the Congressional Budget Office for decades, and it has been an effective tool to balance between revenue and tax.

So you wonder why the dynamic scoring comes in because it breaks the backs of poor people and the middle class.

We believe that it is simply an attempt to force Congress and the CBO to accept this concept of dynamic scoring and promote the efforts of the Republicans to, again, give more tax cuts.

We know that tax cuts did not work. In the good intentions of the Bush administration, those tax cuts put us in the predicament we are in, after leaving the Clinton administration with a billion-dollar surplus and the ability to invest in infrastructure.

I remember the smiles on those citizens during that timeframe that the economy was turning.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In the context of this particular legislation, a budget bill led by Mr. RYAN has now given a $200,000 tax cut already to those who hold most of the wealth, but yet cutting Medicaid and cutting food stamps to give an opportunity for soldiers' families to be able to eat.

I am against this bill because I think CBO has an effective structure to give

us the information we need, and cutting taxes is not going to move America forward to be the greatest Nation in the world with research, with infrastructure rebuild, education, and good health care.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1874, The Pro-Growth Budget Act of 2013.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chairman, this bill could very well be entitled the Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Champions Act, because that's in essence what's going on here.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen, and continues to pop up everywhere; in fact, even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the Super Committee.

Dynamic scoring finds its roots in the anti-tax movement. Dynamic scoring is problematic for the agencies that score and estimate the cost of legislation, and has been soundly rejected.

It is clear from the bill's language and approach that it is designed to make it easier to enact deficit-increasing tax cuts.

The bill requires CBO to produce supplementary estimates of the economic impact of major bills using dynamic scoring, an approach that involves more uncertainty and subjectivity than current scoring rules.

None other than Former Republican Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle opposed moving to dynamic scoring, noting that CBO "generally have done a better job than some of the dynamic score-keeping. That has been part of the challenge of moving to something called dynamic scoring is that we have not found anything that was any more accurate than the current way."

Believers in dynamic scoring argue that tax cuts pay for themselves, generally by spurring so much economic growth, to the extent that revenues will actually increase. If I didn't know any better, Mr. Chairman, I'd think they were talking to us about trickle-down economics.

Mr. Chairman, where have we heard that before?

I recall that the Bush administration attempted to impose the use of dynamic scoring to estimate the cost of its tax cuts, asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue enough to pay for themselves, sort of a trickle-down form of budgeting.

Unfortunately Mr. Chairman, the Bush tax cuts did no such thing, but instead caused our national debt to explode. My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) administers several programs to support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone program.

The HUBZone program is a small business federal contracting assistance program "whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities."

It provides participating small businesses located in areas with low income, high poverty rates, or high unemployment rates with contracting opportunities in the form of "set-asides," sole-source awards, and price-evaluation preferences.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the federal government awarded contracts valued at $12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about $3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program.

Mr. Chairman, that's the gist of my amendment—job creation—because that's what we should be talking about in this Committee today.

The Budget Committee has held hearings on the general topic of budget process reform and the recommendations crossed party lines. Former Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness, testified that, "It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used."

Similarly, Dr. Philip Joyce, former Congressional Budget Office (CBO) staff member and a Democratic witness, testified that "My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox. If the goal is to deal with the larger fiscal imbalance that faces us, the most important thing to do is to make use of them, not search for more tools."

Mr. Chairman, dynamic scoring is the wrong tool at the wrong time—though—in the interest of fairness to the small businesses in distressed communities around this country, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, even though I have serious reservations about dynamic scoring.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for this commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, to hear the debate on the floor this morning about Mr. RYAN's budget, you would think that we are arguing about increases or decreases in taxes, but indeed, we are debating more information to make informed decisions, Mr. Chairman. It has nothing to do with those.

There will be a time to debate the new budget, but this is about job creation, Mr. Chairman. This is about the CBO and the flawed method—many times—that they use in preparing documents for us to make informed decisions.

I will give you a prime example. We had CBO come in and talk to us about energy policy. I said: Well, if we start to tax some of our natural resources so that we can lower gas prices for those people that are having to fill their tanks and having to make decisions between food on the table and gas in their tank, if we tap that, what would be the impact?

They say: Oh, well, you would get a negative CBO score. I said: Well, how could that be? Because, if we had revenues from that, it would create $1.7 trillion over 10 years; and yet what we have somehow is a justification. He says: Well, we are making the assumption that you have already tapped that.

As a business guy, when you have that kind of logic, you can't make correct decisions.

This is about job growth, Mr. Chairman. We lost 400 jobs in the last 48 hours in my district. That is 400 families that are going to have to start to worry about putting food on the table.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get behind this and have informed decisions so that we can make good decisions on legislation going forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just ask one more time, if our Republican colleagues want information to make informed decisions, why did they specifically exclude one whole category of information based on legislation coming out of the Appropriations Committee to make some important investments that can help our economy grow? They say they want all this additional information, but apparently, they didn't.

Again, I say it is not surprising because some of the changes that the Republican budget makes in that area do, according to the Congressional Budget Office, create a drag on the economy in the coming few years.

So, again, you are going to have an amendment later on offered by Mr. CONNOLLY—and he will talk about that point—to find out if our Republican colleagues really do want full information, but at least in the current form of this bill, they don't.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank Congressman PRICE and the Budget Committee for their hard work in trying to give Members of this body better information.

Families and small businesses back home didn't need to read today's jobs report to know that this isn't the strong recovery they deserve. They know that, with Washington's $17 trillion of debt, it isn't hard to see why our economy isn't creating enough jobs.

Hoosiers understand the problems, but they wonder if Washington even cares.

Republicans owe taxpayers a clear plan to tackle the debt and jumpstart the economy with private sector job growth. That is why my colleagues and I are offering a commonsense reform to Washington's broken budget process.

We have to force the Federal Government to take an honest look at how its policies affect Americans struggling in this real economy. It is not too late to save the American Dream from a future of debt and decline, but we have to do that work now.

We owe taxpayers a clear vision for how we can force Washington to stop spending money we don't have and make ends meet without raising taxes. That starts with reforms like the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a senior member of the House Republican Conference.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As an original cosponsor, I am very grateful to Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE for his insight and leadership on this very important issue.

It is no secret that Washington's budget process is broken. The over $17 trillion debt jeopardizes our national fiscal security and threatens future opportunities for our children and grandchildren.

I appreciate House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's work to produce a path forward that restores prosperity and makes substantial reductions to our debt over the next 10 years.

For far too long, Congress has passed bills without a full understanding of how policies will affect jobs and our economy. The Congressional Budget Office, the body we as lawmakers depend upon to provide fiscal and economic impacts of all legislation, has a bad track record of providing accurate information due to a significant loophole.

House Republicans have made meaningful strides in restoring fiscal accountability and responsibility back to Washington. We recognize, as the Lexington County Chronicle promotes, it is the taxpayers' money, not money the government allows citizens to hold temporarily.

Providing the CBO with the necessary toolkit to determine a bill's potential fiscal impacts on every aspect of our economy is a step in the right direction.

Take ObamaCare, for example. Seeing its failed implementation, which has destroyed jobs, proves we must see how a law will impact American job creators and the way families spend hard-earned paychecks.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and give CBO the likely consequences that may occur.

□ 1145

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

The CBO provides lots of information right now. I hope all Members of Congress will take advantage of the information they provide.

We have now heard, for the second time today, that the Affordable Care Act has cost the economy jobs. Well, the CBO looked at that. They studied it. They gave the Congress information just like our colleagues are asking for. They didn't say that it had any negative job impact at all right now. Now, they said, in the outyears, that now that people are able to go into exchanges to afford health care, that people may decide to not go to a job where the job had been the only way to get taxpayer-benefited health care.

Under our current system, if you want a tax benefit for your health care, if you want preferential tax treatment on your health care, where do you go? You go to a job. That is where the tax benefit comes from. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, people now can get a tax credit and go into the exchange. So they can decide to launch a business from their home and get health insurance without having been locked into another job which had been the only place where they got tax-benefited health care.

So I encourage my colleagues to read the CBO reports that have already been issued on the Affordable Care Act. I also urge them to read the CBO reports that have already been issued on the recovery bill because the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that, as a result of the recovery bill, the economy actually saved millions of jobs, that that helped the economy from falling farther and farther.

Remember, when President Obama was sworn in, we were losing 800,000 jobs every month, and the recovery bill helped stop that free fall and turned that around. That is what the Congressional Budget Office said, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

So it is great our colleagues are asking the Congressional Budget Office for more information, and we welcome that. It would be great if they read the information the Congressional Budget Office has already issued.

I just want to make one final point, Mr. Chairman. I have made it before, but it is important because we keep saying we want more information, more complete information, and if you read this legislation, it says that. Then it says: except. We want information except. We don't want any information on the job impact of those parts of our budget that invest in jobs and our economy, like R&D at places like NIH, National Institutes of Health, like our kids' education. We want all the information, but don't tell us about the benefits of those investments.

And I wonder why. It is because the Republican budget slashes our investments in those areas. So don't tell us about the impact of that, Congressional Budget Office.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013.

I thank Dr. PRICE for his leadership on this issue.

Now, this issue may strike many Americans as somewhat arcane, but it has very important and real-world implications for our Nation's economic growth, for job creation, and for wage levels.

Under current law, when legislation is introduced, our Budget Office is prevented from taking into account how individual Americans will actually respond to that legislative proposal; so our Budget Office has to produce this artificial sort of analysis, failing to accurately estimate the true costs or benefits of a given proposal. This obscures, for policymakers, for members of the media, and for many rank-and-file Americans, the true negative impact that tax hikes can have on our Nation's economy, on the private sector, and so forth; and it fails to recognize how tax cuts can actually stimulate the very work, savings, and investment that lead to jobs, higher wages, and a secure retirement.

So the Price bill takes an important first step to eliminating CBO's unrealistic economic analysis by requiring CBO to apply real-world analysis of the impact a proposal will have on our Nation's economy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who will be offering an amendment a little bit later.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Maryland.

Listening to the debate on the floor, one feels one is living out an ''Alice in Wonderland'' chapter. My friends on the other side of the aisle continue to repeat their orthodoxy that slashing taxes and slashing spending leads to prosperity. We went down that road in spades under the previous President's administration, President Bush's, and it led to the most ruinous economic performance since the Great Depression.

Now they want to sell us a budget, once again, that slashes $5 trillion in this investment. This is actually disinvesting in America. It is disinvesting in research and development. It is disinvesting in human capital. It is disinvesting in education. It is disinvesting in infrastructure.

We are handing over our future with this budget and this philosophy to our world competitors, and somebody is going to have to stand on this floor 20 years hence and explain to that generation how a great Congress handed over the country's future to foreign competition.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of a commonsense budget proposal, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2014.

This bill is genius. It is simple and it is darn important. It requires the Congressional Budget Office to analyze the

macroeconomic impacts of major bills before they pass Congress. What a concept. This tool will give Congress and the American people a real-world picture of how the laws we pass impact our economy before we pass them.

Current law requires CBO to provide Congress with information from fantasyland on the fiscal impact of legislation. There is no requirement to stay in our world and analyze the economic impact of legislation, of jobs.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that such scoring is impossible, yet they proudly tout that CBO used a macroeconomic analysis in its report on the impact of the Senate's immigration bill last year. They left fantasyland, joined our world. Welcome.

The more information we have about the economic impacts of bills, the better decisions we can make. Mr. Chairman, a simple but important policy change like this will help get our economy back on track, create jobs, protect hardworking Americans, and keep us in their world.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I was glad the last speaker mentioned the CBO report on immigration reform. I just wish that, if they really wanted to have a pro-growth policy, they would adopt the bipartisan immigration legislation that the CBO wrote about, because what the CBO report said was that would be a great boost to economic growth in our country. It would create more jobs. It would create more economic activity. As I said, because it would generate more economic activity and more pro-growth revenue, it would actually reduce the deficit over the next 10 years by $190 billion, and almost a trillion over 20. So, great.

I haven't really heard a response to this, Mr. Chairman, but we want more information. CBO does reports all the time. But they have this big except. We want more information, except we don't want information about this part of our budget that deals with important investment in our future.

As Mr. CONNOLLY said, a lot of our economic competitors have been copying successful models from the United States. For example, the Chinese are trying to hire more scientists in the areas of biomedical research, yet the Republican budget, if you apply it across the board, cut 24 percent—cut—over the next 10 years from the amount for research at NIH that was in the Ryan-Murray document. Again, not surprising they don't want the Congressional Budget Office to look in detail at that.

When the Congressional Budget Office looked at the budget that just came out of the Budget Committee the other night, which will be on the floor next week, they said, over the next couple of years, these fiscal policies would reduce output and employment below the levels projected in CBO's baseline—translation: it would reduce economic activity and reduce job growth over the next couple of years.

So, again, not surprising that in the legislation before us, pro-growth budgeting, our Republican colleagues don't want the CBO to tell us about the pro-growth benefits of those important investments.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, and I thank Dr. PRICE for his leadership on this issue.

This simple legislation would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a full analysis of major legislation so that we know how bills will impact our economy and our Nation's employment.

It appears today that Democrat opposition to this bill seems to indicate their satisfaction with the anemic job growth, a historic $17 trillion debt and growing, no attempt to balance our budget, and devastation of the middle class.

Before Congress even considers passing another legislative overhaul like the Dodd-Frank or stimulus or the President's health care law, let's understand exactly how these thousand-page bills will impact our economy and potentially result in lost jobs and lost futures.

As we craft fiscal policy to get our economy back on track and improve the livelihoods of our constituents, I would ask my colleagues: Is it better for us to have more information or less? understanding or ignorance? reality or spin?

Supporting the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act is a commonsense step that will help us judge the long-term impact of legislation, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in support.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

It is time to end the budget games in Washington, D.C., and this bill is one way to bring more accountability and more honest budgeting to Washington.

Four years ago, when the President's health care law was passed, it included a number of budget gimmicks so that it appeared to be cheaper than it really was. The gimmicks included collecting premiums for 10 years but only paying benefits for 5, delaying some provisions to the year 11, 12, or 13.

We need commonsense budgeting, like the rest of America has to budget. The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act simply allows the Congressional Budget Office to take a policy proposal and measure its impact on future growth. And understand, that also means future generations. That way we can tell if it is a good or a bad policy and make more informed decisions. Some people really don't want to do that.

This bill is about doing what is right for the next generation. No more passing the buck. Let's bring realistic budgeting and accountability to Washington, D.C. Let's pass this bill today.

□ 1200

The CHAIR. The Chair wishes to make a clarification on the time remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I know I sound like a broken record. Our colleagues keep saying they want more information, but the bill specifically excludes a major portion of information.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill. Dynamic scoring, as contemplated in this legislation, is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a desperate attempt to revive a failed theory of trickle-down economics that has been widely discredited by academics but, more importantly, has been discredited in practice.

Let's just look at a side-by-side comparison: Eight years under Bill Clinton, he raises the top tax rate to 39.6 percent, and 20.3 million jobs were created. George Bush comes into office. He lowers the top tax rate from 39.6 percent to 35 percent, and what happens? Did the economy grow? Did the rich invest more in the economy? Does the economy take off? No. We lose 650,000 jobs. A side-by-side comparison.

Dynamic scoring is just designed to revive a theory that has hurt the American people when put into practice by a Republican Congress and George Bush.

We should be investing in job training, investing in education, investing in transportation and infrastructure, investing in research and development, and investing in technology and innovation. Instead of trying to promote progress for the greatest number of Americans possible, this budget, this bill, this Republican majority is simply trying to protect prosperity for the few. And that is why we should reject this bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

I have to admit, I am puzzled. All this bill does is say that Members of Congress ought to have more information about the decisions that we are making here on behalf of the American people, not less. That is a pretty simple concept in the real world. Only here in Washington do we not want more information. I guess we want to stick our heads in the sand.

The gentleman who just spoke said that this bill's purpose is to trot out and continue to put in place a failed theory.

This bill doesn't do anything about the outcome of the results that CBO would give us under this bill. We don't game the system at all. What we do is want the Congressional Budget Office to give us more information. If the gentleman is correct, then that is the information that we will get. Why would he not want more information?

What else has been said here this morning, Mr. Chairman? We had a scientist take the floor and say that he was against using more information. A scientist.

As a physician, I can tell you that I never met an individual—any of my medical colleagues—who didn't want all of the information that they could get. In fact, that is what happens in the real world. In families and in communities and in businesses, people want as much information as they can so that they can make wise decisions. And that is what this bill would do, give us more information so that hopefully, hopefully Congress would be able to make more wise decisions.

I will tell you, I am puzzled by the gentleman from Maryland who stands up over and over and talks about the benefits of dynamic scoring on a particular piece of legislation that he supports. But then he doesn't want dynamic scoring or a macroeconomic analysis of legislation on anything else, just what he supports. You talk about being duplicitous, Mr. Chairman. I am telling you.

The gentleman from Maryland keeps talking about slower growth in the budget that we are going to be talking about next week, and he always adds ''over the next few years'' because he doesn't want to talk about the outyears, where the growth explodes, and we have that pro-growth economy and getting people back to work and the jobs that are going to be created.

So, Mr. Chairman, this really is pretty doggone simple. Either we want more information or we don't. Republicans in this House at this point want more information. In fact, in the Senate, a piece of legislation that is similar to this—asking for macroeconomic analysis, offered by Senator PORTMAN—was voted on in a bipartisan way. The Senate, in a bipartisan way, supported that amendment.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to stand up today and say to the American people, yes, we want more information, so that, hopefully, we are able to make more wise decisions. And I urge adoption of the underlying piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chair, as chair of the Committee on Rules, I submit my exchange of letters with the chair of the Committee on the Budget regarding the provisions that warranted a referral of H.R. 1874 to the Committee on Rules.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 27, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: On June 19, 2013, the Committee on the Budget ordered reported H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1874. In addition, the Committee on Rules reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Rules for conferees on H.R. 1874 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, August 27, 2013.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013, which the Committee on the Budget ordered reported on June 19, 2013.

I acknowledge that certain provisions in this legislation are in your Committee's jurisdiction. I appreciate your decision to facilitate prompt consideration of the bill by the full House. I understand that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Rules is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Per your request, I will include a copy of our exchange of letters with respect to H.R. 1874 in the Congressional Record during House consideration of this bill. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, and the amendment in part A of House Report 113–400, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1874

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION

''SEC. 407. (a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—The Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each major bill or resolution reported by any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations of each House), as a supplement to estimates prepared under section 402, a macroeconomic impact analysis of the budgetary effects of such bill or resolution for the ten fiscal-year period beginning with the first fiscal year for which an estimate was prepared under section 402 and each of the next three ten fiscal-year periods. The Director shall submit to such committee the macroeconomic impact analysis, together with the basis for the analysis. As a supplement to estimates prepared under section 402, all such information so submitted shall be included in the report accompanying such bill or resolution.

''(b) ECONOMIC IMPACT.—The analysis prepared under subsection (a) shall describe the potential economic impact of the applicable major bill or resolution on major economic variables, including real gross domestic product, business investment, the capital stock, employment, interest rates, and labor supply. The analysis shall also describe the potential fiscal effects of the bill or resolution, including any estimates of revenue increases or decreases resulting from changes in gross domestic product. To the extent practicable, the analysis should use a variety of economic models in order to reflect the full range of possible economic outcomes resulting from the bill or resolution. The analysis (or a technical appendix to the analysis) shall specify the economic and econometric models used, sources of data, relevant data transformations, and shall include such explanation as is necessary to make the models comprehensible to academic and public policy analysts.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'macroeconomic impact analysis' means—

''(A) an estimate of the changes in economic output, employment, interest rates, capital stock, and tax revenues expected to result from enactment of the proposal;

''(B) an estimate of revenue feedback expected to result from enactment of the proposal; and

''(C) a statement identifying the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate;

''(2) the term 'major bill or resolution' means any bill or resolution if the gross budgetary effects of such bill or resolution for any fiscal year in the period for which an estimate is prepared under section 402 is estimated to be greater than .25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for any such fiscal year;

''(3) the term 'budgetary effect', when applied to a major bill or resolution, means the

changes in revenues, outlays, deficits, and debt resulting from that measure; and

''(4) the term 'revenue feedback' means changes in revenue resulting from changes in economic growth as the result of the enactment of any major bill or resolution.''.

''(d) LEGISLATION WITH REVENUE PROVISIONS.—The macroeconomic analysis described in subsection (c) shall rely on macroeconomic analysis prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation for any provisions of such legislation that are described in section 201(f). For legislation consisting solely of provisions described in section 201(f), the macroeconomic analysis described in subsection (c) shall be prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 406 the following new item:

''Sec. 407. Macroeconomic impact analysis of major legislation.''.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–400.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike ''(except the Committee on Appropriations of each House)''.

Page 3, line 18, before the comma, insert ''or as a standalone analysis in the case of the Committee on Appropriations of each House''.

Page 5, lines 13 through 15, strike ''.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for any such fiscal year;'' and insert ''$1,000,000,000 for any such fiscal year;''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

You know, I listened to my friend from Georgia, and Lord Almighty, do I agree with him. We should have all that information available to us on dynamic scoring, including—and I assume the gentleman will support my amendment—to correct what must have been a mistake in the Republican majority's bill on page 3. Because knowing my friend's commitment to full information available to the public and Members of Congress, I can't imagine line 16 got it right. It must have been a typo because it says here, yes, dynamic scoring by CBO, except—except the Committee on Appropriations of each house.

Think about what that means, Mr. Chairman. Every single appropriations bill, the entire funding of the Federal Government, is exempted. I thought my friends wanted full disclosure. I thought they wanted full information.

I heard my friend talk about the parallel with the medical profession. No doctor wants to be deprived of key information when making a key decision about a patient, a client. It could be life-and-death. Well, it is no less than here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that in response to my friend from Georgia, I have a simple but important amendment to ensure that the broader economic analysis required by the bill is applied equally to all congressional actions. The bill, as currently drafted, as I said, it exempts all appropriations bills.

Now, I know some of my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to acknowledge this, but funding basic research, making transportation improvements, and purchasing ships for the Navy, to name just a few examples in which we invest taxpayer money, have a stimulative effect on the economy. For example, it is estimated that 28,000 construction jobs are created with every $1 billion we invest in transportation infrastructure. In addition, the Federal Government spent $13 billion over the past 25 years supporting the Human Genome Project. That $13 billion Federal investment, it is estimated, had a receipt to it of $780 billion, and counting.

We have arrived at the point, Mr. Chairman, sometimes in our debate here on the floor, where we know the cost of everything but the value of nothing. Investments have returns on them.

Whatever the cost of the Internet, which originally started out as entirely a Federal investment, DARPANET, whatever that cost, it was worth every penny because the return on it has been transformative throughout the globe.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's decision to invest in infrastructure in the interstate highway system, whatever it cost, is a gift that keeps on giving. Its returns continue to this day, and it has helped America.

Let's not disinvest in America, and let's make sure we do have full dynamic scoring for all appropriations bills in the spirit that my friend from Georgia has laid down.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a senior member of both the Appropriations and the Budget Committees.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If I did not know my friend from Virginia as well as I do, I would have thought I had detected a little sense of sarcasm in his remarks, but, frankly, I know that is not the case. I know it is a sincere proposal.

I must say, though, as chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations, which has jurisdiction over the CBO, I am pretty familiar with its operations, its resources, and its capabilities, and the simple fact of the matter is that the amendment would create an unsustainable amount of work for the CBO for no benefit in new or additional information to the Congress of the United States. By arbitrarily picking $1 billion as the threshold for the analysis, this amendment would force CBO to conduct analyses on dozens of additional bills.

CBO Director Elmendorf wrote to Chairman RYAN yesterday to explain the limits of their capability and capacity. Let me quote from his letter:

> The CBO would not be able to perform the analyses envisioned by that set of amendments: We do not have the analytical capabilities or the level of staffing that would be needed to undertake and complete the tasks that would be assigned to us, nor would the usual timetable for considering legislation allow the time that would be required to complete such analyses, even if we did not face those analytical and staffing constraints.

The time that it would take the CBO to produce these additional estimates showing no discernible impact would delay Congress' legislative work at both the committee level and on the floor. The simple fact is, the amendment is unworkable and ill-conceived, and I urge its rejection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that I have the utmost respect—and he knows it—of my friend from Oklahoma. No sarcasm was meant.

But he might forgive me for being shocked at a speech I took certainly at face value about the need for full information and then a carve-out explicitly in the law, the draft law, that exempts all appropriations.

Now, if my friend feels that it is too much work for the CBO with this threshold, then let's name a threshold. But his threshold in this bill is zero. There will be no dynamic scoring by CBO on any appropriations. I think that is not serving the American people well. I don't think that is full disclosure. I don't think that is transparency in government. I don't think that is good government. And I think that suggests we have something to hide around here. And I am sure that is not the message we intended to send.

That is the spirit of my amendment, full disclosure. And I am sorry if this

means that CBO has to work harder, but we need full disclosure for our citizenry. And that is what this amendment does.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–400.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike ''\, and labor supply'' and insert ''\, labor supply, and State and local governments''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would direct the CBO to analyze the impact of our major bills here in Congress on some of the Nation's most critical institutions, our State and local governments, and State and local taxpayers.

The State Budget Crisis Task Force is cochaired by former Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York Richard Ravitch and the former Federal Reserve Board Chair Paul Volcker. They spent a great deal of time analyzing the impacts of what we do here on State and local governments and taxpayers.

What did they find? They found that fiscal stress runs downhill, and very often, local taxpayers are the recipient of that stress. Everything we do here in Congress, Mr. Chairman, or everything that we don't do has significant implications on broader levels of government and local taxpayers.

But no mechanism exists at all to assess the fiscal impact of Federal actions on those taxpayers. I am offering this amendment today because if we are going to analyze how our fiscal actions affect the economy, we need to make sure we are not just pushing off the hard decisions to local taxpayers.

Let me give you an example. The Republican budget, offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, cuts over $50 billion from road repair and infrastructure investments.

□ 1215

And so the implication of that budget is that the Federal Government does less but local taxpayers have to pay the bill to fill in the potholes. That is just fundamentally wrong. That is a wrong priority. We have to stop staying in this position where we are cutting taxes and spending here only to increase taxes and spending in our local communities. We can't keep pushing off these costs and the accompanying uncertainty surrounding this funding. That is why my amendment is so important, Mr. Chairman. It would tell us if we are actually being fiscally responsible at all levels, or are we simply moving costs from one level of government to the other?

I hope my friends will support this amendment. We all represent not just Federal taxpayers but local taxpayers, and we should protect the interests of both.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this truly is a great idea. There is no question that Congress ought to have more information about the legislation that we are going to consider and how it affects State and local governments. Far too often, we in Washington decide that we are smarter than everyone else and choose to impose burdens on those governments that are closer to the people.

Frankly, far too many of us here in Congress simply don't take the principle of federalism seriously. In fact, this is such a great idea that a Republican Congress passed it and a Democratic President signed it into law in 1995. It is called the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act or, more popularly, UMRA. This law requires CBO to analyze every piece of legislation for the burdens that it imposes on State and local governments.

Here is how CBO describes their work under the law:

In 1995, the UMRA was enacted to ensure that the Congress receives information, during the legislative process, about Federal mandates—requirements that would be imposed on State, local, and tribal governments and on entities in the private sector.

So, as with this amendment we are debating, the job is already done; and, as with the next amendment, the job is already done. The issue is already addressed. So I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the issue, but there is simply no need for the amendment, and, consequently, we will have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, two responses to my friend from Georgia:

Number one, the law that he cites does not analyze the impact of budget and tax decisions that we engage in here in Washington, D.C. So the gentleman's response, with all due respect, in the world, is wrong.

Secondly, I do find it ironic that this entire debate has focused on the critical need for more information. I have heard my friends talk about the need for a complete picture; except when it comes to local taxpayers, we don't want that information, we don't need to see that picture, and we will continue to pass legislation and pass the bill to those local taxpayers.

So, for all the high-minded speeches that we hear from my friends about needing to protect the taxpayer, opposing this amendment essentially says to the taxpayer you foot the bill for the decisions we make here.

So we talk about cutting taxes and we put out our press releases and we pat ourselves on the back for cutting Federal taxes and cutting spending when what we are really doing is stabbing local taxpayers in the back with those decisions.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–400.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

''(c) JOBS IMPACT.—The analysis prepared under subsection (a) shall also, using analytical principles and procedures consistent with section 402, provide an estimate of the number of jobs which would be created, sustained, or lost in carrying out the applicable major bill or resolution in the fiscal year in which it is to become effective and in each of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, together with the basis for each such estimate, and to the extent practicable, the analysis shall include regional and State-level estimates of jobs that would be created, sustained, or lost.

Page 4, line 21, strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the most important issue confronting our Nation today is the jobs crisis, something my constituents and I know all too well as my home State of Rhode Island continues to be plagued with the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, currently 9 percent.

While most Members would agree that the best way to address this jobs crisis is to pass legislation that gets

our economy growing more quickly, we clearly have different ideas on how best to achieve such growth. But we will have that important conversation in great detail next week as the House is scheduled to consider the Republican budget authored by Chairman RYAN and the substantive alternatives on the floor.

Today, however, we have before the House a bill that modifies the budget process. Specifically, this bill changes the rules that our independent umpire, the Congressional Budget Office, uses to determine the costs of implementing major pieces of legislation, defined as those impacting gross domestic product by more than approximately $40 billion.

While your new rules would supplement—not replace—existing scoring rules, let's be clear, the macroeconomic impact analysis, or dynamic scoring process, that is called for under the bill is something my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle view with great apprehension and serious concern, as it relies upon much more uncertain and subjective analytical principles, procedures, and assumptions than what the Congressional Budget Office currently utilizes for scoring the costs of legislation.

So while my colleagues across the aisle pursue what they believe is an ideal set of scoring rules, I rise today with a proposal to give a more targeted and specific picture of the impact pending legislation will have on jobs in our communities.

The amendment I offer does not change your desired dynamic scoring analysis; it merely requires production of a separate estimate, using CBO's existing analytical principles and procedures, of the number of jobs that will be created, sustained, or lost, including regional- and State-level estimates when practicable, for the same proposals my colleagues wish to score using their preferred set of rules.

Keep in mind, this is not a partisan proposal. This amendment is derived from legislation, the Jobs Score Act, which I introduced along with Senator MANCHIN, and has received balanced, bipartisan support in both Chambers.

So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and help ensure that Members of Congress are fully prepared to conduct their due diligence and have the most complete understanding possible of how the major bills considered in Congress impact jobs in our communities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Rhode Island for bringing the amendment. He and I were elected in the same class together just 3 years ago, and I think we have been able to work together to make a difference in the short time that we have been here.

I share his commitment to making sure that we have jobs estimates coming out of legislation, which is why I am so proud that as drafted—as drafted—this bill, introduced by my friend from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, requires ''employment and labor supply analysis'' in subsection B.

Now, that is incredibly important, Mr. Chairman, because what we do in Washington absolutely has consequences, and what those consequences are is a fair subject of debate here in the Chamber. But today there is no mechanism for determining, again, employment and labor supply numbers on a dynamic basis over time recognizing what those actions are.

Now, my concern about the amendment from my friend is that, rather than scoring those jobs dynamically—again, understanding that for every action there is a reaction—it scores in a static methodology assuming that the government creates jobs, that there is anything at all that the government does that actually creates a job.

Now, we can redistribute the wealth, but short of putting someone on the Federal payroll, this amendment perpetuates the myth that the government is in the job-creation business. The government is absolutely in the job-destroying business, and we both work together on that facet, and we can make some decisions that help the private sector to succeed. It is those decisions, Mr. Chairman, that the bill, as drafted, will make sure are measured, recorded, and reported here on the House floor for the first time.

Again, I very much appreciate the intent of the gentleman to make sure that this Congress is focused like a laser on job creation, but scoring it as if the government is creating jobs instead of recognizing it is only our actions that the private sector is being impacted on that creates those jobs, I believe, would take what is a very good underlying bill and move it in the wrong direction.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, I thank my colleague for his kind words, but I think he is actually missing the point.

The dynamic scoring, in fact, does allow you to assess the employment impact, and, obviously, we think it does that through a tainted lens because such analysis will be subjective and uncertain, and we have made the arguments about dynamic scoring. But it doesn't impact that at all. That remains in the bill.

This simply adds a provision that would require an analysis be done under the traditional methods that the CBO uses. It will ensure that CBO conducts the same kind of analysis of jobs impact when using the static method currently used by CBO. And we can and should do both.

The fact of the matter is this is an opportunity to be sure that we have as much information as possible about the impact of actions that we take on job creation, on the ability to sustain or cost jobs. In fact, providing this amendment will only ensure that that analysis happens in both places.

You have recognized in the underlying bill that jobs impact matters—we agree—but let's not limit that information. Let's be sure there is a jobs impact both in the static analysis that is done by CBO as well as in your new provision for dynamic scoring. Let's have an assessment in both of those side by side. It will provide a full picture of the potential range of likely employment effects in our communities. We certainly have a responsibility to understand that and to deal with as much information as we can about the impact on jobs.

There is no more urgent issue, and we have heard lots of conversations this morning about how important it is that we have good data, good information. This simply supplements that. Let's make sure that jobs analysis happens in both places at the CBO.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–400.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

''(c) REPORTING ON ACCURACY OF MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSES.—Upon completion of the fifth fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of any major bill or joint resolution for which the Congressional Budget Office prepared an analysis under subsection (a), the Congressional Budget Office shall report on the accuracy of the original macroeconomic impact analysis of such enacted bill or joint resolution and submit these reports to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Page 4, line 21, strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward but one that I think is important to consider. Simply put, my

amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to review and report on the accuracy of dynamic scoring estimates 5 fiscal years after any dynamically scored bill is enacted.

Under H.R. 1874, very few pieces of legislation are likely to meet the threshold for requiring this type of macroeconomic analysis. However, as we have heard during this debate, the use of these estimates is controversial. There is a body of opinion that says that this type of scoring is legitimate, and there is a body of opinion that asserts that this type of scoring undermines the budget process and produces highly uncertain projections. My amendment would provide a way to follow up on estimates performed under H.R. 1874 and help shed light on whether those estimates, in fact, offered accurate data.

I will confess that I, for one, remain skeptical of dynamic scoring; but if we proceed in this vein and enact dynamic scoring, I think having the accountability put in place by having the CBO come back to Congress with information on whether the actual economic impact of certain legislation turns out to be, in fact, accurate would be very helpful in helping us assess whether or not this particular form of scoring is, in fact, legitimate and fact-based.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, although I don't oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I may claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the vice chairman for his time.

Looking at the amendment, it makes sense. It looks like the right thing to do. I think it is important that we always reassess these models to make sure that we are getting it right. People call this dynamic scoring. I like to call it reality-based scoring, and we always want to have a better measurement of reality. So I think the gentleman's amendment makes sense, and we would accept it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank the majority for accepting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time, as well.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–400.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 23, insert the following:

''(d) HUBZONE.—The Director shall include in any macroeconomic impact analysis submitted pursuant to this section the impact, if any, of the applicable major bill or resolution on any historically underutilized business zone, as that term is defined in section 3(p)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(1)).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with the spirit of cooperation and recognition that there are definitive distinctions and differences of opinion on the underlying legislation. I am trying to make this bill better.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, if this bill passes, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act. My amendment only seeks to look at the effects, should this measure pass, on HUBZones as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chairman, this bill could be entitled the ''Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Act.'' If that is the essence of the bill, we need to find the impact of it.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt measure that macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen. We want to know in the defined areas that deal with underserved areas all around America, in everyone's State, whether or not there is an impact on these important areas.

I believe that dynamic scoring has an impact on the outreach and the funding that we have to support the concept of a HUBZone, and therefore, my amendment is clear in its effort to make sure that those particular areas are in fact impacted.

The Small Business Administration administers several programs that support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone.

I recall that the Bush administration tried to use dynamic scoring to estimate the cost their tax cuts—asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue in sort of a trickle-down budgeting, but the question is, these smaller businesses that are attempting to thrive and impacted by Small Business Administration programs, how would this type of structure impact them.

The HUBZone program is a small business Federal contracting assistance program whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities.

That is an important responsibility, and it is an important goal for this Nation because we know that small businesses can help generate any number of jobs; and the assistance, I know, personally, to small business has been effective and productive.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1874, The Pro-Growth Budget Act of 2013.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUB Zones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chair, this bill could very well be entitled the, Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Champions Act, because that's in essence what's going on here.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen, and continues to pop up everywhere; in fact, even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the Super Committee.

Dynamic scoring finds its roots in the anti-tax movement. Dynamic scoring is problematic for the agencies that score and estimate the cost of legislation, and has been soundly rejected.

It is clear from the bill's language and approach that it is designed to make it easier to enact deficit-increasing tax cuts.

The bill requires CBO to produce supplementary estimates of the economic impact of major bills using dynamic scoring, an approach that involves more uncertainty and subjectivity than current scoring rules.

None other than Former Republican Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle opposed moving to dynamic scoring, noting that CBO ''generally have done a better job than some of the dynamic score-keeping.

That has been part of the challenge of moving to something called dynamic scoring is that we have not found anything that was any more accurate than the current way.''

Believers in dynamic scoring argue that tax cuts pay for themselves, generally by spurring so much economic growth, to the extent that revenues will actually increase. If I didn't know any better Mr. Chair, I'd think they were talking to us about trickle-down economics.

Mr. Chair, where have we heard that before?

I recall that the Bush administration attempted to impose the use of dynamic scoring to estimate the cost of its tax cuts, asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue enough to pay for themselves, sort of a trickle-down form of budgeting.

Unfortunately Mr. Chair, the Bush tax cuts did no such thing, but instead caused our national debt to explode. My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) administers several programs to support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone program.

The HUBZone program is a small business federal contracting assistance program

"whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities."

It provides participating small businesses located in areas with low income, high poverty rates, or high unemployment rates with contracting opportunities in the form of "set-asides," sole-source awards, and price-evaluation preferences.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the Federal Government awarded contracts valued at $12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about $3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program.

Mr. Chair, that's the gist of my amendment—job creation—because that's what we should be talking about in this Committee today.

The Budget Committee has held hearings on the general topic of budget process reform and the recommendations crossed party lines. Former Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness, testified that, "It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used."

Similarly, Dr. Philip Joyce, former Congressional Budget Office (CBO) staff member and a Democratic witness, testified that, "My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox. If the goal is to deal with the larger fiscal imbalance that faces us, the most important thing to do is to make use of them, not search for more tools."

Mr. Chair, dynamic scoring is the wrong tool at the wrong time—though—in the interest of fairness to the small businesses in distressed communities around this country, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, even though I have serious reservations about dynamic scoring.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment and for recognizing the value and importance of economic analysis for legislating here in Congress.

Too often, we hear from the other side of the aisle these taunts about magic asterisks and phony numbers, but your amendment rightly recognizes that legislation can make a difference on the economy.

However, what we can't accept about the amendment is the idea that CBO should try to estimate its effects on only small sections of the country rather than the Nation as a whole.

Instead of dictating every detail of the macroeconomic analysis for CBO, we think that we need to give them the flexibility to adapt their analysis to the specifics of particular legislation. This amendment would unnecessarily limit that flexibility, so we urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the full Budget Committee and thank him again for his leadership.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Ms. JACKSON LEE. We have heard from our colleagues all morning that they want more information, a more complete picture of the impact of legislation on our economy.

Well, the legislation before us, as we have pointed out repeatedly today, exempts the part of the budget that deals with investments in discretionary spending. From the start, it does that.

Then they said no to amendments on the impact on jobs. They have said no to getting more information on the impact on State and local governments and local taxpayers, and now, they are saying no to getting more information on vital portions of our economy.

This doesn't say the CBO can't look at other things. It just says that it is important that they look at this part of the economy. There are HUBZones in every part of the country, and they are an important part of our strategy that a lot of us are working towards to try to make sure that everyone in this country has an opportunity to move forward and succeed.

So it is discouraging to hear our colleagues reject a request for more information on jobs, local taxpayers, and now in this particular area.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his astute comments and build on the comments made by the ranking member.

Let me put into the record that the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the Federal Government awarded contracts valued at $12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about $3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program. That is an investment in small business. That is the creation of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the gist of my amendment is jobs and what will be the impact of this type of budget structuring on the HUBZones. Why wouldn't we want that information?

Let me quote former Budget chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness who testified:

> It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used.

If you are going to add more responsibilities to the CBO, give them additional tools to assess who the job-creating small businesses are going to be impacted by this bill.

Dr. Philip Joyce, former CBO staff member, said:

> My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox.

Therefore, I am saying if we are putting another tool in the toolbox, if this bill passes, then give them the ability to make sure that we are not killing small businesses that are impacted by the HUBZone funding and assistance.

We already see that small businesses create jobs. I would make the argument to my colleagues, and I thank Dr. PRICE for his earlier kind words about the gist of this legislation, and I would ask for his reconsideration. This is a good amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support it. I ask my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–400 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ISRAEL of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 214, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—182

Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera (CA)	Capuano	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)	Courtney
Braley (IA)	Chu	Crowley
Brown (FL)	Cicilline	Cuellar

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—214

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
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)
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—35

Barton
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Costa
Garcia
Garrett
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Lankford
Lofgren
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Noem
Nunes
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Rooney
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Young (IN)

□ 1303

Messrs. LoBIONDO, BROOKS of Alabama, CAMP, STUTZMAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MESSER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HECK of Washington, STOCKMAN, CLEAVER, MEADOWS, and PETERSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 159 I missed the vote, but I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 159 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 211, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—189

Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—211

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline

Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—31

Barton
Bass
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Garcia
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Lankford
Lynch
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Noem
Nunes
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1308

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, on Friday, April 4, I missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on No. 160.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 219, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—186

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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Barton
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Farr
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Lankford
Lynch
Matsui
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1312

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 222, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—185

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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro

DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
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)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Barton
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Lankford
Lynch
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Waxman

□ 1317

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 539, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1874, as reported, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike ''(except the Committee on Appropriations of each House)''.

Page 4, line 4, insert ''AMERICA'S FIRST PRIORITY IS JOB CREATION, INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE, AND'' before ''ECONOMIC IMPACT''.

Page 4, line 12, insert ''The analysis shall include the impact of Federal expenditures contained in the applicable bill or resolution, including investments in education, transportation, and infrastructure, in promoting job creation and economic growth.'' after ''product.''.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend with the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, some of us will support this bill, and some of us will oppose it; but Republican and Democrat alike, we can all agree on the need for both parties to work together, invest in our future, and help create jobs and opportunity for all Americans.

Yes, we must reduce the deficit and tackle our national debt, and yes, we need to cut wasteful spending whenever we can, but to get the Federal budget in order, we need to make smart investments to help grow our economy.

To help American workers and businesses compete and win, we need to double down on education, job training, research, and infrastructure, the very foundation of our economy; and yet the legislation we are debating today disregards the importance of these investments.

This bill will require the Congressional Budget Office to study the long-term benefits of some proposals, but not others. Under this bill, the CBO would have to tell us how another tax break would help billionaires, but not how early investments in education will help middle class families and long-term economic growth.

That just doesn't make any sense to my constituents in New Hampshire.

Under this bill, the CBO would not analyze the impact of investments to revitalize our bridges and highways; train our veterans for good jobs when they return home; prepare students for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; fund cutting-edge medical research; or expand our National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, which is already helping more workers and businesses make it in America.

These investments make our economy stronger and are of long-term benefit to our economy. If we are going to

pass this bill, we should recognize their value. To that end, my amendment would broaden the underlying bill and apply it to major investments in education, infrastructure, economic growth, and job creation—smart investments to help hard-working families all across our Nation.

These are the issues that the American people want us to focus on, so let's work together across the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to improve this bill and to invest in a better future for our children.

I urge support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have very good news for my friend from New Hampshire. The underlying bill would include macroeconomic analysis on all of these items: education, infrastructure, employment, growth, and so much more. Therefore, we must oppose the MTR, as it is redundant and unnecessary.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 218, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—187

Barber
Barrow (GA)
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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—218

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Barton
Bass
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Lankford
Lynch
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Richmond
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1332

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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 224, noes 182, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—224

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
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)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock

McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Barber
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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Barton
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Farr
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Lankford
Lynch
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Noem
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Richmond
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1341

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to attending the funeral of Tuskegee Airman, Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, USAF, Retired, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 157 through 164 on April 4, 2014. If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall vote No. 157—H. Res. 539, On Ordering the Previous Question, "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 158—H. Res. 539, On Agreeing to the Resolution, "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 159—Connolly of Virginia Amendment to H.R. 1874, "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 160—Israel of New York Amendment to H.R. 1874, "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 161—Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment to H.R. 1874, "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 162—Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment to H.R. 1874, "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 163—H.R. 1874, Motion to Recommit, "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 164—H.R. 1874, Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013, "aye."

□ 1345

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider three bills from the Budget Committee.

The first bill, H.R. 1871, the Baseline Reform Act, authored by Representative ROB WOODALL of Georgia, would require CBO and OMB, when scoring legislation, to assume that the baseline does not increase or decrease for discretionary spending, which they do now. This practice added $1.2 trillion to the baseline in 2013.

The second bill, H.R. 1872, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, written by Representative SCOTT GARRETT of New Jersey, brings off-budget programs on-budget to provide a more accurate accounting of these programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider and pass a budget resolution on time for a fourth consecutive year. The Republican budget, under the leadership of Chairman PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin and the Budget Committee members, will adhere to the agreed-upon spending limits and balance the budget in 10 years, as we did last year, increase economic growth and job creation, create opportunity, lessen the middle class squeeze, cut wasteful government spending, and strengthen our entitlement programs.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. It is wonderful news that that budget is going to do all of those things, I want you to know. And we are pleased that a budget is coming forward. We may not be pleased with the budget, but we are pleased that it is coming forward.

As the gentleman knows, we have already had the budget levels for fiscal year '15. You indicate that the budget will adhere to the Ryan-Murray agreement. I assume that also means that it will adhere to the firewall division between defense and nondefense discretionary spending as well.

Is that accurate, Mr. Leader?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, for this fiscal year, he is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I will tell my friend, the majority leader, The Wall Street Journal had an editorial of about 13 or 14 paragraphs. I disagreed with the first 13 paragraphs, but I did agree with the last paragraph.

It said, ''But the Ryan outline does the service of showing the policy direction in which Republicans would head if they regain control of the Senate next year.''

Then it goes on to say, ''Senate Democrats don't want to declare themselves with any votes, but they favor higher taxes and much more spending for everything other than defense. Voters will have to decide on the direction they want Congress to go.''

So, Mr. Leader, as I said, we welcome a debate on this budget. We do believe it expresses the priorities of your party, and, as you know, we differ with those priorities in many instances. So I think the American people will get a spirited, informative, and educational debate on the Ryan budget, and I think that that will do much to inform them of the priorities of both parties. As I say, we look forward to that budget.

Unemployment insurance, Mr. Leader, is being considered on the Senate floor. I know the cloture vote has been taken. I don't know whether final passage has been taken.

Does the gentleman have any expectation that if the Senate passes that bill today whether or not that bill might be on the floor next week?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, first I would ask the gentleman just to refer to a letter by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies, dated March 19, to the Majority Leader and the minority leader in the other body. This letter essentially lays out the case for why their bill is unworkable. Again, these are the folks that are in the business of administering these programs.

I would also say to the gentleman, I think the gentleman knows our position on that bill. It doesn't create any jobs. Right now, we are in the business of trying to see how we can get people back to work, for an America that works for more people, and I would say to the gentleman, I look forward to joining him and focusing on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I am informed by the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee that we also have a letter from the Secretary of Labor, or one of the people that works with him, indicating that, in fact, they believe this would be workable. But very frankly, notwithstanding the letters, let me ask the majority leader: If, in fact, we made it prospective—which, of course, would clearly be workable—and made it 5 months prospectively, rather than 3 or 3.5 months retrospectively and a month and a half prospectively, as you know, through May 30, would that be an acceptable alternative, Mr. Majority Leader?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say back to the gentleman, it is my opinion that what the gentleman asked for is a continuance of the status quo.

We want to get people back to work. We are in the business of job creation. We want to provide a better environment for businesses to hire folks. We want to help those folks who are chronically unemployed access the skills necessary to fill the job openings today. As the gentleman knows—and I am sure his district is not unlike mine and many others—there are a lot of job openings that are left open because the workforce doesn't have access to proper training and skills.

I look forward to joining with the gentleman in looking towards the future and to how we can help those who are out of work get a job.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, Mr. Speaker.

But it seems to me that it begs the question. The question is, yes, we want to get people back to work. Everybody on this floor wants to get people back to work. I don't think there is any doubt about that. Hopefully we would be at full employment, however one defines that—whether it is 3 percent, 4 percent unemployment, which would be transition employment or unemployment. But yes, we want to have everybody back to work.

The issue that I ask about, Mr. Speaker, is that if we don't get everybody back to work—and we haven't gotten everybody back to work. There were 192,000 new jobs created this past month. That is good, but it is not good enough. And that is why we have a continuing 6.7 percent unemployment rate.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the majority leader was to assume, for argument, that the letter to which he refers is accurate. I don't accept that premise. But accepting that premise for the minute, would the majority leader be amenable to, rather than to do as the Senate does, making it retrospective so that the 3.5 months that would have gone from December 29 of last year to today and paying that back, simply extending for 5 months while people continue to look for employment but have been unable to find it because there are three times as many people looking for jobs as there are jobs available—and we are adding 72,000 people on a weekly basis to the unemployed roles. So if we made it prospective, that would save an awful lot of people the pain and suffering that they are experiencing because they can't find a job.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that what we are amenable to is looking to try to fix the problem. I would also refer the gentleman to the fact that the emergency unemployment insurance that the gentleman speaks of was in place for the longest time, I am told, in history, and that it was in place for an emergency.

As the gentleman well knows, we have in place 6 months of unemployment insurance benefits for those who are out of work. I know that what those who are out of work beyond that, who are deemed chronically unemployed, want most is an opportunity to get back to work. That is where I believe we ought to focus our efforts and really help people get back into a job so that they can support themselves, their families, and create a better future.

So I hope the gentleman will join us in refocusing away from accepting the status quo as the new norm and, instead, try to enhance the prospects for the pursuit of happiness for more people. And we are about an America that works for everybody, including those who are chronically unemployed.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. As he knows, we have an agenda to do just that. It is called Make It In America, to expand manufacturing, create the kinds of jobs where people can make good salaries, have good benefits, and have good security for the long term. There is no disagreement on that, Mr. Speaker. The only disagreement seems to be, while we are trying to get that done, whether or not we try to assure that those who have fallen through the cracks do not find themselves in dire circumstances because we have eliminated the safety net that we constructed.

I would say to the gentleman, this is the longest time in history—and we are going to hear a lot of information from members of the Ways and Means Committee—the longest time in history that we have had this level of long-term unemployment. One of the reasons for that is, obviously, the dislocations in the marketplace and that we experienced the deepest recession that anybody—maybe RALPH HALL is an exception—that anybody in this body has experienced.

□ 1400

In other words, the last time we had as deep a recession as we had at the end of the last administration that carried over into this administration was the deep Depression, and you have to be 90 years or older to have really remembered and experienced that.

So there is a lot of pain out there. All I am saying is we agree there is no disagreement. We want to get people to work. We want to take actions that give them the skills.

As I have told you—and we haven't done this as vigorously, and that is as much my fault as anybody—I want to do that. You were focused on your SKILLS Act. Clearly, we want to make sure people have the skills to get employment.

I would hope that we could look at—assuming the Senate passes this bill—to give relief to 2.8 million people who are in dire straits, increasing by 72,000 a week, give them some support while we are trying and, hopefully together, create the kind of jobs and skills necessary to get them out of the hole that they are in.

If I might note, there are 193 Democrats who have signed a discharge petition to bring the unemployment insurance to the floor. If I might do one other issue, last week, we had the sustainable growth rate. We extended it. We worked together to get that done.

Without going into it at length, I know the gentleman and I have had discussions about the sustainable growth rate, the so-called doc fix. We put a temporary patch on it.

That was, in my opinion, the wrong thing to do. It was the right thing to do temporarily, but it was the wrong thing to do. The gentleman knows that fixing the sustainable growth rate is now, from a scorable standpoint, less expensive to do than it has been in over 5 years.

I would hope that, Mr. Leader, working together, that we could address this issue at some time before this Congress adjourns sine die. We need to fix this, and we need to fix it permanently.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, we, too, would like to see the SGR overhaul replaced with something that works. Our

Physician's Caucus on the majority side of the aisle has put a lot of work into this issue, together with the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, have come up with a plan, as the gentleman knows, that had bipartisan support.

The problem is how to pay for it, and as I think the gentleman would agree, we can't go and continue to incur costs without finding out ways to pay for it, and that seems to continue to vex—many of the problems around here are trying to discover bipartisan pay-fors.

We made a commitment to continue to work with those Members who are most engaged in this issue and look forward to continue working with the gentleman to try to find those pay-fors, so we can put in place a long-term plan to give some certainty to our providers under Medicare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I look forward to working with him. I would observe, as he well knows, and I have discussed with the Speaker, the pay-fors that were included in the temporary patch were as elusory as any other pay-for we could find.

We simply accelerated dollars. We didn't have due dollars. We didn't really pay for it. We just simply put the debt off a month or so and collected the money early and pretended that that was going to pay for it.

Whether that is any more real than doing any of the other options that have been suggested, I think, is questionable, but I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Because I mention it every time, but I want to mention it in a slightly different context, I will bring up comprehensive immigration reform again. The majority leader says it is a broken system. We all agree on that, and we ought to move forward.

We are going to be considering the budget. The budget, we don't think is paid for. We will have a discussion about that as we go down. We think it increases the deficits; it is not balanced in 10 years.

But that aside, comprehensive immigration reform, the CBO released its score on our bill H.R. 15, which we think is a bipartisan bill, found it would reduce the deficit by $900 billion over the next 2 decades, including $200 billion over the first 10 years.

Therefore, comprehensive immigration reform, in our opinion, is not only the right thing to do, it is economically the smart thing to do. That is in the context of a bill that was brought to the floor this week that increases the deficit by nearly $74 billion, dealing with the ACA.

It is a bit ironic that, during the time of enormous deficits, that we have been unwilling to bring to the floor a bill that is scored by CBO as close to a trillion dollars positive reduction of our deficit in the coming 20 years. I would hope that we could look at that.

As I say, it is not only the right thing to do, but it is supported across the board, the bill that the Senate passed by a 68–32 margin, supported by the Chamber of Commerce, supported by the AFL–CIO, supported by growers, farmers, ag interests, as well as farm workers, supported by the faith community across the board, and supported by 70-plus percent of the American people.

You would think, in the context of that broad base of support, that we could bring a bill which has such positive affects for human beings, for individuals, and for our country, as well as a positive economic affect.

I would hope, very sincerely, that once we get past the budget and come back after the Easter break, that we address comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to my friend if he has any comments.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just say to the gentleman, as he knows, both the Speaker, I, and others have said we reject the comprehensive approach taken by the Senate.

Also, as the gentleman correctly states, we are in favor of trying to fix a very broken, antiquated, legal immigration system, as well as trying to do something to stop illegal immigration. We just have an issue about the President's insistence on, first of all, saying it is his way or the highway.

Secondly, the gentleman and I have talked before about the growing frustration that many Americans have, as well as Members on our side of the aisle, about the seeming disregard for the law by this administration in selectively implementing laws that have passed, specifically as it relates to the Affordable Care Act.

How would one know provisions that will be upheld, implemented, executed in whole or not, given this situation surrounding the ACA? Those are the kinds of challenges we face.

I would also note to the gentleman that the kind of thing that he refers to, comprehensive immigration, we reject that notion that the Senate bill, and we reject comprehensive efforts that have been undertaken over the last several years because they haven't worked so well.

Instead, we should be looking to try and do the things that we agree on. What about border security—border security itself? If we can agree to say that is going to be our position, we are not negotiating on a comprehensive bill, that we have to take care of that.

What about the kids? The gentleman knows I am very focused on trying to do something that we can agree on, but without saying that that has to be a precursor to something that the President insists, or otherwise, we can't even have the discussion.

So, again, we have got a lot of issues with regards to immigration. I would say to the gentleman I understand his frustration. I think that we have plenty of people who are also frustrated, given how things have gone with this White House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I want to say on border security, H.R. 15, we refer to as a comprehensive bill, as you know, included the border security provision passed out of the Homeland Security Committee, chaired by your Republican chairman, passed out on a voice vote, essentially unanimously, is included in our bill.

So, on the border security issue, we apparently have a very broad-based agreement on that issue. The gentleman says you want to do it individually. The gentleman knows that the Judiciary Committee has passed out individual, discrete bills dealing with discrete parts of the immigration issue, what you say is a broken system.

Bring out discretely those bills. The bill that the Homeland Security reported out unanimously has not been brought to the floor. The four bills that have been reported out of the Judiciary Committee have not been brought up to the floor. They were passed months and months and months ago.

So that if you don't want to do a comprehensive—if that is the view of the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest to the majority leader that he bring out discrete bills, individual bills, not comprehensive, and see if we can deal with those.

I will tell you our disappointment also is that it was not only the Senate bill that was rejected, but the Speaker put out some principles with respect to comprehensive—or immigration reform, I won't call it comprehensive, put out some principles.

We received those positively. We thought that was a positive step. Unfortunately, those—the Speaker's proposal were rejected apparently by a very large number of your party in and outside of this institution. As a result, 6 days after he issued the principles, he said that they were not going to be pursued.

Yes, we were frustrated and disappointed with that because we thought the Speaker had taken a positive step forward. I don't know whether the majority leader was, Mr. Speaker, part of those principles, but in any event, we accepted them as good-faith efforts to come to an agreement, and we were prepared to pursue discussions on those principles. Unfortunately, as I say, the Speaker withdrew them.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time, unless the majority leader wants me to yield to him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers has proposed under waterways of the United States rules that the EPA claims jurisdiction not just over nearly every navigable waterway, but virtually every body of water in the Nation, no matter how large or how small.

Using a creative interpretation of a 40-year-old law, the EPA argues that it holds jurisdiction over any activities that could conceivably impact not just navigable waters, but any waterway that eventually flows into a river, even a waterway or wetland, which is simply near a navigable waterway.

Furthermore, the EPA doesn't stop at claiming control over water. It also claims control over any activity that could impact those waters in any way. This rule drastically limits private property rights by inserting the Federal Government into local land use decisions.

The rule would also expand EPA's authority from rivers, bays, and wetlands into manmade waterways like storm drains, drain ditches, farm ponds—unconnected in any way to a waterway—and even puddles. That's right, puddles.

EPA's first draft of that rule specifically exempted puddles. Tellingly, the final draft does not exempt them anymore.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time to put an end to the government overreach and defund these efforts in the appropriations process and ensure that only America's elected representative make the laws that govern the Nation.

VERA HOUSE'S WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, with what is left of my voice, to support Vera House's 20th annual White Ribbon campaign. For more than 35 years, Vera House has played a crucial role in combating domestic and sexual violence.

Located in the Syracuse area in my district, Vera House provides a safe shelter, counseling services, and other services for rape and sexual abuse victims and helps survivors rebuild their lives. It also provides life-saving prevention and education throughout central New York.

It is critically important that we continue to support Vera House's ongoing mission to end domestic abuse and sexual violence and to empower the victims to promote equality and respect in relationships.

The White Ribbon campaign encourages all members of the community to join those efforts and to demonstrate such support by wearing a white ribbon.

I urge my colleagues to support Vera House's White Ribbon Campaign to raise awareness of sexual and domestic violence.

□ 1415

COMMENDING CHICAGO ON INITIATING NEW POLICIES

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the mayor of the city of Chicago for initiation of a new set of policies designed to help facilitate the reentry of individuals with criminal records back into normal and productive life.

These policies include apprenticeship and job opportunities with the Chicago Transit Authority, city departments, and other municipal agencies, and—on a limited basis—the ability to access public housing as a place to live.

These are important initiatives for the reentry into community and for the citizens of Chicago. I commend Mayor Rahm Emanuel.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 60 minutes as the minority leader.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, several of us come together to talk about unemployment insurance.

The majority leader said to accept the Senate bill is to accept the status quo. That is simply not correct. No, it is not accepting the status quo; it is whether we will penalize over 2 million long-term unemployed looking for work who have lost their unemployment insurance because of the overall economic situation in this country that is getting better, but for them, not nearly good enough. So don't raise the issue of the status quo as a reason to penalize over 2 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, a number of us invited a number of unemployment workers to be our guests at the President's State of the Union Address. We wanted to give a voice to the over 2 million Americans who have had their unemployment benefits cut off.

When these jobseekers told their stories one by one, I thought to myself: This is America, these are folks who come from every walk of life, who have worked hard, very hard, and who have played by the rules in pursuit of the American dream; now, they have lost their jobs, through no fault of their own, and they are desperately seeking new employment.

You can understand their complete bewilderment when uninformed people call them lazy, and you can feel their utter disbelief that their government apparently has abandoned them.

My guest for the State of the Union Address was Josie Maisano from St. Clair Shores, Michigan. Josie proudly told us she had worked since she was a teenager, but now, at age 60, she could not find a job.

Her unemployment benefits were helping her to keep her head above water as she searched for work, but when her benefits were cut off, she fell behind on her mortgage payments, struggled to keep the power on, and worried about becoming homeless, worried about that every day.

Josie and over 2 million Americans just like her are desperately waiting to see if this Congress will finally act to help those seeking jobs, not saying we are ratifying the status quo, but as I said to the majority leader, not letting the status quo—which is changing a bit but not enough—let that status quo penalize her.

Indeed, the good news is that the Senate is expected to take that critical step on Monday by passing bipartisan legislation—bipartisan legislation—to retroactively extend the unemployment insurance program through May.

So the question is this: Whether this House will also act or will it leave town and leave America's jobseekers in the lurch?

If every Member of this Chamber will simply take a few minutes to talk with unemployed workers in their district, to people like Josie, I have no doubt we will do the right thing and act; but up to this point, action has been scant, while the excuses have been plentiful.

We have heard that an extension of unemployment benefits must be paid for, even though these emergency benefits have traditionally not been offset, but the Senate unemployment extension is fully paid for with bipartisan offsets, so end of excuse.

We have heard that any legislation extending unemployment benefits must also create jobs, but the CBO has estimated that continuing emergency unemployment benefits would create 200,000 jobs by raising consumer demand, so, again, end of excuse.

We have heard that extended unemployment benefits aren't needed any more because the economy has recovered. The economy certainly has improved from the depths of the Great Recession, but we continue to have near-record rates of long-term unemployment.

Indeed, the percentage of those long-term unemployed in this country are the largest in our records, and we have never cut off these benefits in the past with anything close to this level of long-term unemployment, so end of that excuse.

Again, we have heard that it is too late to help the unemployed because the Federal UI program has been expired for too long, but as the whip said,

the Secretary of Labor has sent a letter saying that it can be implemented.

Governors and State UI directors have said they stand ready, willing, and able to restore these critical benefits, as has been done after prior lapses in benefits, so let there be an end of that excuse.

So let's get past any excuses and focus on the facts. Anyone receiving an unemployment benefit must look for work, and they have ample reason to do so, given that the average unemployment benefit is only $300 a week.

Even at that modest level—and I want to emphasize this—unemployment benefits have lifted 11 million Americans out of poverty since 2008, according to the Census Bureau.

The end of the Federal emergency unemployment program in December has left only one out of every four jobseekers receiving unemployment benefits, the lowest coverage in over 50 years.

The bipartisan Senate bill that will be voted on—we now expect Monday—would restore this vital lifeline to nearly 2.8 million Americans, including Josie Maisano, and 106,000 other jobseekers in my home State of Michigan.

Someone recently asked me if this issue is personal to me. It is. When you hear the unemployed tell their stories, when you see the anguish in their faces, and when you know how hard they are struggling to find work, it is impossible to not take it personally. America, these are our friends, our neighbors, our fellow Americans. How can we give them the cold shoulder?

This poster, 2.8 million Americans, these are the people whose livelihoods, whose lifelines are at stake here. I fervently hope that this institution will rise up to its greatest traditions, to respond to the needs of Americans out of work through no fault of their own, looking hard for work, unable to find it.

Often, people who are in their forties, fifties, and older find it difficult to find someone who will give them a fair shot. These are people like us, and they are everywhere. We need to act.

I now yield to a colleague and friend of mine, a member of our committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN for yielding and for his leadership on that committee.

I rise to join Mr. LEVIN today in lending a voice to the 2.8 million American workers who are waiting for Congress to act and renew unemployment insurance benefits.

These people have been waiting 17 weeks for Congress to reinstate the benefits that help them stay afloat as they search for a job. Imagine having to decide between putting food on the table and having a roof over your head, but these are the decisions that millions of workers, including more than 514,000 in California alone, continue to face.

It is a hardship they have to face because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

Over the last several weeks, my office has heard from dozens of constituents who are struggling because of congressional inaction. In fact, I have had the opportunity to talk with some of them and hear their stories personally.

They come from all walks of life, from working class backgrounds to even educated professionals who hold master's and doctorate degrees, and they all share one thing in common, they want to work.

If I may, I would like to share one of their stories with you. One of my constituents wrote to me:

> Linda, in the past, I benefited from unemployment insurance when I was between jobs. Part of my responsibility every time I went to pick up a check was to certify that I was actively searching for a job.
>
> This motivated me to continue searching for a job because I knew that the small income from unemployment benefits allowed me to pay for my needs, such as copies of my resume, gasoline to travel to prospective work sites and interviews, and the phone calls I made to potential employers who were looking for employees.
>
> Nowadays, it seems that the unemployed are being punished for being jobless through no fault of their own.

That is just one of the many letters my office has received, but all of them share the same message: they want my colleagues on other side of the aisle to know they are not lazy or unmotivated; they want to work.

As they continue to navigate the tough labor market, they need unemployment benefits to provide for their families and pay for the gas and phone bills that help them look for work and connect with potential employers.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment insurance is not a handout. Workers earned those benefits. They paid into the unemployment insurance program, so they would have a safety net when times got tough. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't seem to agree, so perhaps an economic argument might sway them.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that an extension of unemployment insurance benefits would grow our GDP by 0.2 percent and add 200,000 jobs to our economy in this year alone.

That is because recipients are more likely to take the money they receive and spend it on essential goods and services. As a result, employers would hire more people to meet consumer demand for those goods and services. It is simple economics, Mr. Speaker.

My Republican colleagues say they care about creating jobs and growing our economy, but when an opportunity comes around to do exactly that, they refuse to act.

It has been 17 weeks since millions lost their unemployment insurance benefits, so what are they waiting for? Each week that we delay, 72,000 new unemployed Americans lose their benefits. That is one more household, one more family that will have to decide whether they keep a roof over their head or food on their table.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of these Americans are part of the group of long-term unemployed. These are people who, despite their best attempts, have not been able to find work in over six months. The reality that these Americans face is abysmal.

Research by Princeton University shows that, in any given month, the long-term unemployed have only a one in 10 chance of finding work, and a big reason for this is because employers are more likely to discriminate against long-term unemployed, even if they have the same skills and experience as other applicants.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, these people are waiting for Congress to act.

I will share one more note from Ron in Pasadena, California, who says:

> I just hope that our representatives are able to see beyond political polarities to the faces of those families to whom this issue does not merely exist as a statistic or a theory, but more genuinely as a question of survival.

Next week, the Senate is set to vote and pass an extension of unemployment insurance benefits. The measure would reinstate Federal unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed and allow for retroactive payments to go out to more than 2 million Americans who lost their benefits in late December.

I hope that my colleagues here in the House summon the courage to act and follow the Senate's lead. It is time to stop disrespecting people who are working hard to try to find work.

Mr. Speaker, don't leave millions of millions behind. Give unemployment insurance the vote that it deserves.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her moving remarks. I hope the country is listening.

Now, another person who has devoted so much time as Ms. SÁNCHEZ has to this effort to bring to the attention of this country what this is really all about, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

First, I would like to extend my appreciation to my colleague, my good friend, and the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, from the great State of Michigan, for hosting this critically important Special Order hour on extending unemployment insurance benefits for over 2.2 million people who have been cut off since the end of last year. Thank you for your leadership and tenacity in making sure that this issue remains a priority here in this House. I commend you, sir, for your leadership.

The timing of this Special Order hour in this session is not coincidental. The Senate is well on their way towards passing a bipartisan bill to restore this critical financial lifeline that the people in this country depend on while they search for work.

I want to commend my Majority Leader, Senator HARRY REID, from the great State of Nevada, and the other great U.S. Senator from Nevada, DEAN HELLER, a Republican, who have worked in a bipartisan manner with Senator JACK REED to get to the point they are in the Senate.

I want to go further in recognizing Senator DEAN HELLER in calling Speaker BOEHNER just recently to ask him what it would take to bring up a clean vote on extending unemployment insurance benefits, because this is not a partisan issue—at least it shouldn't be. Helping 2 million Americans who rely on unemployment insurance as a bridge while they search for work is basic, fundamental, and should be supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program through May and restoring the financial bridge to nearly 2.8 million Americans. These are our neighbors. They are people that we know.

Now, the Democratic Caucus in the House comes to the floor today with a unified voice to respectfully ask the Speaker of this House for a vote. We have heard the calls from our constituents, and they cannot wait another day for the Republican leadership to continue to play political games.

My colleague, Representative SÁNCHEZ, just said it has been 17 weeks since these unemployment insurance benefits have expired. For each week, that is $300, on average, that family members who use this to pay the rent, to keep the utilities on, to put some gas in the car so that they can search for work have been lost.

So we come here today to talk about the lives that have been affected by this Congress' inaction at a time when the American people expect us to act. We are here to put the face to the numbers, because there are real people behind the 2.8 million Americans who are suffering, to give voice to those who are being ignored while they struggle to stay in their homes and to put food on their table for themselves and their family.

Now, I am from Nevada. In our State, we recently had our numbers released today, and fortunately the numbers are getting better. Now we are the third worst in unemployment. So that is good news, but it is still not good enough. Nevada, along with other States like Rhode Island, continue to face higher unemployment in the Nation, not because the people in our States don't want to work, but because the environment in our States hasn't recovered fast enough from the recession.

Now, in Nevada, we like boasting more about being the entertainment capital of the world and the fact that we have some of the most magnificent natural resources anywhere, but, unfortunately, the prolonged recession has hit our State and the people of Nevada to our core.

As I said, it is because, in large part, our economy was a growth economy. For nearly 20 years, year over year, we had double-digit growth, and people were moving to the great State of Nevada to help us build and to grow.

But during the recession that changed, and so now over 100,000 Nevadans are unemployed and have been primarily from the construction, engineering, and architecture sectors of our economy. These aren't people who don't want to work. There is an environment that is not allowing them to go to work.

Now, if we pass the Senate bill, 31,500 Nevadans would see their unemployment benefits extended. It is not a lot of money. As I said, it is not enough to live off of, but for these families and the stories that they have told us, it can make all the difference between being on the brink and literally falling off.

Now, I want to share a couple of stories of constituents whom I have met over the last few weeks as we have tried to bring attention to this issue.

Before coming to Congress, I ran an employment and training agency that helped thousands of people get training to go to work in Las Vegas. I know what it takes to put people back to work. So I went and visited one of our workforce centers and met with a group of unemployed workers to hear directly what they are facing and what it has meant to lose their unemployment insurance. They told us that they didn't know where else to turn. And they surely, if Speaker BOEHNER could hear from them, they want him to know that they want to do right by our fellow citizens and return to work.

Now, among the Nevadans who have been cut off from unemployment insurance is Monty. He was laid off from his job on December 4, 2013, and he lost his benefits on December 28, 2013. When he called my office in February, his life had gone from bad to worse. Monty told my staff:

> I've had to basically pawn everything of value that I own to try and stay in my apartment. That came to an end last week when I couldn't afford to stay there anymore and I was evicted. Right now, I am sleeping on rocks outside of a brick wall at night with a blanket to keep me warm, and during the daytime I go out and look for work.
>
> Prior to losing unemployment benefits, I was able to pay my rent on a weekly basis, have bus fare to get around and look for jobs, and provide a little bit of food for myself and keep looking.

Monty hasn't given up because he is determined to get back on his feet. He has never been in this situation before and, Mr. Speaker, he is not a lazy person. When he was employed, he hadn't missed a day of work in 25 years. Now he just can't understand why Congress has turned its back on him. Unemployment benefits were providing him the opportunity to keep looking for work and to stay in his home so that he could have a bed to sleep in and a hot shower before he goes on work interviews.

Now, there was recently some good news for Monty. He recently signed up for Medicaid because of the Affordable Care Act. It is a small victory for him, but his story of losing his home is the same as thousands of people around this Nation.

That is why I am proud to be a lead sponsor of the Stop Foreclosures Due to the Congressional Dysfunction Act introduced by Congressman MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania. The legislation would impose a 6-month moratorium on foreclosures for individuals who have lost their unemployment insurance compensation due to the recent congressional inaction.

Until we do the right thing, Mr. Speaker, by extending unemployment insurance, we must do everything that we can to keep families with a roof over their heads. Congressman CARTWRIGHT and I have also sent a letter to Federal Housing Finance Agency Director Mel Watt requesting that he take action and use his regulatory authority to establish the 6-month moratorium if Congress fails to act to pass this important legislation.

Another constituent who I talked with recently is Elizabeth. Like my colleague Representative SÁNCHEZ said, many of these workers, or unemployed people who want to work, happen to be older Americans who feel that age has something to do with why they are not able to get back into the workforce. She lost her job with the Nevada Division of Insurance last year after suffering a stroke and two severe concussions. She has been searching every single day for work. She, like Monty, was uninsured until receiving coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Her unemployment benefits helped pay her premium and for the expense of medications that help prevent her seizures.

After losing her benefits, she had to cut down on taking her medication, now taking it every other day instead of daily, and now risks suffering another accident. Given her new condition, she made it her goal to become a caretaker and companion for senior citizens, which requires she attend classes and trainings. The unemployment benefits that she was receiving helped pay to put gas in her car to attend those classes. When she lost her benefits, she had to stop taking the classes, which was devastating, because this was part of her goal and the transition that she was trying to make to return to work.

But like many people, she had tough choices to make. She told us it wasn't a lot of money when she had a job, but now her family barely has enough to stay in their home and to pay their bills. Elizabeth wants to work. She told us: Do you think it is fun sitting around every day feeling like you are worthless, like you are nothing? She told us that most of all she wants to be able to get back to work to help provide for her neighbors, for those senior citizens that need that care and attention, for those who are worse off than she is.

One of the hardest parts of being in financial straits, for her, is not being

able to give to charity. That is true citizenship, Mr. Speaker, and House Republicans could learn a lot from Elizabeth.

These are the personal stories of those who have been hurt by Congress' failure to act. If Republicans don't want to extend unemployment insurance because it is the right thing to do for our fellow Americans, then maybe—then maybe—you will do it because it is the right thing to do for the economy.

Overall, failing to renew the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program will cost the economy 200,000 jobs this year, according to the Congressional Budget Office, including 3,000 jobs in my home State of Nevada. Failing to extend unemployment insurance has drained, already, nearly $5 billion from our State economies, including $70 million from Nevada's economy, at a time when economic growth is needed the most.

□ 1445

For every $1 that is spent on unemployment insurance, it grows the economy by $1.52. So, whichever way you look at it, there is no excuse for inaction.

When the Senate acts next week, the country's attention will turn to the House, and I am here with my colleagues today to urge the Speaker to listen to the Americans in this country who are desperately depending on us to act. At the end of next week, we will go into a work period for 2 weeks. During those 2 weeks, Americans will suffer if we don't act.

Mr. Speaker, we must be ready to act, and I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by extending unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who need it now.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan and my other colleagues who have joined for this Special Order.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you so much for your eloquence. I hope this country is listening as well as your beloved State.

Now I yield to another friend of mine and, most importantly, to somebody whose life embodies caring for others, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee. I am pleased to join with him and others of my colleagues as we come to the floor to call for the immediate passage of legislation in the House to concur with the Senate in the restoration of unemployment benefits to the more than 2.2 million Americans who have been cut off of extended unemployment insurance because our Republican colleagues continue to block an extension of the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that, as a government, as a nation, we would leave all of these individuals hanging, many of them since December 28 of last year, in 2013. Nationally, nearly 72,000 people are losing unemployment insurance, on average, every week, adding to the 202 million people who have already lost their benefits. The Department of Labor estimated that the bipartisan Senate agreement to extend emergency unemployment insurance would benefit nearly 2.8 million people. That is a big part of America.

Long-term unemployment wrecks people's lives. It makes it almost impossible for them to ever catch up because they have gotten behind. They have lost what they had. They have been evicted from their homes. Their children have had to leave college. They just have not known which way to turn except to turn to their government, which they believe has their interests at heart and will do the right thing by and for them.

Illinois, my State—the home of Lincoln—is estimated to have lost $296,763,435, just under $300 million, in unemployment benefits during the first 3 months of the year. Any way you count it, that is a lot of money, and it takes that money away from and out of the economy. Those of us who understand a certain kind of economics know that, if you are not able to exchange goods and services, if people are not able to go to the store and get a bottle of milk or to stop at the service station and buy gasoline, there is no point in talking about economic recovery. So, not only is it in the best interests of those individuals who are in need of unemployment benefits, but it is also in the best interest of our Nation as a whole.

Mr. LEVIN, I want to commend you for the leadership that you have provided on this issue. I want to thank you for the tremendous leadership and for your understanding of the issues facing America.

I hope that, next week, when we return, that our colleagues will realize that we, too, can make a difference, that we can join with the Senate and pass unemployment insurance benefits for more than 2.8 million Americans.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank you for your eloquent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is left in our hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Before I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for the remainder of my time, I just want to conclude in this way.

This is a bipartisan bill that is coming over from the Senate. This country has asked for bipartisanship. That bill embodies it. This country has asked for fiscal care. Traditionally, unemployment insurance has not been paid for. This bill is paid for on a bipartisan basis.

So what more is America asking for?

It is asking for people in this institution to step into the shoes of several million people who are hardworking, who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, who are looking for work, many of them never having been unemployed before. If there is a vote allowed in this institution, this bill will pass. There is only one obstacle to our doing what is right, and that is whether there will be a decision on the part of the leadership of this House to let us vote, and it won't be ourselves voting. It will be America voting. America wants a vote to help the several million and their families.

So I leave here, going out of Washington, hoping that when all of us return that we will have looked into the eyes of fellow and sister Americans out of work, that we will have reached out and will have listened to their stories, and that we will come back with a sense of urgency, with a sense of decency, and with a conscience. This issue should be on the consciences of every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE RYAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. NOLAN. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN, for this Special Order and for bringing to the attention of our colleagues and the country the importance of providing unemployment insurance for the millions of people who are struggling and who are in danger of losing their homes and the ability to feed their families.

As a businessman over the last 32 years, I would like to point out to these people who somehow like to characterize these people as scofflaws who don't want to work and remind them that you don't qualify for unemployment insurance unless you are a worker and have found yourself unemployed by virtue of circumstances you had no control over.

You are so right that this is the right thing to do. It is bipartisan, and there is a pay-for here. We should have the good judgment and the decency to extend the unemployment insurance for these people. So I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another issue, and it is the fact that most of us here in the Congress grew up at a time when our leaders weren't afraid to invest in our country, to invest in human development, and because of them, education was affordable. Guess what? That is no longer true.

Now we are faced with a Ryan budget that cuts Pell grants for poor and needy kids who would like to get a postgraduate education.

Medicare. Nothing has ever done more to extend the lives of more people than Medicare. In a little over a generation, we went from a nation with a life expectancy of about 47 to over 77. What does the Ryan budget do with

Medicare? It eliminates it as we know it. It turns the elderly back over to the insurance industry.

Our leaders in the past invested in transportation, in health, in education. They created the strongest economy and the strongest and largest middle class in the history of the world, and now our bridges are falling down. What does the Ryan budget do? It cuts funding for transportation.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. The simple truth is that the Ryan budget guts funding for all of the investments that created and were responsible for the incredible national and individual success that our generation has enjoyed. It cuts everything from Head Start to health to essential air service, funding for basic research for health and technology—so many of the things that made us a great Nation. Now, after being the beneficiaries of what our generation before us did, we don't want to invest in the future of our children and their children.

It is time for a budget that acknowledges the real foundations of our prosperity, of our opportunities, and of our freedom here in this country. Let's put forth a budget that shows our gratitude for the next generation. Let's pay it forward. Let's be mindful of how many important things that leaders in the past did for us in laying this foundation. Where I come from there is a wonderful, old Biblical saying that says, ''For those to whom much is given, much is expected''—not less but more. Let's do for the next generation what the past generation did for us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LET'S DO FOR THE NEXT GENERATION WHAT THE LAST GENERATION DID FOR US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to chime in in agreement with the last thing that my colleague across the aisle said. He said let's do for the next generation what the last generation did for us.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is incredibly important. What a great thing my Democratic friend said, because every generation before ours has tried to live within its means.

□ 1500

This generation that is in power in this Congress is the first generation that continues to spend not only children's money, but grandchildren's and great-grandchildren's money.

We have accumulated such debt that our children are not only not going to rise up and call us blessed, they are going to rise up and swear at our names. Because this is the generation that has felt that it was so incredibly important that we needed to put our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren in hock just so we would not have to quit spending money so irresponsibly.

I could not agree more with that last statement. Let's do for the next generation what the last generation did for us. Thank goodness I have a friend on the other side saying that. He pointed out the verse of Scripture:

> To whom much is given, much is required.

We have been given much. We have been blessed more than any nation in the history of the world. We have got more freedoms than Solomon's Israel could have ever dreamed of and more individual assets than any nation in history could have dreamed of. We have been given much.

As a result, this generation has become so self-centered, so narcicisstic, so self-indulgent, so obese that we want to engorge ourselves at the expense of future generations.

Let me just say I haven't decided what I am going to do about the Ryan budget. I am still going through it. PAUL RYAN and I have had some very severe disagreements during my 9-plus years here, but I know this: he does not want to hurt future generations. He wants to do for the next generation what the last generation did for us.

And we will not—we cannot—do that if we are spending money so irresponsibly that generations to follow us will be paying the debts and the interest on those debts without getting a dime of the benefits that we engorged ourselves with in this generation. So it is time to be responsible.

I disagree with something my colleague said when he said, basically, the Ryan bill destroys Medicare as we know it. I don't know if I like what PAUL RYAN has been able to do about Medicare. I would have handled it differently. It is one of the things I am struggling with.

What he is trying to do is what Democrats should have done for 40 years before the Republicans took office. They had the majority before the 1994 election. They put us on a course to destroying Social Security. Since the sixties, after Medicare was passed, we have been on a course to bankrupt Medicare so our children and grandchildren will have nothing for themselves because we spent it all on ourselves.

So I don't know if it was the best way to do it, but I know what PAUL RYAN was trying to do. He is trying to make sure that we protect our seniors and we make sure that we can have future generations have some of the same protections. And from what I was reading, he is trying to do that. Some changes would come in Social Security, from what I am reading, but not for anybody 56 or older.

Anyway, I am still making up my mind on the bill, but I know what PAUL RYAN was trying to do. He was trying to do an honorable thing for future generations, just like my colleague said he felt we should be doing.

I also want to get to another topic today that has been so much on the minds and hearts of people all over the country this week as Killeen, Fort Hood, Texas, has had another mass shooting.

The first one was in the civilian sector in a cafeteria. That caused Texas to rise up and pass a concealed-carry permit law, which was driven by a woman whose parents were killed there. She had to put her gun in the glove compartment and couldn't take it in. She could have saved her parents had we had a concealed-carry permit law in place at the time of that mass shooting.

I have had people ask, as I know my friend from Georgia has: What have you guys in Congress done since the last shooting at Fort Hood to protect our soldiers? What has the Commander in Chief done to protect the military members under his command?

Under this Commander in Chief, we saw in Afghanistan that in half the time he had twice as many fatalities—even more than that in injuries—of our military members in Afghanistan. That is half the time of the Bush administration and about twice as many fatalities.

We have seen what happened there. But what about right here?

After the first Fort Hood shooting, it was an outrage—as it should be to every military member and everybody that understands anything about the military—when this Commander in Chief allowed the incident to be called workplace violence when, clearly, Nidal Hasan, according to all the witnesses, stood up, made the universal cry that a radical Islamist terrorist makes, claiming, in essence, that he is going to kill innocent people on behalf of a god who likes people like him to kill innocent people, just as they think there is a god that liked planes being flown into buildings to kill thousands of innocent men, women, and children. That is a god I don't know, and I know that is a god I will never meet.

But I want to talk at this time about what we should be doing for our soldiers.

I have got a bill that legislative counsel is working on right now. We will be filing it early next week. We anticipate calling it the Save Our Soldiers bill, or SOS. They have been crying ''SOS.'' It is just that nobody in their highest chain of command has listened.

Well, Congress is listening and we are going to get something done, if there are enough people down the hall in the Senate who worry about their election next November that they will actually take this bill up and do something to protect our soldiers, other than lip service. Lip service doesn't really protect you against an incoming round.

At this point, I would yield to my dear friend from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas.

There was a tragedy this week at Fort Hood, Texas. The folks in South Carolina once again stand with the people in Texas.

The President's former Chief of Staff, and now the mayor of Chicago, Rahm Emanuel, infamously said:

Never let a crisis go to waste.

That is what we are seeing going on today with HARRY REID looking to use the recent Fort Hood tragedy to pursue his agenda of control. HARRY REID said this week that the recent shooting should renew discussion about gun control, and then went on to talk about background checks and mental health issues.

Mr. Speaker, these comments have nothing to do with the facts at hand. However, HARRY REID wants to use this as a way to restrict Americans' Second Amendment rights. I don't agree with his motives, but I do agree with his suggestion that we need to revive a discussion on the Second Amendment. It should reawaken our discussions about Americans' constitutionally affirmed rights to keep and bear arms to defend ourselves, to defend our families, to defend our property, and, ultimately, to defend this great Nation.

With regard to our military, the gentleman from Texas and I had a conversation earlier. I fully understand that when you join the military, you give up some rights. You give up the right to speak unless you are spoken to or it is appropriate. You give up the right to assemble peacefully. You assemble when they tell you to on the parade ground, I have been told, but you don't have the right to assemble. You don't have a right to trial by jury. We set the jury of court-martial for the military. I get that.

Yet we trust these soldiers with both high-tech and low-tech weapon systems that they use to defend this great Nation, but then we turn around and create these gun-free zones on their bases, which have resulted in two incidents. Gun-free zones have resulted in two incidents at Fort Hood and the killing of unarmed and law-abiding citizens.

I will mention, as the gentleman from Texas did, that the President wants to call this an episode of workplace violence. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. Major Hasan was an Islamist jihadist intent on doing harm in the war against America that we see raging all over the world in places like Afghanistan and Iraq.

The folks that were wounded there and the soldiers that were killed at Fort Hood deserve the medals that they have earned, and it is time to call this for what it was. It was an episode of terrorism, and the original Fort Hood shooting incident requires, I believe, that those victims receive the medals. That is something I renew the call on.

I raised this issue about the travesty this week and the gun-free zones to my constituents via Twitter and Facebook. These are some of the things they had to say.

A lady named Carolyn Chandler says:

Our own soldiers, without guns, shot down on our own base in our own country. A ban on guns gives the criminals free targets. The criminals will have the guns. Criminals do not obey laws.

Steve Carey says:

The victims at Fort Hood are not dangerous. The politicians who have disarmed the soldiers at a military base are dangerous.

Ken Crowe says:

We don't need more gun laws; we need fewer gun-free zones.

I agree with him on that.

It is time for America to wake up. The only lawbreakers in Fort Hood, Texas, in both of these tragic events were the killers themselves who took a firearm into a gun-free zone.

I am reminded of an old adage that says, when seconds count, the police that can protect you in these gun-free zones are just minutes away.

When seconds count, the police are just minutes away. Think about that, America. It is time to let our soldiers and law-abiding Americans defend themselves and reaffirm our Second Amendment and constitutional rights in this country

I appreciate the gentleman bringing forth the SOS law. I look forward to cosponsoring that. Let's allow law-abiding Americans, soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to defend themselves. SOS sends a warning signal. It is an alarm. It is put on the beach when someone needs to be rescued. Well, guess what? The people in gun-free zones need to be rescued as well by having the ability to defend themselves.

So I thank the gentleman from Texas for giving me the time to talk about this important are issue. May God bless him, may God bless the Republic of Texas, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman from South Carolina has just made clear why I am such a big fan of his.

And, yes, I was in the Army. By naming the bill ''Save our Soldiers,'' I am not saying the Army is more important, because it is, generically speaking, inclusive of our soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard, and everybody that is in the uniformed military. That is who it pertains to.

□ 1515

But we wanted a title that people would remember and think of all of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, Coast Guard, people that are protecting us.

The greatest irony still comes back to this: we have military members who are qualified to fire tank weapons. We have got military members—I think the largest thing I fired in the Army was a 105 Howitzer. But we have a massive number of weapons, rocket-propelled grenades of different kinds, SAM missiles. We have got all kinds of things that our military are able to utilize.

We have got airmen who operate airplanes that drop thousands and thousands of pounds of bombs, and yet for too long political correctness has said, even though they may fire 105 Howitzers or some of the most modern weapons we have, tanks, drop thousands of pounds of bombs, we probably can't trust them to carry a little pistol. Yeah, they may be on a ship. They may fire rounds that are bigger than I am, but, gee, we might not better trust them with a pistol.

And what we have seen over and over in the tragedies here in the United States, the norm is for a criminal who wants to shoot and hurt and kill people to go to a gun-free area. That is why the shooter in the theater in Colorado could have gone to much closer theaters, but those theaters did not restrict the right to have weapons in them, so they probably would have had someone who could have pulled a gun very quickly and ended the rampage.

From the reports of what happened this week at Fort Hood, when the hero, female military member pulled her weapon, he took his own life rather than risk ending up in a wheelchair or worse. He wasn't going to take chances on firing at anyone else once someone had a weapon leveled on him.

We have lost enough lives in gun-free zones. It is time to allow the law-abiding, the qualified, to protect themselves, to save our military.

I hope that our leadership will allow the bill to be brought to the floor here because I know good and well, if we bring it to the floor here—I am open to amendments, suggestions—we get a bill like that passed here, then the pressure will be on the Senate.

Yes, I know Senator REID protects his Democratic Members all he can. If there is a bill that his Members would get defeated for voting against, then he just doesn't bring it to the floor for a vote. Protecting his Members from having to cast a vote for a bill that is a good bill or against a bill that would get them defeated because it was a good bill, he just keeps it from going to the floor. We have seen that in so many of the bills we have passed here from the House that would have an immediate helpful effect on our economy. It would have had an immediate helpful effect on our government.

For heaven's sake, I know the mainstream media will never get this right. Even our own Speaker didn't understand what happened that day, apparently. But last fall, our House of Representatives—a majority, at least—believed that ObamaCare was very detrimental to this Nation, to its economy, to people's health. So what did we do? We did what we believed, and we voted to completely defund ObamaCare. That is what we believed. That was the vote we did first.

But understanding that in Washington you have to have two Houses pass a bill, we passed a compromise measure that simply said, look, obviously ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. You have had going on 4 years to get ready, and it is not ready

for prime time, so we are offering you a gift, Democrats in the Senate and Democrats in the House. We are offering a gift. Our compromise is this: we passed the bill. It said let's suspend ObamaCare for a year. Clearly, it is not ready. Many people will be hurt.

That was an incredible gift of a compromise to the Senate Democrats and the House Democrats and even to the President himself. But our Democratic friends down the hall had bought in to the mainstream conventional wisdom that if the Democrats could cause a shutdown, the mainstream media would protect them by blaming Republicans, and then that would help them win the majority in the House in the next election. So HARRY REID refused to even bring that gift that Republicans in the House offered to the Senate Democrats, the President, and House Democrats. He wouldn't accept it.

I bet there are times that their Democrats in the House and Senate really wish they had accepted our offer of compromise and said: Okay. All right. We don't want to do it; but, okay, we will suspend ObamaCare for a year.

There were some in our party that felt like, gosh, if we suspend it for a year, who knows what will happen in a year from now. Maybe we are better off letting America find out how bad it is so then we can get it repealed outright. But we knew the suffering that would ensue once that bill fully kicked in, and how could we want people to suffer like we knew they would once ObamaCare kicked in?

But HARRY REID wouldn't bring that to the floor. I didn't think it was wise when they rejected a clear offer of compromise down the hall by refusing to even bring it to the floor for a vote. We funded everything HARRY REID wanted. We just had a 1-year suspension on ObamaCare.

So then we came back and said, okay, the President has unconstitutionally signed an executive order that put off the business mandate for a year, so we will offer what was an incredible compromise. We will agree to postpone the individual mandate in a legal manner—not unconstitutional, but a legal manner—and we will go ahead and put in writing that the business mandate would be suspended for a year, and that would protect the President's order.

HARRY REID wouldn't bring it to the floor for a vote. He knew good and well if he brought either one of our compromise bills to the floor that there would be Democrats that would either have to vote for the bill or, for sure, lose their Senate seat come November—Democrats in the Senate, that is. So he protected them and didn't allow that to come to the floor. And his Members seemed quite happy to just sit back and let HARRY REID try to protect them by not allowing them to vote.

Then, at 1:10 a.m. on October 1, when it was clear to us here in the House that HARRY REID was not going to even accept a gift of a 1-year suspension or the following compromise offered gift of a year suspension of the individual mandate and a year suspension of the business mandate, then we did what was almost unthinkable—bid against ourselves for the third time. We voted to approve conferees from the House. These are people who would have reached an agreement if the Senate had bothered to even appoint conferees or negotiators.

It was understood here, if HARRY REID will go ahead and appoint Senate conferees, they can start immediately, and before even anybody is required to be at work at 8 a.m., we could probably have a deal worked out, get it passed, and people would have never known there was a shutdown for 8 hours. But HARRY REID was so determined to follow through on what was the mainstream conventional wisdom: HARRY, if you can just cause a shutdown, the Republicans will be blamed—they didn't even know the Speaker would accept the blame because he didn't know what we did that day—but they will be assessed the blame by the mainstream media, and then you can get the majority back.

So he forced a shutdown. Actually, he tried to do that a few years ago, and our leadership and the Republican side capitulated at 10:30 the night that the shutdown was going to begin at 12 midnight. Probably, if the truth be known, the Democratic Leader, HARRY REID, may have hoped that he would have a shutdown at midnight that night because he consistently said: It is my way or nothing, my way or nothing, no compromise whatsoever. Of course, our leadership came back and said: Well, we actually cut $26 billion. And it turned out we did no such thing. But, anyway, we came so close to a shutdown that night.

But some of us still have enough faith in the American people that we believe a majority will ferret out the truth, come to the truth, regardless of what the mainstream media says, regardless of what anybody on television who gets a thrill up their leg when they see certain Democrats, no matter what they say, eventually the majority of the American people will eventually come to the truth and that will save our Nation.

So, clearly, there are areas in which we agree, as my Democrat friend indicated when he said let's do for the next generation what the last generation did for us. That is all I want to try to do. Let's give our children and grandchildren a nation where they have the freedoms that we have enjoyed, where they have the privacy that we used to enjoy, where they don't have $20 trillion of debt from the prior generation because the prior generation was so selfish, so self-centered that they didn't even care to clean up the waste, fraud, and abuse in the government.

I read an article that talked in terms of the massive amount of fraud just at the State Department. Here is an article, April 4, today, from The Fiscal Times, Brianna Ehley:

> The State Department has no idea what happened to $6 billion used to pay its contractors. In a special ''management alert'' made public Thursday, the State Department's inspector general, Steve Linick, warned ''significant financial risk and a lack of internal control at the Department has led to billions,'' that is with a b, ''billions of unaccounted dollars over the last six years.''

Mr. Speaker, by the way, that is while this President was in office.

The unaccountability is dramatic. Future generations will have to pay for the waste, fraud, and abuse that not only will we not clean up, but we borrowed money in our children and grandchildren's name to lavish on massive, wasteful, fraudulent government, abusive government, because we couldn't control ourselves.

□ 1530

There is going to be a price to pay for the irresponsibility of this government in the decades ahead. If we do not get this country turned around and back on a responsible track, then there will be books written about the rise and fall of the United States of America. And our generation will be blamed, and the line of my Democratic friend will be at the forefront in that book, that this generation refused to do for the next generation what was done for us.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped—that is why I am still here. That is why I have run again. I have hoped that we are going to get back on track, that we will be able to rein in the government, that at some point, HARRY REID will be willing to bring bills to the floor that we have sent down there passed by a majority here in the House that do things like get the economy going, that allow businesses to start hiring again without worry about just irresponsibility and overregulation.

We need to be providing privacy for Americans that began deteriorating in prior administrations before this but that this administration has taken to an all-time high with regard to individual privacy information taken away and held onto by the government.

People want to know, gee, well just what does the government have that would be invasive of our privacy? Well, for one thing, we now know the NSA has logs of every call that every American makes. That is outrageous. It is unnecessary. And we can't go into classified briefings. But, Mr. Speaker, I stand here to tell you that even though there are some in our intelligence that have said, gee, if we had not gathered every log of every phone call ever made, we may not have stopped a subway bombing, like we did. And from the evidence that we know from the public arena, it was clear—it sure seemed to me, as a former prosecutor and judge and chief justice—that there was plenty of evidence for an officer of the law—Federal, State, or local—to go before a judge and swear this information and get a warrant from the judge

and go after an individual that was about to try to set off a bomb. It looked like, to me, from just what is available in the public, that there was plenty of information that would have allowed a judge to sign a warrant. So not only are they getting every log of every phone call made, but we are not quite sure, even now, whether some are right to say, well, actually, they could pull the actual discussions of the conversation, or whether they couldn't.

But we also know that under ObamaCare, the Federal Government gets every record of everyone's most personal and private health insurance. And for so long in this body, I have heard my friends on this side of the aisle complain about, we don't want government in the bedroom. And then without a single Republican vote, they passed the ObamaCare bill that not only put the government in your bedroom, but it is in your bathroom, your kitchen, your living room, your garage. It is with your Realtor. It is just everywhere you can imagine. The government is there. That is with the health care law and the other bills that the Democrats have passed while they were in the majority.

So if it is not enough that the Federal Government—and, of course, we have to give credit to General Electric, because I understand they have got the contract to gather this information. So it is not just the government. It is cronies of this administration in private business that also have this information.

Anyway, the government has got your most private secrets, health carewise. They know everybody you are calling. There is information in the public press that says they can comb through every email you send.

And then we find out that one of the bills that the Democrat majority in the House and Senate passed was involving the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. That group has apparently decided that in order to protect us, they need to gather everybody's credit card, debit card information just so they can protect us.

So there we go. The Federal Government has got all of your medical information. They have got all of your credit card and debit card information, purchases, loans, all of those kinds of things. You have got regulators, Federal regulators going into banks, checking on your loans and things like that. I mean, is there anything left in the way of privacy that this Federal Government has not already co-opted and gotten access to without a warrant?

I mean, I was very serious, and the judges I knew were very serious about making sure there was probable cause because that is the constitutional requirement. You have to have probable cause before you get a warrant. And there were times when law officers would come to me in my judge's chambers or on the bench during a recess or at my home at 2 or 3 a.m., and I would read the affidavit and the officer would swear to the information. But if it wasn't adequate, I, along with other judges I know would say, I am sorry. Probable cause is not here. There are not enough facts provided to justify going after somebody's private property or private information. I can't sign the warrant. And there were times where officers would say, give us another chance, a little more time. We see your point. We will be back. And they would come back later, and then you go, okay, well, yes, this is probable cause. Certainly this raises probable cause. Sometimes they wouldn't be able to get it. But that was the constitutional standard by which law officers and courts are supposed to live.

And now, in the name of a little security, we have to stand there—I can't even count the number of times I have had to stand there with my arms open and be groped by Federal agents. Sometimes you can tell they have got a little bit of a grudge. And we giving that away because we want security.

Okay. We want health care, so let's let the government know every one of our most intimate private secrets in our health care records. And, you know, we want to make sure that some bank doesn't take advantage of us. Heaven forbid the investment banks take any more advantage of us. Man, the investments banks brought us to the brink of ruin.

And by the way, for those who don't know, Mr. Speaker, Wall Street executives and their spouses donate four-to-one for Democrats over Republicans. I know people think it is the Republicans that have all the rich people on their side. People are beginning to find out, it is middle class. And actually, poor people in America are coming to the conclusion, wait a minute. We have one party that keeps us dependent upon the government for the little crumbs it throws out. We have got another party over here that wants us to be president of the company, president of the country. They want us to have the best education possible. And they want us to be able to speak the language of this country that gets you to be president of the country, of the corporation, of the business, English. And gee, they want us to have a job. They don't want us to be beholden and having to beg the government all the time. They want us to be able to have independence and have our own money and make our own decisions. Gee, maybe, as a poor person, I would be better off supporting the Republican Party.

As I taught a combined sociology class at Texas College not that long ago—Texas College started as an African American college and is still prominently African American. But I am telling you, the African Americans in that class had some good ideas about how we straighten up welfare, how we get people more independent, how we get our government on track. Those are folks that had some good ideas. And some of the things that they proposed, like a work requirement, well, that was put on when Republicans took the majority back in January of '95. And then this President stripped that out—I would say unconstitutionally. He did it with an executive order. He changed a law that was duly passed and signed into law by Bill Clinton. And it ended up being one of his most proud accomplishments because what we saw after the requirement for work for welfare was, for the first time in 30 years, single moms' incomes, when adjusted for inflation, started going up. It had been flatlined for about 30 years, since aid to dependent children had started, since welfare had started, single moms' incomes, adjusted for inflation, had been flatlined for about 30 years.

And once the Gingrich-led Republican revolution took hold and a work requirement was put on for the first time in 30 years, single moms had more take-home money. They had more freedom. They had more autonomy away from the government, where they didn't have to be dependent on the government. They could make their own decisions without some law being passed by Congress to send them another crumb. It gave them money, more than they had ever had, and it gave them independence.

That is what the people I know want for women, for African Americans, for everyone in America, for Hispanic Americans, for anyone, Asian Americans. It is what we want for Americans.

One of the things that meant so much to me on 9/12/2001, as we stood out there, hundreds—maybe thousands of people in our town of Tyler—and I know it was going on in Longview. And actually, all over east Texas it was going on. People came out to the town square, and they prayed together. And no court would have had the nerve to tell America on 9/12, you have no right to pray in public. They wouldn't have had the right to say that on 9/12/2001. So we were praying together as citizens out there.

We sang hymns. We sang ''Amazing Grace'' and ''God Bless America.'' What is ''God Bless America''? It is a prayer asking for God's blessing to continue on this country. We held hands as we sang ''God Bless America.'' People by the millions did this all over America on 9/12/2001.

And as I looked around among all of those people, my American friends, there was not a hyphenated American in the group. We had all national religions, races, genders. I mean, we had all kinds of groups represented, but we were Americans. There were no Euro Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, Irish Americans, Hispanic Americans. There were Americans. And we stood together. We prayed together. We sang together. And there was no mess out there. We were together, one people.

As that great speech given by Senator Barack Obama pointed out, there shouldn't be a red America and a blue America; a white America and a black

America. There ought to be one America. But we have gotten into the politics of division. That is why the Senate refused to take up our repeated efforts at compromise to avoid shutting down the government.

The politics of division, that is why the World War II memorial was barricaded and massive man- and woman-hours were utilized to try to keep veterans out of the Iwo Jima Memorial for Marines, the World War II Memorial. I couldn't believe they had the nerve to put up a barrier to the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial.

And I, along with my friend from Mississippi, opened up the streets, opened up the barriers there at the World War II Memorial. I clipped the yellow ribbon, the crime scene tape. I moved one barricade. He moved the other. The World War II vets came in.

□ 1545

STEVE KING, a few others, and I went out to the marine memorial, and we opened up that memorial. We checked out their other days and made sure that that was accessible. One day, it turned out there was a bus of World War II veterans that had come out there. There was a big, plastic barricade shaped like the concrete barricades. This was plastic, and it was filled with water, a wooden barricade there. And that bus of World War II veterans—many of them that had fought in the Philippines, that had been to the top of the mountain and seen that flag be planted up there—their bus ran over that barricade.

I was so proud of them. I ran up there, and I got up there, they were already out there enjoying the memorial. These people that saw that flag that was planted there now were enjoying the memorial to them.

When we came back by, we were going to stop at the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. They had barricades up all up there. And I was so proud that there were a slew of Americans. Most were African Americans. I was so proud of them. They didn't let the barricades stop them. They climbed right over and went in to that wonderful memorial. And I didn't even have to stop to open that up. They had already taken care it.

That is the politics of division: try to make people suffer and blame it on the other party. We need to be back to being Americans, not hyphenated, not Republican Americans, Democrat Americans, Tea Party Americans. For Heaven's sake, the Tea Party, all it means and all it is is a group who have been Taxed Enough Already. They are tired of the waste, fraud, and abuse in government. They want a responsible government so that we can do, as my Democratic friend said just a while ago that he wanted for us to do, for the next generation what the last generation did for us. That is all the Tea Party wants. They are not racist. They got all races in the meetings I go to. They just want us to be responsible and do for the next generation what the last one did for us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will be able to bring Save Our Soldiers to the floor. I know back 3 years ago, when I was concerned that our military was going to be used as a pawn to try to get people to vote for a bad continuing resolution under the threat that, gee, if you don't vote for this bad continuing resolution, our military members won't be paid, so shame on you. Well, I was furious that our military members had to even have it cross their minds that they might not get paid. So I filed a bill that would ensure that if there were a government shutdown that our military members' pay would be treated like Social Security is. I know there is a lot of fear mongering about that. But if there is a shutdown, the law is and continues to be and was 3 years ago, that it is basically on automatic pilot. If there is a shutdown, then the Social Security checks continue to go out. If someone is entitled to more Social Security during the shutdown, they don't get the increase until after the shutdown is over, and then they would get it. But that is what the bill would do for the military.

I am grateful—even though our Speaker did not let that bill come to the floor, I was grateful that so many millions of Americans came on to some Web site set up for that purpose to say put our military pay on automatic pilot just like Social Security is so if there is a shutdown, people that have their lives in harm's way don't have to worry about their loved ones getting paid.

Even last fall, we saw military members whose families—when they were dying in harm's way for us, this administration wasn't even going to let them get paid. It was really outrageous. We even passed a bill last fall to make sure that finally the military wouldn't have to worry about it, and the Defense Department and this administration interpreted it in such a way to inflict as much harm on survivors of our military heroes as this administration could. It was wrong. But they did it. It is the politics of division.

It is going to be important, Mr. Speaker, that we let people know who the real heroes are for this country. Heroes would include those who are willing to lay down their lives for others.

John 15:13:

> Greater love knows no man than this, that a man lays down his life for his friends.

That includes generically men and women, anyone willing to lay down their lives, not to kill innocent people, but to save lives. That is what we have always attributed as a hero here in America. And yet we find out—I didn't know until I read an article by my friend, Andy McCarthy, about this on the President's Web site, but whitehouse.gov regularly profiles young, left-wing radicals that it calls ''Champions of Change.''

I am quoting from the article of Andrew McCarthy. It is dated today:

> Now, in a space of just a few days, two of the President's champions have made news.
>
> One is Linda Sarsour, described by the White House as a ''community activist'' who specializes in ''community organizing'' and ''immigrants' rights advocacy,'' and who ''conducts training nationally on the importance of civic engagement in the Arab and Muslim American community.'' Evidently, civic engagement need not be civil engagement. Ms. Sarsour has joined her voice to that of CAIR.

CAIR is the Council on American-Islamic Relations that two Federal courts have declared is a front organization for the Muslim Brotherhood, which has appropriately been declared as a terrorist organization by Egypt, and others are looking at doing the same, including even Great Britain. But not here. No. We take our lead from whatever CAIR says in this administration.

But this so-called Champion of Change, according to the White House Web site, has reacted to the widely viewed acclaimed film ''Honor Diaries,'' a film about the brutalization and systematic inequality faced by women in Muslim majority society. And this is what Ms. Sarsour had said:

> How many times do we have to tell white women that we do not need to be saved by them? Is there code language I need to use to get through?

As Mr. MCCARTHY notes, he said:

> I would note that the executive producer of ''Honor Diaries'' is the heroic Somali human rights activist Ayaan Hirsi Ali. It features several courageous Muslim women, including Pakistani-born Qanta Ahmed, a medical doctor who has an important column about the film and the campaign to suppress it at NRO today.

He also points to Bonnie Youn as a Champion of Change as so named by the White House. And Matt Boyle with Breitbart has a column that says:

> An amnesty advocate that President Obama's White House publicly promoted as part of its Champion of Change series has been indicted in Federal Court on charges of fraud.

And it goes on down. Part of it reads:

> The second indictment count alleges that Youn violated a Federal immigration law that prohibits bringing illegal aliens into the United States and harboring them, alleging she did so ''for the purpose of commercial advantage and private financial gain.''

So, apparently, a Champion of Change is someone who there is probable cause to believe is engaged in human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, this country has to reawaken. If we are going to do for the next generation what the last generation did for us, we have got to stop the indebtedness that is growing every second of every day. And we keep adding to the debt and the interest that mounts on top of that. We have got to get more responsible in protecting privacy and not allowing this administration to further go into people's bedrooms, bathrooms, credit card records, phone calls, and emails. We have got to stop the insanity, or not only will the

next generation rise up and not call us blessed, they will curse our names.

I am here because I have hope. We are going to turn things around. We have just got to keep fighting. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REGULAR ORDER IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

We are constantly confronted with agendas and issues, some of which are good for the country, and some of which are bad for the country. That is why we debate here in this Congress.

I would like to think that anything that passes off the floor of the House of Representatives enjoys the full support of at least a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. I would like to think that is also the case with the Senate. I would like to think that when we disagree, we come together in conference and we produce a conference report that can achieve and enjoy the majority support of the House and the Senate of the conference report and go on its way to the President's desk, where it is either signed into law or vetoed and sent back to the Chamber of origin, as the Constitution directs.

There are also tactics and maneuvers that go on in this Congress, and this more than two centuries of the structure of this great deliberative body has developed a system within our committee process to define jurisdiction committee by committee. More committees have been created over the years, some committees have been abolished over the years, but it is designed to function so that this constitutional Republic—which is guaranteed in our Constitution, by the way—brings the best judgment of the people in America through their elected representatives.

There are 435 House districts and 100 Senators from the 50 States. The good ideas that come from our neighborhoods need to go into the eyes and ears of their Member of Congress, and we need to bring it here and bring those best ideas forward and compete. Put those ideas together in a competitive fashion so that as we sit down and first we draft a bill, that bill gets assigned to the committee of jurisdiction where the people have accumulated expertise on the topic are seated. There will be hearings for them to get better informed about the bill in question itself, and then in the subcommittee, a markup of the base bill that allows every member of the subcommittee to offer an amendment, any series of amendments, that are germane to the topic and the subject of the bill, which is assigned to the committee because of the jurisdiction of the committee, and then that subcommittee acts, in which case then the bill goes to the full committee for a similar process to the broader committee.

If it comes out of that committee improved in theory—and actually improved in practice most of the time—then that bill goes on the calendar here on the floor, where in which case it is subjected to the amendments that might come from all of the other Members, the Members that are on the committee of jurisdiction and the Members who are not on the committee of jurisdiction.

When this Congress is set up to function accurately, when we are defending, protecting, and respecting the jurisdiction of the various committees, we get the best product because we have the people on the committees that have—at least in theory—the most knowledge about the topic that comes before the committee. Some have years and years of expertise accumulated, some not quite as long, but they might bring that interest from their private life into the committee, as well.

I get very concerned when I see a bill come to the floor that didn't go through the committee process, that didn't have a legitimate hearing process, that didn't go through subcommittee or the full committee and comes to this floor because someone decided that it was so urgent that we act on a subject that we didn't have time to go through regular order.

□ 1600

That concerns me a lot. I get concerned when there is an expectation that we will have a full debate here on the floor on a bill, and it is brought to the floor and voice-voted on a weekend, going into a weekend, without the knowledge of most of the Members of Congress. I get concerned about regular order.

I have had my conversations with our leadership regarding that. I am not yet satisfied that this is the last time. However, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to address a different kind of regular order, a kind of regular order that is this: if we have committees that are not committees of jurisdiction of a subject or a topic and that subject or topic outside their jurisdiction is slipped into a must-pass piece of legislation from another committee, now they have usurped the jurisdiction of the committee that actually has that jurisdiction, and they have placed a topic into a subject matter that must pass, and the people who have allowed that to happen on their watch, at least in theory, don't possess the expertise that exists within the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, all of this gibberish that I am talking about now, this technical explanation of what goes on here in this Congress boils down to this, Mr. Speaker—and I want to speak specifically to this issue. There is a bill that is floating around this Congress that is referred to as the ENLIST Act.

I can't read for you the name of this bill because it is about as accurate as the Affordable Care Act is to naming ObamaCare; but it is one that grants amnesty to people who come into the United States—are unlawfully present in the United States.

Many of them committed the crime of unlawful entry. A good number of others may have overstayed a visa or come into America on a visa waiver program. In any case, they are unlawfully present in America. They might sign up for the military. If they do that, they are defrauding the Department of Defense.

We don't recruit people into our military who are unlawfully present in the United States. They have to have a green card, at a minimum; citizenship, better.

Now, one might presume that we are having trouble recruiting people to come into the military, so therefore, we should bring in mercenaries from outside the United States and take the oath to uphold, preserve, protect, and defend our Constitution and go out and defend the liberty of Americans.

That actually happens, but when it happens, it is a violation of the law. If they take that oath of office, illegal aliens into our military have to misrepresent themselves in order to be accepted into the military, so that is fraud. It might well be document fraud.

This bill called the ENLIST Act would reward them for doing so, for defrauding the Department of Defense and, yes, putting on the uniform and, at least in theory, defending America. They take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. They salute our flag.

They may mean it; they may not mean it. But we know the very act of entering the military was a dishonest act on their part. So why would we accept their oath to have more value—the oath to defend the Constitution, to have more value than their word that they gave when they misrepresented themselves to join the military?

In any case, this ENLIST Act bill rewards people who broke our immigration law by putting them on a path to citizenship, giving them a green card. The only qualifications you need is you are unlawfully in the United States, you enter into the military, you misrepresent yourself to do that because we are not taking them into the military if they are unlawfully present.

Then they have to assert they were in the United States continuously since before December 31, 2011, which happens to be the date that is in the Gang of Eight's bill, and they have to assert that they were brought into this country or came into this country by the time they were 15 years old—they might be in their 30s when they sign up

for the military, who knows—but those have to be the assertions.

Then if they are in the military at the time, then they have to be either honorably discharged or on the path to honorable discharge, and they will then have a path to citizenship.

I think this is a misguided bill. I think it is misguided to think that we need to reward people for breaking the law. It is misguided to believe that Americans will not sign up for our military. We are shrinking our military. We are not expanding our military.

We have high-quality Americans who are lining up to join in all of our branches of service. Yes, I am sure there are recruiters who would like to do a little more, but this is not an expanding Department of Defense budget; this is a shrinking Department of Defense budget. It is not an expanding military; it is a shrinking military.

But that, Mr. Speaker, isn't so much the point as it is what is right and what is wrong, what is justice and what is equity and what is not.

I understand there are people who have sympathy, and they say: this pulls on my heart strings; I think, if they are willing to defend America, I think we ought to give them a path to citizenship.

I understand that, but do the advocates for this ENLIST Act, do they understand that it is a reward for lawbreakers?

They are not just someone who came across the border illegally or someone who overstayed their visa. They are the ones who misrepresented themselves to get into the United States military; we would then trust them with perhaps military secrets and the security of Americans and American installations around the world?

It is not that I don't trust them. I just don't believe that we should be rewarding people who have already proven they have broken the law. If they take the oath to the Constitution and if they are not on a path to citizenship already, if they are unlawfully present in the United States, then they violated the law already, and we are supposed to accept their word for it. I think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

I look at some of the press that has come out on this, the tactic and the effort that seems to be that they think they can slip a provision into the NDA bill, the National Defense Authorization bill, a provision in there that would legalize people who illegally entered into the United States military and reward them with a path to citizenship for their trouble?

There are many countries in the world where you are a lot better off in the United States Marine Corps than you would be, say, on the streets of many cities in the countries of the world. That is true.

So this would put out the advertisement, this bill, this ENLIST—badly named ENLIST Act would put out the advertisement, which is sneak into America, sneak into the military, and that is going to be the most expeditious path to American citizenship and the whole smorgasbord of benefits that comes from American citizenship.

Citizenship must be precious, not handed out like candy in a parade. We don't ride along and throw out citizenship like you do M&Ms or Tootsie Rolls or whatever it is that we are tossing out in our parades.

Citizenship must be precious. The rule of law is precious. It is the center core argument on the immigration issue, the rule of law.

We can't grant amnesty to people because our hearts tell us we have sympathy for individuals. I have sympathy for individuals. In fact, if I am ever declared a liberal, it is because of how I deal with some people individually, because I see something in their eyes and hear something in their voice and see how they carry themselves.

I see something in how they conduct themselves and what they do that convinces me that this is a good person, and I want to invest in them, whether it is my capital, my time, my trust, or recommendations that others do the same. I actually do that on occasion because I have faith in an individual.

But when you set policy—policy for the United States of America because your heart tells you to have sympathy for some people you know, keep in mind there are thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of people that are impacted by that decision, and you have to say: I trust every one of those people the same way I trust the individual or the individuals that I know that bring the sympathy from my heart.

We aren't charged with having sympathy here in setting foreign policy or setting our national policy because of the sympathies of our heart. We are charged with providing justice and equity, and that is laid out in the Constitution.

To me, it is a clear charge; so when I take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend this Constitution, I mean it. It is the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, and it is the foundation for the rest of the laws.

Congress passed a law that says we are not going to bring people into our military that are unlawfully present in the United States, and when I hear from let's say other Members, in particular an individual Member that says STEVE KING is dead wrong on this issue, Mr. Speaker, I take issue with that.

I am right with the rule of law. I am right with current law. The policy is right because, otherwise, you fill our military up with people who may and likely do and some certainly will have foreign interests.

It is not to the interest of the United States to replace on our ranks, our troops, people who are American citizens or people who are on a path to citizenship, replace them with people who came into the United States illegally.

How poor would we be as a people? How empty our soul as a people if we say: Well, that is another job that Americans won't do? They don't want to put on a uniform and go defend our country, so we will have to reward illegal immigrants, if they will just lie to us, we will let them in the military, and we will give them a path to citizenship.

That is what the ENLIST bill does. It does damage to the rule of law. It is misguided, however good the hearts are of the people who advocate for this.

I think this is an important debate, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't belong on the defense authorization bill. This debate doesn't belong in the Defense Committee, the Armed Services Committee. This debate belongs, if it is going to take place at all, in the committee of jurisdiction, the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, where it ought to have—if it deserves any debate at all, it ought to have witnesses who agree with people like me.

I have seen these hearings come out before, even in our Judiciary Committee, where someone gets the idea that we ought to grant a path to citizenship to several million people who are unlawfully here, and I have seen the committee, even there where there were four witnesses, no questions, another round of four witnesses, now the chairs and the ranking members get to ask questions, 90 minutes after the beginning of the hearing, the first voice of dissent might be heard.

That is not a very good committee, in my opinion; but at least it was in the committee of jurisdiction. I would like to expect that the subcommittee chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee would defend the jurisdiction of his committee and reject the idea that they sneak this bill into the defense authorization bill.

I would like to see that the chairman of the full committee defend the jurisdiction of the committee, as he did so effectively last year, and deny this end round that they are attempting to run this poorly named ENLIST Act around an end run of the Judiciary Committee and to slip it into a must-pass piece of legislation that would come to the floor here under the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our country will be stronger. The security of the country will be at least as strong. The heart of our country will be just as strong. We can still have sympathy for people without turning them all into Americans, and our defense will be stronger because we will have more American citizens step up and actually qualify to get into the service.

Just think, across this country, you go to work, whether you punch a timeclock, whether you are on salary or whatever it might be, you walk into that workplace, and you are there, and let's just presume you are on a production line making an American car.

Let's call it a ''Hord.'' On your right hand is someone working who is unlawfully present in the United States and can't work legally in the United States. On your left hand, there is somebody who fits that same category.

Do the workers standing there realize that there are two good, well-paying jobs that Americans aren't doing, not because they won't, but someone else who is unlawfully in the United States has stepped into their stead and taken that good-paying job, that job that actually pays taxes and contributes to the benefits of people who aren't working?

So if you look on your right and you look on your left and you see somebody working who is unlawfully present, and you say, I like him, I enjoy working with him, he is efficient, probably that is true.

But what is it doing to America? What is it doing to the soul of America? And what is it doing to the rule of law to reward people who break the law while this Congress borrows money every year, 42 cents or so off of every dollar we spend from places like China, Saudi Arabia?

And with the bonds that are out there, about half of our debt to the American people that so far are willing to reinvest in the debt we have, what does that do to America when we are borrowing money to fund the more than 80 different Federal welfare programs that are there?

We have a population of some 316 million Americans. 101.4 million of those 316 million are of working age and simply not in the workforce, and some of the biggest reasons are right there in the list of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs.

So what should we do in this Congress, Mr Speaker? We should have policies that increase the average individual annual productivity of our people. Each one of us should get out of bed and go forward to contribute to the gross domestic product that day.

□ 1615

That means we come in an hour or 8 hours or 24 hours, if you can. You are contributing to the GDP. That will increase your income. You can pay your share of the taxes. When you make that contribution, you are helping pull the load.

If you are sitting, though, and you are one of those people that has taken this safety net that we offer that I support and turned it into a hammock for yourself and you are riding here when you should be contributing off of somebody else's labor, it is wrong.

We need more Americans going to work. We need a higher percentage of Americans working. There is no work that Americans won't do, including putting on a uniform, going into basic training, being trained up in AIT or wherever you might be assigned to go and step up and defend our country. It has been done with honor. It has been done with dignity. It has been done gloriously by Americans since before there was an America, and it needs to be so for the duration of this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, furthermore, the idea that there are jobs that Americans won't do, I looked at this and I thought: what would be the toughest, dirtiest, nastiest, most dangerous job that Americans are ever asked to do? When I think of this, I think, I bet I know somebody that is an authority on that, and that would be one of the gentlemen in my Conference from Colorado that served in the Marine Corps. The toughest, dirtiest, nastiest, most dangerous job we ask Americans to do is how about rooting terrorists out of a place like Fallujah. What does that pay? How do we get Americans to do that if we can't get Americans to cut meat or pick tomatoes or whatever it might be? How do we get them to do that?

I went back and ran the numbers on that. So a marine in the streets of Fallujah in the line of fire, if you figure him at a 40-hour week, instead of about a 70- or 80- or 90-hour week or more, at a 40-hour week, they were getting paid right at about $8.09 an hour. If a marine will go into the line of fire for God and country for $8.09 an hour—and God bless him—I bet we can find some Americans for $20 an hour to go out there and cut meat and $20 an hour that might go out and pick lettuce, as the Senator from Arizona used to talk about during his Presidential campaign.

So here is my point, Mr. Speaker. I think this Enlist Act is misguided. I think the press that has spilled out on this has illuminated a deft maneuver to try to circumvent the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I reject that. I am here defending the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I think that those who have a heart that tells them, ''I want to pass some legislation because I have sympathy for individuals that I know who will make good Americans,'' I understand that. I have some sympathy for individuals I know that will make good Americans, too, but I am not about—I am not about to usurp and undermine the rule of law, because I didn't run for office telling my constituents my heart is going to overrule my head, my heart is going to overrule human experience and human history and the rule of law and the Constitution. We should know better. We are here to be analytical, to lead and not let the emotions drive us.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I remember a display at the National Archives as I was waiting some years ago to be able to walk up there where the Declaration of Independence is on display. There I see they had the display of the Greeks who had demagogues in their communities. They had the pure democracy. They found out that there were demagogues that could get the masses all ginned up and they would storm off in a direction that was bad for the city-state of Greece. They couldn't control the overheated rhetoric of the very effective and persuasive demagogues, so they had a system to blackball them. If three of the members of the city-state—men of voting age in those days—dropped a black ball into the pottery that was the voting one and discarded a white one in the nonvoting one, then they would banish that demagogue from the city-state for 7 years. But that was emotionalism.

Our Founding Fathers understood we didn't want to form a democracy here. We created a constitutional Republic. It is guaranteed in our Constitution. And it has done so because it charges each of us to have a cool head. And I owe my constituents, as everyone here does, my best effort and my best judgment. That includes listening to my constituents, all of them. But it includes also, step back, take a look at it from 10,000 feet; analyze the policy; understand my oath to the Constitution and the supreme law of the land; and act accordingly for the long-term best interest of the United States of America.

This Enlist Act is not in the long-term best interest of the United States of America. It is not in the best interest of America that we circumvent the jurisdiction of the committees. That is not either in the best interest of America. What is in the best interest is we preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and the rule of law and recognize that this immigration debate is driven by emotion on their side. The open borders, amnesty people are driven by emotion, and there are others that stand here and say: We are going to protect the rule of law.

So here is what I would submit, Mr. Speaker. If they are successful in passing a Gang of 8's bill in this House or bringing it to the floor and trying to get it passed, if they are successful in eroding the rule of law with regard to the Enlist Act, if they are successful in getting passed what they call the DREAM Act, that also erodes the rule of law. Anything that rewards people for breaking the law is a continuation of the Amnesty Act that was signed by Ronald Reagan in 1986. We are debating the results of the signature on that bill today.

It was passed this way. It said we are going do legalize a million people who are here illegally because we don't know what to do, and then the promise is we are going to enforce the law hereafter and there will never be another amnesty so long as anyone shall live. That was the promise of the '86 Amnesty Act, and Reagan was honest about it.

So we live with that, but they are pushing on the other side. We never got the enforcement. The 1 million became 3 million plus. The enforcement didn't come, but the implied promise of amnesty exists, and that is what they are pushing on.

If any amnesty is passed now, that perpetuates the promise that there will be another amnesty, which turns up the current end of the huge electromagnet that draws people to come into

America, the promise that they will receive citizenship, a path to citizenship, some kind of amnesty.

We have to restore the rule of law, the respect for the rule of law. If there is a provision that is an amnesty provision that passes, then that promise exists in perpetuity that there will be another one, which means we will not be able to restore the rule of law in this country—at least with regard to immigration—again. I don't know that I can say ''ever,'' but I can say never again would we see the rule of law with regard to immigration within the duration of this Republic, not as long as I shall live or as long as we shall live, not until death do us part. But until the death of this Republic, we will not be able to restore the rule of law, at least with regard to immigration. And the argument goes to the next and the next and the next, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a critically important issue. I am happy to debate this with the colleagues from my Conference in any State where they would like to take this up, be it California, be it Colorado, be it anyplace else around the country.

This debate is one that is important. We need more American people that are aware that our hearts cannot overrule our heads. We cannot allow the rule of law to be torn asunder because we have sympathy for certain people.

Let's have sympathy for Americans first. Let's understand that America can be defended by Americans, and if people want to come and join and defend and help protect America, go get in line the right way. Because the advocates for this kind of legislation will tell you, well, they go to the back of the line. Except this bill isn't the back of the line. It is we create a new line and you are in the front of it. They are not going to allow them to go to the back of the line. They don't really believe it. They will just tell you that.

They will say there is work Americans won't do. Defending America, then how is it that marines will step in the line of fire for $8.09 an hour? How is it that we have Americans working in every single job and profession that is listed in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Web site?

Americans are doing every work there is to do in this country. They just need to be paid what the work is worth. The wages are being suppressed by elitists who are making millions of dollars off of the cheap labor that is subsidized by the taxpayers who are backfilling and funding these households with the 80 different means tests and welfare programs, and we are borrowing the money from China to do it. So let's have that discussion.

Tell me how we get this budget back to balance. How do you do that while you are rewarding people for not working and you are rewarding people for breaking the law? What kind of country do you want?

I think the advocates for this bill that I so oppose actually want the same kind of country that I want. I just don't think that they see what they are doing to erode the progress that we need to be making.

I think that when they declare that I am dead wrong, the real result is, if they get their way, there will be more Americans that eventually are actually dead, because there is not a day that goes by in this country that there isn't at least one American citizen that dies at the hands of someone who is unlawfully present in the United States. Whether it is an act of homicide, whether it is an act of willful manslaughter, whether it is an OWI on the streets of America, hardly anybody has gone through the last 10 years and doesn't at least see that show up in their local newspaper, if it doesn't show up in their neighborhood.

So STEVE KING is not dead wrong. Let's keep more Americans alive. If I need to go to those States and have those debates, that is what I will do. But I call upon our committee chairs especially to defend the jurisdiction of our committee. If you are chairing a subcommittee or a committee in the United States House of Representatives that happens to be the Judiciary Committee, the rule of law and the Constitution are essential. I also expect and call upon those who have that special charge to renew their vigorous defense of the rule of law, the jurisdiction of the committee, and the supreme law of the land, the Constitution.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on April 3, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 4152. To provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 7, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Farm Storage Facility Loan Program, Security Requirements (RIN: 0560-AI19) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5210. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Jackfruit, Pineapple, and Starfruit from Malaysia Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0019] (RIN: 0579-AD46) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5211. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Revisions in the WIC Food Packages [FNS-2006-0037] (RIN: 0584-AD77) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5212. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program [Docket ID: ED-2013-OPE-0066] (RIN: 1840-AD13) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5213. A letter from the General Counsel, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting the Foundation's final rule — Public Access to NEH Records Under the Freedom of Information Act (RIN: 3136-AA32) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5214. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Bicycling [NPS-LAMR-15022; PPIMLAMRS0,PPMPSPD1Z.YM0000] (RIN: 1024-AE12) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5215. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wyoming Regulatory Program [Stats No.: WY-044-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2013-0001; S1D1SSS08011000SX066A00067F144S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A00033F14XS501520] received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5216. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-16] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5217. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Per Capita Distributions of Funds Held in Trust by the Secretary of the Interior [Notice 2014-17] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1192. A bill to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as ''Mount Jessie Benton Fremont'' (Rept. 113–401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3366. A bill to

provide for the release of the property interests retained by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon, with an amendment (Rept. 113–402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. H. Con. Res. 96. A resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 (Rept. 11–403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4398. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility with respect to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4399. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the performance appraisal system for senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4400. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 4401. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the immediate designation of substitute representative payees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a surface danger zone over the Guam National Wildlife Refuge or any portion thereof to support the operation of a live-fire training range complex; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 4403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10-percent penalty on qualified natural disaster distributions from qualified retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 4404. A bill to direct the Attorney General to acquire data, for each calendar year, about sexual offenses, including rape, that occur aboard aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4405. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession of a firearm by a person who is adjudicated to have committed a violent juvenile act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4406. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to impose restrictions on the risk corridor program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 4407. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set reasonable limits on the stringency and timing of proposed regulations for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, new forced-air furnaces, and new residential masonry heaters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4408. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a task force on Agent Orange exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 4409. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in an effort to bring justice and equality to Americans in Mississippi during Freedom Summer; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 4410. A bill to improve the national defense laboratories by increasing retention and hiring flexibility to enable the laboratories to perform breakthrough scientific research and effectively fulfill the needs of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO):

H. Res. 543. A resolution affirming the support of the United States for Macedonia's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4398.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4399.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4400.

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. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4401.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4402.

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

Article I. Section 8.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4403.

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

Article I Sec. 8 regarding Congressional authority to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4404.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4405.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4406.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4407.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4408.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 4409.

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

Article I Section 8

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 4410.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 10: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 20: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 29: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 118: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 148: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 292: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 460: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 482: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 494: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 521: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 778: Mr. POSEY and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 916: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 929: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 942: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 956: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 988: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1015: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1180: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1188: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 1192: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1199: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1201: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1209: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1318: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1340: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1343: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1351: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1507: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1563: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1750: Mr. PETRI and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1812: Mr. RUSH, Mr. COBLE, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1821: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1827: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1851: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1852: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1941: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1998: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2041: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2093: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2160: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2203: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2309: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2329: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2364: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2377: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 2426: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2452: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2499: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2504: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2527: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2548: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2553: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2663: Mr. OLSON and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2672: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2707: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2746: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2750: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2803: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2807: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2870: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2918: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2932: Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2939: Mr. POCAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 2955: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2959: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 2971: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2972: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2996: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3077: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3086: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3112: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3121: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3135: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 3199: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3211: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3367: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3384: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3395: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3471: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3482: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3489: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3494: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3508: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3530: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3580: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3601: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 3602: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3604: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3673: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 3708: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3712: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BARR, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 3723: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3726: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3728: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3740: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3854: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3969: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 3992: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4006: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 4007: Mr. PERRY and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4012: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4013: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4031: Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4035: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4056: Mr. VELA and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 4060: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4119: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 4129: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4136: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4190: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4200: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4217: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 4225: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4232: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4237: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4241: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4277: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4286: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4306: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4310: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4320: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 4321: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 4323: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4344: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4348: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4349: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4352: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4365: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4366: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4370: Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4384: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4387: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.J. Res. 34: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.J. Res. 113: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MCALLISTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 417: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H. Res. 476: Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 494: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 525: Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 526: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WELCH.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Ms. DELAURO on the bill (H.R. 377): Katherine M. Clark.

Petition 9 by Mr. GARCIA on the bill (H.R. 15): Rosa L. DeLauro, David Scott, William L. Enyart, Bennie G. Thompson, John Conyers Jr., Allyson Y. Schwartz, Eliot L. Engel, Brad Sherman, Suzan K. DelBene, Donald M. Payne Jr., Carolyn McCarthy, Theodore E. Deutch, John B. Larson, Henry A. Waxman, Emanuel Cleaver, G.K. Butterfield, André Carson, William R. Keating, Terri A. Sewell, and Tim Ryan.

The following Member's name was deleted from the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. DELAURO on H.R. 377: Edward J. Markey.