



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2012

No. 17

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 2, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. NEAL. I rise today to speak about the New Markets Tax Credit program and the positive impact it has had on western Massachusetts.

I've been a leader of New Markets since its enactment in 2000 because it's a cost-effective way to create jobs and drive investment in low-income communities. Today, I want to highlight a few New Market Tax Credit initiatives in my State.

New Markets Tax Credit is designed to stimulate investment and economic

growth in areas that are traditionally overlooked by conventional capital markets. This program attracts capital to low-income communities by providing private investors with a 39 percent Federal tax credit for investments made in businesses or economic developments located in those areas.

In 2010, New Markets generated \$9.5 billion in capital for projects and businesses in low-income communities. This capital resulted in the development of 15 million square feet of manufacturing, retail, and community-related space throughout the country.

Last year, New Markets Tax Credits investments resulted in the creation or retention of 70,000 jobs, including 38,000 construction jobs.

Unfortunately, New Markets is a temporary program that expired on December 31. I am now and have been the lead Democratic sponsor of this legislation to extend the program for a predictable 5 years. I've now been calling on our colleagues to extend this initiative. So let me share with you a few successes from back home and explain why I think New Markets works so well.

Hot Mama's Foods in Springfield, Massachusetts, my hometown—it's a great success story. The company was created in the 1980s, and they manufacture and package fresh and frozen gourmet salsa and other spreads that are all natural and, indeed, organic. Hot Mama's was originally located in Northampton, but thanks to New Markets, they were able to purchase a larger USDA-certified food production facility on Avocado Street in Springfield. It has added 10 new jobs and retained 50 jobs in the current workforce.

Another success story is the River Valley Market in Northampton, Massachusetts, which moved into a former granite quarry. No one wanted this space because it was prohibitively expensive to renovate; but through New Markets and other financial support,

they opened a food cooperative that features local farmers and employs neighborhood residents.

Finally, let me highlight a more recent New Markets project that's currently under construction, the Massachusetts Green High Performance Computing Center in Holyoke, Massachusetts. Holyoke is a city in western Massachusetts with a population of about 40,000 people. From the late 19th century until the mid-20th century, Holyoke was known as the world's biggest paper manufacturer.

The High Performance Computing Center is a \$168 million technology hub that is being built at the former Mastex Industries site on Bigelow Street in the heart of Holyoke. Construction of the center began in the fall of 2010; and the two-story, 90,000 square foot complex is expected to be completed next year.

This facility will be New England's first high performance computing center. It will feature computers with high speed and the capacity to process extraordinary amounts of data. When it's complete, it will be among the 500 most powerful computer centers in the world.

The Holyoke Center is a partnership between local universities—University of Massachusetts, Harvard, MIT, Boston University, Northeastern University—and two private sector companies: the EMC Corporation, based in Hopkinton, and Cisco Systems.

The center also received a \$14.5 million New Market Tax Credit allocation, which is the critical component to financing this important project.

I believe the Holyoke Center will be a catalyst for economic development in Holyoke and in western Massachusetts. It will employ 13 permanent jobs and 130 research positions at various universities. It is expected to create 600 construction jobs.

Without New Markets and the leadership that I've tried to offer in this program, Hot Mama's Foods, River Valley

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H377

Market, and the Green High Performance Computing Center probably would not have been possible. New Markets is a good example of how public and private investment can be used to spur community and economic revitalization.

I hope that we will stop wasting time, and with the other tax extenders that have to get taken care of, we will include an extension of the New Markets Tax Credit program as quickly as possible.

WHO CARES FOR THE POOR?

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today we endure much discussion about who most cares for our poor. Some measure their compassion by spending their own money; some measure their compassion by spending other people's money. Yet compassion for the poor's true measure is premised upon this fact: You cannot empower a person by making them dependent, be it upon charity or be it upon bureaucracy.

Thus, let us strive to emancipate our poor from dependency's nightmare so that our suffering brothers and sisters may rise in self-reliance and awaken to the American Dream.

HOW MANY MORE GROUNDHOG DAYS IN AFGHANISTAN?

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it's Groundhog Day. Phil saw his shadow this morning, and winter will last 6 more weeks.

But what comes to mind for me is that old Bill Murray movie called "Groundhog Day," where he wakes up and the same thing happens day after day after day. We're living our own version of "Groundhog Day" right now, because every morning, for the last 3,700-plus mornings, the American people have woken to a Nation at war.

□ 1010

Every morning, we've woken up to the same scenario—thousands and thousands of our fellow Americans in harm's way, occupying a foreign nation as part of a reckless policy that is costing us at least \$10 billion a month.

There was some encouraging news, however, just yesterday as Secretary of Defense Panetta said that our combat role in Afghanistan would be over as soon as the middle of next year, which is a year earlier than we've been talking about. That would be a long overdue but welcome development, a belated recognition that this war is doing more harm than good in every way we're involved.

I'll believe it when I see it, though. The goalposts have been moved too

many times to put much confidence in a single statement. What I've heard so far is a little too vague to take to the bank, especially since Secretary Panetta maintains that some troops would still remain through 2014 in an advisory role and that the commander on the ground, just this morning, is reported on the news as sounding less than enthusiastic in his response.

What I'd like to hear, perhaps in conjunction with Secretary Clinton and the head of USAID, is that, as our military role recedes, we will use all the civilian tools at our disposal to improve the lives of the Afghan people, because the real challenge and the best way to advance our national security interests is to eliminate the crushing poverty and to address the overwhelming humanitarian need in Afghanistan.

That is what's at the heart of my SMART Security proposal. Instead of military force, instead of unmanned, amoral drones that don't know the difference between killing an insurgent and killing a child, how about we send American compassion to Afghanistan? How about we send our very best experts in education, health care, energy, agriculture, legal reform, government transparency, and whatever else we have to offer that they may want to learn from?

Even if Secretary Panetta sticks to this timetable, under the best case scenario, we have another 500 or so mornings and perhaps another Groundhog Day ahead of us, at least 500 more days of the same old, same old—Americans dying on a mission that is not making America safer or Afghanistan freer.

The time has come. In fact, it came a long time ago. Let's make tomorrow different from the thousands of days that preceded it. Let's end the war in Afghanistan now and finally bring our troops home.

USMC PRIVATE FIRST CLASS VICTOR DEW

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to name the United States Post Office in Granite Bay, California, in honor of United States Marine Corps Private First Class Victor Dew.

This young man was only 20 years old when he left his family and friends in late September of 2010 for Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Just 3 weeks later, on October 13, Private Dew was killed in action when his convoy was ambushed.

Victor grew up dreaming of becoming a marine. He loved military history. He was fully aware of the mortal dangers he would face. Yet, when he was offered a posting to a ceremonial position stateside, he turned it down. He believed his duty and destiny was to keep the fight away from our shores, away from his family and his country, and so

he chose combat even when he had been offered safe and honorable service at home.

What did he sacrifice in order to give our country a little more security and to give another country a fleeting chance at redemption?

He had everything in the world to live for. He was engaged to be married to a devoted young lady named Courtney Gold. Courtney said, "We had life in the grasp of our hands, and we were ready to take on the world." They would have. She had already picked out her wedding dress. There is a picture of her wearing that dress. It's in Victor's casket.

Victor was one of those sunny personalities who lifted the spirits of everyone around him. That's the recurring theme in all of the recollections of everyone who knew him. They'd be feeling down, and Victor would lift them up. I didn't know him, but I think I caught a glimpse of him in his little brother, Kyle. At the funeral reception last year, I found Kyle sitting at a table with his friends. When I went to offer my condolences, one of his friends said, "You know, we came to cheer him up, and instead, he's been cheering us up."

Victor lives on in the lives of those he touched, and he touched quite a few. He is remembered in his community as a faithful friend and as an inspiring teacher. Before he'd enlisted, he'd already become a popular martial arts instructor at a local dojo. Some of his students—and some of them a lot older than he—came to his service that day.

It has now been over a year since he returned to Granite Bay. In that year, he would have celebrated his 21st birthday. He would have returned safely home with his unit. He would have been married. And as Courtney said, he would have taken on the world. Instead, he rests in an honored grave. His family does what every Gold Star family does—they cope with their grief with a mixture of fond memories and faith but, most of all, of pride for the life of their son.

There are many graves in that cemetery that are etched with lifetimes much longer than the 20 years recorded on Victor's, but none of them comes close to his in this most important respect: what they did with those years. The most iconic work of art on the Titanic was a great carving that depicted Honor and Glory crowning Time. Victor Dew's time may have been short in this world, but he crowned that time with honor and glory that the rest of us can only marvel at.

Every morning since he was 12 years old, Victor Dew awoke under a Marine Corps banner over his bed that was emblazoned with the words "Semper Fidelis." In his life, we can see the full measure of those words. Every day in this majestic Capitol, we walk in the footsteps of the giants of our Nation's history. The oratory of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster still echoes through these Halls. At arm's reach of where I

stand right now once spoke Franklin Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan, Douglas MacArthur and Winston Churchill. Yet, in their long and illustrious lives, not one could claim to have sacrificed more for his country than these young men like Victor Dew.

Lincoln was right that no meager words of ours can add or detract from their deeds. But Shakespeare was also right that their story should the good man teach his son.

For that reason, I am proud to join a unanimous delegation from California in proposing that the post office in the town where Victor Dew lived and loved and returned as a fallen hero be named in his honor.

IN HONOR OF GAIL ACHTERMAN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Oregon lost an amazing pioneer with the death of Gail Achterman last weekend. At the moment Gail was drawing her last breath, this remarkable woman's husband, Chuck McGinnis, was telling me the story of how she had won his heart as he listened to her give a lecture on the Taylor Grazing Act.

That tells you all you need to know, actually, about both of them: that her lecture on an obscure Federal law could spark a whirlwind romance and a marriage of over 30 years. That is part of what made Gail such a remarkable woman. A three-sport letterwoman at Stanford University—in basketball, track, and swimming. An accomplished lawyer, public policy analyst, civic volunteer par excellence, and more.

Each of the many roles she played during her too-short life but stellar four-decade career were characterized by her insight, drive, comprehensive view of the world, and commitment to excellence. She was a pioneer in every sense of the word—from big-time women's athletics to being the first woman to chair Oregon's transportation commission. She was not just breaking ground for women but being a leader and a role model for anyone who wanted to both excel and make a difference.

Oregon was fortunate to have her as one of America's finest natural resources lawyers, practicing in Portland at one of the State's largest law firms, Stoel Rives. She rose to become a partner in the firm, leaving for 4 years to become the Governor's senior adviser on natural resources and helping to navigate some of Oregon's most difficult challenges in the 1980s.

□ 1020

What for most people would have been at the very height of her career, she left the law firm to retire to lead the Deschutes River Conservancy in central Oregon and then in 2003 to become director of the Institute of Natural Resources at Oregon State University.

During all of this time, she was involved in civic affairs and professional activities too numerous to mention, giving speeches, lectures, consulting with people throughout her beloved Pacific Northwest and around America.

During the last 10 years, she served on Oregon's transportation commission, the last term as its chair where she guided some of the most innovative approaches in the Nation to our transportation infrastructure challenges. Her work and leadership helped spark Oregon's economy and community revitalization.

She also won environmental and civic awards. The last I witnessed was a few months ago from the pedestrian community because of her leadership and understanding of a transportation system that worked for everybody: truckers, railroad, bikes, and pedestrians.

She was part of our celebration last summer of the 25th anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act in recognition of the role she helped play in drafting Senator Mark Hatfield's legislation that led to the protection of this priceless national treasure.

At the time of her passing, Gail had been focusing her attention on the future of the Willamette River Valley and the need for a comprehensive approach to its needs and opportunities.

Even in her last month, Gail's vision and commitment and insight were focused on the big picture. But everything about Gail seemed to be big picture and larger than life, whether rowing on the river, cross-country skiing, in the gym exercising, or presiding over a public hearing. Passion, focus, commitment, and the joy of getting a job done well were her signature characteristics. It was always part of that bigger picture, especially of land use and transportation, and water for our future.

She epitomized the strength of Oregon public policy, understanding how the pieces fit together and then translating that knowledge to others in a very understated, but powerful, way and ultimately helping find its way into public policy and action.

She was an extraordinary daughter of Oregon. She will be missed by all who knew her and appreciated her for the difference she made for generations to come.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today I've heard Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. McCLEINTOCK talk about the war in Afghanistan, and it kind of reminds me this morning about 8 o'clock I did a call-in show down in my district, Jacksonville, North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune Marine base.

The topic of the call-in show was proposed budget cuts to our military. The

emcee of the show said to me: I'm coming around to your thinking. It is time to get out of Afghanistan. We are spending \$10 billion a month in Afghanistan. Let's say that we start bringing them home this year in 2012, at least start the process of bringing them home. The host said: I guess if we did that, we would save at least probably \$240 billion in a 2-year period of time. If they are proposing cuts of \$490 billion in next year's budget for the Department of Defense and we save \$240 billion, then we are almost cutting in half what we are going to require of the military. I said, You're exactly right.

Not only did I hear this from a talk-show host, but I hear it throughout the eastern part of the State that I have the privilege to represent.

I hope that Mr. Panetta, who I have a lot of respect for, will keep to that 2013 timeframe. I share with Ms. WOOLSEY that I don't trust it, and it has nothing to do with the person. I want to make that clear. He is an honorable man, but there are too many factors that are planned into this issue of staying in Afghanistan. There are too many people that sadly are making money on war. I won't get into that because I don't have enough time.

As the host said to me today, if we would just spend money on the defense of America instead of building empires around the world, we probably would save a lot of money and we would have a strong defense, which we need.

That brings me to this poster. I have a book called "The Three Trillion Dollar War" that was written by a Nobel Prize winner in economics named Dr. Joe Stiglitz. His coauthor Linda Bilmes is an economics professor at Harvard. They testified a year ago before the Veterans Health Committee. I do not serve on that committee, but Mr. FILNER at the time was chairman. Now Mr. MILLER is chairman because Republicans are in the majority.

As they finished their discussion, they were saying that if they wrote the book today—this was written 5 years ago—the title would go from the "The Three Trillion Dollar War" to "The Five Trillion Dollar War." That is what it is going to cost to take care of our young men and women.

The poster to my left is a young Army sergeant, who has lost both legs and an arm, with his wife going into a new apartment. I have seen four young men at Walter Reed that have no parts below their waist and they are living. God bless them, and I hope they have a good life. I don't know. I cannot make that judgment. I know one thing: Uncle Sam, you're going to have to spend a lot of money to take care of those young men because they earned it. They earned it because of our failed policies in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that sometime this spring, in a bipartisan way, we will have an amendment on the floor that the House will pass and it will say: you need to start bringing our troops home beginning the end of 2012 because the process will take a long time.

In closing, as I always do, I have signed over 10,000 letters to families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq because I was not strong enough to vote my conscience on the request by the Bush administration to go into Iraq. I have asked God to forgive me by signing these letters, and I think He has forgiven me.

God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform. God, continue to bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, in Your loving arms hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. God, please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in Your eyes for this country. God, please continue to bless the leader of our country. Let him know that he is doing what is right in Your eyes. Three times I ask God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

FAST AND FURIOUS AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STONEWALLING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when most people think of smuggling, they envision outlaws recklessly sneaking guns, contraband, and money to other outlaws.

Most people would never imagine that the government of the greatest Nation in the world would be engaged in helping a criminal smuggling operation by sending guns and money to narcoterrorists south of our border.

No, this isn't a Hollywood movie. Unfortunately, this has become a reality in Washington, D.C.

□ 1030

The Justice Department, with the aid of the ATF, facilitated the smuggling of over 2,000 weapons to the drug cartels south of the border—the national enemy in Mexico. Reports indicate those weapons were used to kill at least 200 Mexican nationals and two U.S. law enforcement agents.

The Justice Department appears to have gone wild. Instead of enforcing the law, rogue operatives in the Department of Justice seemed to be recklessly encouraging violations of law. Who's responsible for this conduct?

Over a year has gone by since the murder of Brian Terry, border agent, and we still don't know who was in charge. Brian Terry was murdered by one of those Fast and Furious guns. The Attorney General said he was unaware of Fast and Furious. He claims that he either didn't get the memo, or maybe he didn't read the memo.

Well, according to the latest of group of emails sent over to Congress, he did get the email. According to emails sent to Congress Friday night, Arizona U.S. Attorney Dennis Burke notified Eric Holder's deputy chief of staff—via email—about Brian Terry's murder hours after it happened. Later that

day, he notified the Department of Justice that the murder weapon was from Fast and Furious. Imagine that. Holder's staff member implied that he alerted the Attorney General.

So who knew what and when? The Attorney General apparently knew not days or months but hours after that murder occurred. Did he, the Attorney General, know about this operation? Did he approve it? In any event, the Attorney General should resign because it all happened under his watch. He is the one in charge of the Justice Department.

When he appeared before the House Judiciary Committee in December, the Attorney General also told me that he did not know who in his department was responsible for making the decision of Operation Fast and Furious. So is the Attorney General now claiming there is a rogue operation of moles in the Department of Justice that authorized and carried out these smuggling missions? We want to find out.

To coin a phrase from then Senator Hillary Clinton on another subject, the fact that he did not know about this massive operation requires a "willing suspension of disbelief."

The Attorney General is the chief lawyer and law enforcement officer in the country. Whoever did know about this and approved it may have violated U.S. or international law. They need to be held accountable even if it means somebody goes to jail. But that is not the case.

The rogue criminals responsible for carrying out Fast and Furious still work in the Justice Department. These individuals have not been fired or criminally prosecuted for their reckless actions. Some have actually been promoted or transferred. It all looks like an organized, deceitful attempt to hide the stench of Fast and Furious from the American people.

Apparently, the Department of Justice believes in order to catch a criminal, you have to be like a criminal. We need an independent special counsel appointed by the President to investigate the Justice Department and the ATF.

The Department of Justice cannot be trusted to investigate themselves because the agency has lost credibility on this issue. The DOJ has stonewalled providing information to Congress. If the DOJ has nothing to hide, why do they keep hiding information from us? The Justice Department has to be removed from investigating Fast and Furious. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, this would look like a bunch of burglars sitting on a jury trying a burglary case. That would sort of look bad; wouldn't it?

People died in this reckless, misguided operation. We owe it to the American people and the people of Mexico to get to the bottom of this.

In many States when a person commits an offense, if he recklessly causes the death of an individual, the definition of that offense is called man-

slaughter. Even Washington insiders responsible for Fast and Furious cannot hide from the long arm of American justice because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS UNDER ATTACK

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

Mr. SCHILLING. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, last week was the March for Life here in Washington. Now, as a father of 10, life is a big issue in my house. It's a big issue in other homes and businesses throughout the United States. Thousands of Americans, including some residents of my district, traveled from all corners of the country last week to express their support for the right to life for each human being, to express the desire and passion they have for the born and the unborn.

Just a couple of days later, on Sunday morning, once we had all returned to Illinois, my family and I headed off to church, as we normally do. We sat in the pew and listened to the priest's homily. He read us a letter written by the Bishop of the Diocese of Peoria:

"In the history of the United States, Friday, January 20, 2012, will certainly stand out as a moment of enormous peril for religious liberty," the letter reads, referring to the date the Department of Health and Human Services announced that religious organizations will be forced to provide employees with insurance programs that provide abortifacients, contraceptive services, and sterilization.

The letter continues:

"If these regulations are put into effect, they could close down every Catholic school, hospital, and other public ministries of our church, which is perhaps their underlying intention. What is perfectly clear is that this is a bigoted and blatant attack on the First Amendment rights of every Catholic believer. Under no circumstances, however, will our church ever abandon our unshakable commitment to the gospel of life."

I later learned that this was one of more than 120 letters that bishops had read from the pulpit at masses across the United States.

The letter written by the Bishop of Marquette reads:

"The Federal Government, which claims to be 'of, by, and for the people,' has just dealt a heavy blow to almost a quarter of those people—the Catholic population—and to the millions more who are served by the Catholic faithful."

It later says:

"Our parents and grandparents did not come to these shores to help build America's cities and towns, its infrastructure and institutions, its enterprise and culture only to have their posterity stripped of their God-given rights."

Like many of my Catholic brothers and sisters, I do not believe it is the government's business to target religion and require that its believers violate their conscience and their religious beliefs—or suffer the consequences. I do not believe it is the role of government to persecute religions.

I am proudly and passionately pro-life. But regardless of what your views may be on abortion or contraception, I imagine most Americans would be alarmed to learn of our government chipping away at the First Amendment, mandating its citizens disregard their liberty, convictions, and conscience—or else. This is totally unacceptable. No government should force its citizens to violate their religious beliefs.

I recently joined with a number of my colleagues in urging that the administration reconsider this unprecedented government overreach and violation. But I would go further and encourage the administration to abandon this rule. Abandon this rule and continue to allow these Americans who oppose these services for either moral or religious reasons to live their lives in the way that they see fit and without the fear of punishment.

Bishop Jenky of the Diocese of Peoria concludes his letter by saying:

“This country once fought a revolution to guarantee the freedom, but the time has clearly arrived to strongly assert our fundamental human rights.”

Our religious freedoms are under attack. I was sent here to uphold, protect, and defend the United States Constitution, and I intend to do so.

TRIBUTE TO JOCK MICHAEL SMITH

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and pay tribute to one of our Nation's most distinguished trial lawyers, an avid sports collector, historian, author, and family man, Attorney Jock Michael Smith.

Attorney Smith was a well-respected member of the Alabama bar, and he was known nationally throughout the legal community for his exceptional legal abilities, his legendary courtroom style, civic activism, and passion for equal justice for all. Sadly, Attorney Smith passed away at his home in Montgomery, Alabama, on January 8 at the age of 63.

The story of Jock Michael Smith is not just one of a notable and accomplished attorney. His story is one of hope, beating the odds, and the fearless pursuit of one's dreams. The life and legacy of Jock Smith is an inspiration to us all.

Despite losing his father tragically at a young age and despite being told in high school that he could not be anything more than a sanitary worker, he did not let that deter him. This young boy, son of a widow, single mother of two, was determined to chart his own course.

Inspired by the memory of his father, Jock developed his oratorical and academic gifts. He graduated with honors from Tuskegee University and then matriculated to the University of Notre Dame School of Law on an academic scholarship.

□ 1040

As a first year law student, Jock founded the Black American Law Students' Association chapter at Notre Dame. He earned his law degree in 1973.

In 1996, Attorney Smith cofounded a partnership with the late renowned attorney, Johnny Cochran. The Cochran Law Firm, as it is known, is actually the law firm of Cochran, Cherry, Givens & Smith. It has 22 offices across this country and continues to be one of the most well-known criminal defense and civil plaintiff law firms in the Nation.

Attorney Smith's remarkable legal career was filled with many record-setting verdicts and settlements. A landmark \$1.6 billion verdict against Southwestern Life Insurance was one of the largest in America's history in 2004. He represented the legacy estates of both Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, Jr., and he represented the Negro League Players and civil rights activist Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth.

During his illustrious career, Attorney Smith's hard work and leadership was acknowledged by numerous awards. He was recognized by the Alabama Trial Lawyers Association for his tireless dedication and unwavering commitment. As an author, Jock Smith shared his amazing life story in an autobiography entitled “Climbing Jacob's Ladder: A Trial Lawyer's Journey on Behalf of ‘the Least of These.’”

Media personality and author Tavis Smiley best summed up the gift he gave us by writing down his memoirs: Jock Smith's story is part of America's story. It's part history lesson and part sermon and 100 percent fascinating. He and lawyers like his late partner, Johnny Cochran, are modern-day knights, using their skills to protect both the poor and defenseless. On a personal level, “Climbing Jacob's Ladder,” his book, shows how faith and hard work can bring great success.

Jock Smith was a member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated, and he was the first African American to serve on the board of the President's Advisory Council of the National Wildlife Federation.

Jock Smith was amazing. I know as a young lawyer his life stands as a personal tribute, to me. I am grateful to have known him. I know that I walk in a path that he blazed, and for that, I am eternally grateful to his family. Some of his family members are here with us today in the gallery. He is forever remembered as a remarkable and amazing man. He is survived by his wife of 45 years, Ms. Yvette Smiley-Smith; and his daughter, Janay Smith, who is with us today.

I want to say, in closing, that his life is truly a testament to what is possible

with opportunity—when you take opportunity—and with so many resources. Jock lived life by his favorite quote that he always would say: “Service is the price we pay for the space that we occupy.”

It is with tremendous pride, privilege, and great honor that today I get to recognize the life and legacy of Attorney Jock Smith on the floor of the United States Congress so that all of us can remember that we must pay our fair share for the space that we occupy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to make reference to occupants in the gallery.

CONGRESS IS NOT A CAREER

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, we in the House of Representatives need to start restoring the trust that the American people gave when they elected us to this office. Last night, 100 Members voted to give themselves a pay raise. Is that what we're all about? It's not about us enriching ourselves, because I don't believe that's what our Founding Fathers thought.

When I first came to Congress last year, I found out that I had an option to either take the health insurance plan that the Federal Government offered or to go out on my own and do my own thing. And I took the option, even though it cost myself and my family over \$10,000 more. But then we started to look at options with regards to the Federal Employee Retirement System that all Members of Congress are required to be in, and also the Thrift Savings Plan that all Members of Congress are part of, whether they want to be or not—even though it's different for the Senate. The House of Representatives back in the 104th Congress decided that they wanted to take that option away. I think that's wrong. I believe that America is about choices.

I also believe that Congress is not a career. And so when those Members of Congress don't have an option to remove themselves from the Federal Employee Retirement System, as I wanted to, or those Members of Congress that wanted to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan but are told that you, the taxpayers, are going to give us an additional 5 percent of our salary because you like us so much, I asked if I could exempt myself from that. And guess what? We were told we couldn't because those prior to us had made a decision for us now that we couldn't do that, we couldn't do what we think is right for this body.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, it is about doing the right thing. It is about looking back at what our Founding Fathers envisioned for this country. It's about service to this country, not about enriching ourselves on the backs of our fellow countrymen.

On the “60 Minutes” program we saw the insider trading issue that has gone across this Congress. It brings to mind that it is about doing the right thing. And unfortunately, there are those among us that really believe that it’s about enriching ourselves on the backs of those that we’re supposed to serve. There has been a number of bills put forth in regards to stopping insider trading, and so we have put forth a bill to do the same thing. It’s very simple. It just requires that Members of Congress, the President, and the Vice President put their holdings into a qualified blind trust, which means no matter what information they may have they can’t enrich themselves with it because within 30 days of their taking office, they must put it within a blind trust. It takes away all the issues in regards to how do you enforce some of the issues that were talked about in the STOCK Act.

These are noble intentions, but when you make it more difficult to enforce, what you do is you give people loopholes to get around it and skirt around the issue. If you put it into a blind trust, it takes away the ability to skirt around the issue.

Ladies and gentlemen, it’s not about creating more loopholes. It’s about making it simpler to do the right thing here in Congress. When we have the lowest approval rating, I’m shocked. I’m not shocked because we don’t deserve it, I’m shocked because we don’t want to do anything to improve it. As sheriff, I had a 73 percent approval rating. I come to Congress, and I find out that we’re not as respected as we should be. But it’s because of our own hand that we’re not. It’s nobody else’s fault. It’s not the press’ fault. It’s not anybody’s fault. It’s what we do within these Halls. What we do sets the tone for what the American people believe in or what we are supposed to be providing to the American people, and that is a level of trust.

So in two things: A bill that was called Congress is Not a Career Act is sitting out there and also one in regards to blind trusts. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we think about those issues and move forward.

GETTING TO THE TRUTH OF FAST AND FURIOUS

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 1 year since the tragic death of U.S. Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry, who was killed using weapons that were purposely walked to deadly drug cartels in Mexico as part of Operation Fast and Furious. Since Agent Terry’s death, the responsible Federal Department, the Justice Department, and its leader, Attorney General Eric Holder, have obfuscated every attempt to get to the bottom of what went wrong with this disastrous operation.

Despite the best efforts of the Justice Department to hide the facts, we now know many disturbing things about Fast and Furious. This ill-conceived operation began in November of 2009. Since that time, the ATF has sanctioned the sale of thousands of weapons to straw purchasers who transported these weapons across the United States’ southern border and into the hands of Mexican criminals.

□ 1050

The ATF lost track of these weapons until they began turning up at crime scenes in the United States and Mexico. As a result of Justice Department incompetence, the United States actively armed dangerous cartels that have wreaked havoc in Mexico and put our own Federal agents directly in harm’s way. Our hard-won trust and the relationships we’ve built with the Mexican Government as both countries seek to combat the cartels has been severely strained, which has harmed our efforts to get drug-running under control.

Operation Fast and Furious hasn’t just been a failure; it’s been a tragic failure. It is believed that hundreds of Mexicans have lost their lives through the use of these weapons, and at least one U.S. Federal Agent, Brian Terry, has lost his life.

When an operation goes so horribly wrong, it is important to find out why and who was responsible. The Congress has acted on its oversight responsibility; and in doing so, we’ve asked Attorney General Holder directly about the operation. On May 3, 2011, Attorney General Holder testified before the House Judiciary Committee. When asked when he first knew about Operation Fast and Furious, he stated, “I’m not sure of the exact date, but I probably heard about Fast and Furious for the first time over the last few weeks.” However, we now know that weekly memos addressed to the Attorney General, which included briefings on Operation Fast and Furious, began crossing his desk nearly a year before that.

When it became clear that his May 3 testimony was untrue, the Attorney General later revised the timeline in which he claimed to have knowledge of the operation. On November 8, 2011, Attorney General Holder claimed that he had in fact first learned about the operation at the beginning of 2011, which, again, is belied by the fact that he was receiving memos about the operation much earlier than that.

But we now know that even that revised and extended time frame is incorrect. Just days ago, the Justice Department finally released documents, which included a December 14, 2010, email exchange between the Attorney General’s chief of staff and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona, stating that the Attorney General had been alerted of the shooting and death of Agent Terry on the day of the shooting.

A troubling picture has emerged of the Holder Justice Department. From

the Attorney General’s own testimony, it would appear that he is either frighteningly unaware of major operations taking place in his own Department or that he did know about Fast and Furious, did nothing to stop it, and refused to take responsibility when it failed.

It has been more than a year since the death of Agent Terry, Mr. Speaker, and we still don’t have the answers the American people deserve and Agent Terry’s family deserves. We know we won’t get these answers from a proper internal investigation from the Justice Department. Far from the Department investigating itself, it has covered up for itself.

A year of delay, denial, and obfuscation is enough. A year of nighttime document dumps full of blacked-out pages and redacted information is enough. A year of senior Justice Department officials pleading the Fifth is enough. It’s time that we get to the bottom of why Fast and Furious happened and restore accountability to the Department of Justice. That’s why I introduced H. Res. 532, which calls on the President to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Operation Fast and Furious as well as the Attorney General’s role in it.

Without a special prosecutor, the only other way to get to the truth is through impeachment proceedings and the investigations that come with those proceedings. With all of the vital work before this House, it would be far better to avoid the distraction and the cost that impeachment proceedings would bring. I hope the President agrees.

I urge my House colleagues to support this resolution so that we can finally get to the truth and ensure no more innocent lives are lost due to this Attorney General’s failure.

REMEMBERING AMBASSADOR CHARLES PRICE

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, “Praise Silence.” Praise Silence is the very British expression that was used regularly by Ambassador Charles Price when he would stand up after dinner to offer thoughtful, insightful, and humorous remarks. He did it most often at the wonderful home—Sunnylands—of Ambassador Walter and Mrs. Annenberg, and he was one who provided a great deal of inspiration and leadership. I’m very saddened to have had the news, Mr. Speaker, of his passing, but I have to say that he lived a very, very full and active 80 years.

Ambassador Price and I shared a hometown and many mutual friends in Kansas City, and we also shared a great love of California. Mr. Price was someone who was very big physically, he was very big intellectually, and he had a great big heart. I always felt comforted around him because he had that wonderful embrace when he would

bring you in. And with me, for the past several decades, he's offered very thoughtful political insight and advice and counsel on a wide range of issues.

He served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James after having served as Ambassador to Belgium under President Reagan during the 1980s. He was the first American to go to the site in Lockerbie, Scotland, where Pan Am Flight 103 went down. He was on the cutting edge of very, very important decisions that were made with our very important ally, Margaret Thatcher. And I have to say that Ambassador Price was someone who had that very unique ability, Mr. Speaker, to, as Rudyard Kipling said, "walk with kings and keep the common touch."

He was known for his great sense of humor, and he was known for having a great desire to spend time with working men and women. And to listen to people, he would often go to pubs in England, and I suspect that Charlie Price might have enjoyed a Guinness or two at the same time.

But, Mr. Speaker, he was also a great business leader and a great philanthropist. I remember that, as the leading diplomat that he was, our great former Secretary of State, George Schultz, once said to me, in describing Charlie Price, that when the Secretary would arrive in London and he would get into the car with Charlie Price, there was no ambassador who could provide him with more cogent, thoughtful insight into the circumstances that existed on the ground as they were.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of Winston Churchill, I read in my original hometown paper—and Charlie Price's as well—the Kansas City Star, that he had just, not long ago, written a note to a grandson of his to lift his spirits. In that note he said: "Never, never give up. You will always succeed if you accept that you will not succeed every time. But never accept losing as anything other than a learning experience to drive you to be a champion in all walks of life."

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go to Carol Price and to the wonderful family. I have to say that, as we look to next week's—a week from this Sunday—dedication of the great new operation at Sunnylands in southern California, I know that Carol will be there, but Charlie Price will be greatly missed.

AMERICANS DESERVE HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve a genuine and predictable government that shoots straight. As Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest." How can the people hold their Representative accountable when Congress and the President distort the basic facts?

Many of my colleagues and I are dismayed by the dysfunction in the process. We have seen firsthand the insider tricks and schemes to distort the budget and hide new spending. We've learned that these loopholes are deeply ingrained in the rules of Congress—they are institutionalized—and both Republicans and Democrats are guilty of exploiting them.

The American people have a right to expect accountability, honesty, and transparency from their government. But every year Washington relies on a series of budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to conceal or enable deficit spending. With our Nation's debt nearing \$16 trillion, Washington must drop the budget games and commit to honest budget practices.

Many of us believe we were sent here to Washington to do things differently and to insist on an honest and transparent government.

□ 1100

That's why I, earlier this week, along with 28 of my colleagues, introduced the Honest Budget Act of 2012, an important step to change the way Washington works and instill integrity into the budget process. This legislation is designed to root out the budget gimmicks most commonly used by politicians to hide the truth, confuse the public, and run up the national debt.

Last year, Senator JEFF SESSIONS from Alabama introduced in the Senate similar legislation to strengthen the Senate's rules against budget trickery. Numerous conservative groups have endorsed Sessions' bill, including the Heritage Foundation, Americans for Tax Reform, and Citizens Against Government Waste.

This legislation introduced in the House expands the Senate bill with similar rules for the House of Representatives to address nine specific budget gimmicks that, since 2005, have cost taxpayers more than \$350 billion and have consistently added to our deficit and our debt.

For example, the legislation makes it more difficult to pass appropriation bills without first approving a budget. What a novel idea. The legislation also tightens rules regarding emergency designations and disaster designations to justify off-budget spending. It reveals both real costs and the real commitment on what the Federal Government is spending.

The bill also prevents Congress from relying on phony rescissions, or claiming savings that are not savings unless they are real and genuine. That's common sense. Common sense dictates that you cannot account as savings money that was never going to be spent in the first place.

A budget is a plan for this Nation's future. Americans deserve the truth. Mr. Speaker, given what I have witnessed over the last year, the only way to guarantee truth is to specifically root out and end the gimmicks.

We're all keenly aware that the number 1 issue facing America today is

jobs. We must continue to do all that we can here in Washington to create an environment that fosters job growth, and we will continue to do that. But we cannot overlook the fact that Washington spends money it does not have. Certainly, this reckless spending spree has contributed greatly towards our downward economy.

The Honest Budget Act does not fix all of our problems, but it is a step in the right direction. In many respects, the Honest Budget Act of 2012 embodies the spirit of transparency and accountability that unites many in my freshman class. The bill is a rallying point for those who truly want to put an end to tricks, gimmicks, and empty promises, and for all who believe that the American people deserve a government that they can trust.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to see this proposed legislation become law.

PROMOTING STEM EDUCATION

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, during the President's State of the Union address in this Chamber just last week, he spoke of the importance of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, also known as STEM education. STEM education helps support U.S. manufacturing jobs, and it is something that I am a strong proponent of.

The 10th District of Illinois, the district that I represent, is one of the largest manufacturing districts in our Nation. As I travel back home, I hear time and time again from manufacturers that they can't find qualified people able to step up and take the jobs that they have open right now at their manufacturing facilities.

One way we can help put people back to work is by promoting STEM education. Those trained in the STEM field have the opportunity to gain good-paying jobs right here in our local communities. From high schools training our future workers to community colleges helping to train and retrain unemployed individuals, STEM education helps put people back to work and allows U.S. manufacturers to hire American workers.

One example of a successful STEM education program back home is at Wheeling High School. Wheeling High School's Principal, Dr. Laz Lopez, took the initiative to start a STEM education program in order to empower his students to graduate and have a competitive edge against other students seeking employment. Just yesterday, Wheeling High School announced that they are now looking to expand that education to include a curriculum that has nanotechnology. This type of curriculum will give Wheeling High School students a greater competitive advantage when applying for jobs and pursuing degrees in science and technology.

Preparing our students for the 21st century workforce, I would argue, is absolutely critical. But it is also essential that we empower the unemployed to be retrained to pursue careers in the STEM field right back at home and across our country.

Back home, I'm working with the College of Lake County, which is working hard to provide STEM education to adults who are interested in preparing themselves for new careers. The College of Lake County will be hosting a STEM education day on Saturday, February 25. This is to motivate our young people about the importance of STEM education, and to especially focus on young women to learn more about careers in the fields of science and technology.

I am impressed with the work that the College of Lake County and other community colleges are doing to bridge the gap between industry and education. By teaming up with local employers, the College of Lake County is putting in place programs that can train the workforce and also help local manufacturers in need.

In the weeks to come, I'll be hosting a manufacturing and education summit at ETA/Cuisenaire in Vernon Hills. The goal of this summit is to find ways in which local industry can invest in local education so that our region has the resources and trained workforce it needs to expand and to invest in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

I will continue to work with Republicans, with Democrats on promoting this critical initiative of STEM education. This will not only help put people back to work, but will enable manufacturers to hire workers right here at home so that they can continue to grow and expand in our local communities.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

There have been many prayers this day rising to You from those engaged in the political discourse of this Nation. We give You thanks for those who were able to gather at the National Prayer Breakfast and those across this land who joined their prayer intentions with the many who attended.

Bless the Members of this people's House now as they gather to do the legislative work they are called to do. May their prayers this day be authentic and heard by You, the living God.

May their work be fruitful and beneficial to those whom You favor, the poor. And may all they do be done in humility and charity, knowing that they are all earthen vessels through whom Your spirit might shine forth.

And finally, 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 Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ELLISON 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN MUST RECEIVE PERMIT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission, which was tasked with making recommendations for dealing with our country's nuclear waste, recently issued their findings. After conducting a 2-year study, the commission discovered that measures must be taken to deal with nuclear waste currently and interim storage at 121 sites across the country. The editorial response by the Aiken Standard to this anemic obvious conclusion is summarized by one word: "Duh."

We have known for decades that this waste must be properly dealt with and discarded in the proper setting. The scientific community has determined that Yucca Mountain is the ideal location for a safe national repository.

The President and the liberal-controlled Senate must quit playing political games and allow the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to finish analyzing the license permit. It's time to let science dictate policy, not politics.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WILLIAM STREET POSTAL FACILITY

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my good colleague from western New York, Congressman BRIAN HIGGINS, united in opposition to the proposed elimination of the postal processing and distribution center in Buffalo and the 700 jobs of people that are currently employed there.

I understand the Postal Service has gone through some tough times. They need to make some hard decisions. Up in our neck of the woods, 700 jobs is a very big deal. That is 700 families making mortgage payments, 700 families making their car payments, and 700 families that haven't been able to make their tuition payments.

In addition to these individuals, businesses, seniors, and rural communities we represent would be adversely affected if this were to end. This would end the overnight delivery of first-class mail in the Buffalo region, impacting all the businesses that depend on this service. It would probably slow commerce, delay the delivery of medication to our seniors, and impair communications for rural families who don't have Internet access.

At a time when the Postal Service is struggling to retain business, they need to be creative and find new ways to garner more customers.

STOP ATTACKING COAL JOBS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's activist EPA is at it again. This destructive agency, in advancing the administration's war on coal, is forcing the closure of six coal-fired power plants in three States. Just a few weeks ago, it was announced that the Muskingum River Power Plant in my district would have to close and eliminate over 100 jobs because of burdensome EPA regulations.

President Obama's war on coal is nothing new. With just one proposed rewrite of one rule, President Obama is putting tens of thousands of direct and indirect coal-related jobs at risk. Just over a week ago, the President stood in this Chamber and told Americans that he wants to create jobs and grow the economy, but his policies do the exact opposite.

Hardworking taxpayers across America deserve better. They deserve effective leadership that moves us forward rather than holding us back. With over 14 million Americans out of work, we can't afford more of the same failed

policies from this administration. They are hurting America.

PAYROLL TAX CUT EXTENSION

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the month of February. In less than 4 weeks, the 2-week payroll tax cut extension, which House Republicans begrudgingly agreed to, will expire.

To avoid the same dramatic standoff that threatened a \$1,400 tax increase for the average Massachusetts family, we must work together and adopt a yearlong extension of this vital tax credit rather than waiting till the last minute yet again.

Failure to extend the payroll tax cut to the end of the year would not only severely impact already overstretched households around the country, but would also dramatically undermine our still fragile economic recovery.

Families have already made their budgets for this year. They are counting on this extension to pay their bills, heat their homes, and meet other needs. Let's not let them down.

PBGC SHOULD RESTORE DELPHI SALARIED RETIREES PENSIONS

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today our colleagues at the Education and Workforce Committee held a subcommittee hearing looking into the challenges facing the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing the PBGC is transparency. The PBGC will not release even the most basic documents explaining the denial of the full earned pension benefits of the Delphi salaried retirees. Perhaps it is because of the many conflicts of interest that existed between the Treasury Department and the PBGC.

When these pensions were turned over to the PBGC, approximately 20,000 current and future salaried retirees were subjected to benefit cuts of up to 70 percent. The hardworking taxpayers whose tax dollars were used to pay for the auto bailouts deserve to know who made these decisions to cut these pensions and why they are made.

NFL BLACKOUT UNACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, tens of millions of Americans will gather with family and friends to watch the Super Bowl. Many from my western New York community will be among them. Unfortunately, western

New York families do not always have the opportunity to watch their hometown team, the Buffalo Bills.

The NFL's blackout rule prohibits the broadcast of a game in a team's home market if the game has not been sold out within 72 hours of the kickoff. In Buffalo, this meant that this past season almost half of the Bills games were blacked out. This is unacceptable. We have a strong and enthusiastic fan base; but with one of the largest football stadiums in the National Football League, Buffalo must sell 6,000 more tickets than the league's average to avoid a blackout.

I have sent a letter to NFL Commissioner Goodell, along with my colleagues Congresswoman KATHY HOCHUL, Congressman ROSS, and Congresswoman BROWN, asking for an end to this unfair policy. It is time for the league to update this regulation, taking into account factors like stadium and media market size and, most importantly, the tough financial situation millions of families across the Nation find themselves in.

□ 1210

STOCK ACT

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Washington is failing the American people. Our leaders need to be held to the highest standard, and that means obeying the same laws that everyone else has to live under.

I'm pleased to report progress on an important bill that I cosponsored; it's called the STOCK Act. It would prohibit inside trading by any Member of Congress.

This bill is now starting to move in the Senate, and I intend to fight to ensure its swift passage. No one in government should profit from private information obtained through their position. Serving the people is a privilege and it's an honor, not an opportunity for personal gain.

SUSAN G. KOMEN HALTS PARTNERSHIP WITH PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day. In an effort to strip women of the right to choose, anti-choice groups have blocked access to life-saving cancer screenings.

The Nation's leading breast cancer charity, Susan G. Komen, announced it will no longer partner with Planned Parenthood, the Nation's leading women's health care provider. This fight has pitted two of our Nation's premier and important women's health care groups wrongly against each other.

We on either side of the Capitol and in these Chambers must remember that

rhetoric has real-world consequences. For the health of all women across America, this issue must be resolved quickly and the collaborative relationship between these two great institutions restored. Until then, lives are at stake, sadly, for political gain.

CONSCIENCE RIGHTS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, institutions across the country are facing an impossible choice: Do they continue in their mission to provide for their employees, or do they violate their conscience?

When the Affordable Care Act passed, there was no thought in the minds of many Catholics that the law would eventually force them into such a terrible choice. In fact, my former colleague from Pennsylvania, Kathy Dahlkemper, recently came out and said, I would have never voted for the final version of the bill if I expected the Obama administration to force Catholic hospitals and Catholic colleges and universities to pay for contraception.

I might add, this rule that will go into effect on August 12 includes not only contraceptives, but abortifacients, drugs like Ella and Plan B, as well as sterilization services.

Catholic and other religious organizations have cared for the sick and educated Americans of all religions since the founding of our Republic, and they've done this because their conscience compels them to show their love to all mankind. Never before has the Federal Government compelled them to violate their conscience in such a terrible way. There are fundamental questions about life and morality that the government has no business forcing on organizations and individuals. To force them to violate their conscience is wrong.

PROMPT SHORT SALE DECISION ACT

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to advocate an aggressive response to the housing crisis.

Last year, 30 percent of California homeowners with mortgages were underwater. That's one of the highest rates in the country. To improve our economy, we must fix the broken housing market. Large banks simply wait out short-sale offers, which kills the process.

Back home, I hear from people who are trying to secure short sales and have to wait for months or longer to get a decision from their lender. That's absolutely unacceptable. Banks need to treat people fairly, which is why I'm a cosponsor of H.R. 1498, the Prompt Decision for Qualification of Short Sale Act. This is a bipartisan bill that requires lenders to make a decision within 45 days to approve or disapprove a

short sale. This bill simply makes sure that prospective homeowners receive a decision from their banks in time to be useable.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation so we can break up the housing market logjam.

LET'S GET TO WORK ON CREATING JOBS AND STRENGTHENING MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, if Congress does not act soon, 160 million Americans will see a tax increase at the end of the month. Working families in my district rely on the payroll tax cut to make their mortgage payments or put food on the table. We need to get to work right now on extending the payroll tax cut and unemployment insurance for a full year.

Fourteen million Americans are without jobs. Families need our help; they are hurting. But instead of working together to create jobs, Republicans continue to push a partisan agenda that further divides us.

This week, we have yet another bill to repeal the health care reform. Let's stop these misguided bills. Let's get to work on the agenda that creates jobs and strengthens the middle class. We must work together.

AN AMERICA BUILT TO LAST

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, last week we were in this Chamber listening to the President deliver a State of the Union address, the blueprint for an America built to last. We took away different points from that speech. Many will speak to his initiatives which address American manufacturing, a new and innovative energy source, educating and creating a more skillful workforce. I took away that this blueprint for an America built to last will be successful because of its foundation, the foundation which is the people of this great Nation.

The President is putting his faith in the people. He is putting his faith in their values, uniquely American values. He is putting his faith in those values which created and motivated the creation of the middle class, the middle class which is the backbone of this great Nation. That is why we will have an America built to last.

CRYSTAL SUGAR LOCK-OUT

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, 1,300 Minnesota workers have been denied their basic and most fundamental right to work and support their families.

That's right, yesterday marked the 6-month anniversary of workers at the American Crystal Sugar factory in Moorhead being locked out. Many of these people have worked for the factory their whole lives. Their parents worked there, Mr. Speaker, and their grandparents worked there, too.

These workers have gone to work and have gone to bat for the company. These workers, Mr. Speaker, stood shoulder to shoulder with the company to fight for a better sugar program in the farm bill just because that's how dedicated they are. But what have they got in return? They've gotten locked out. They're not on strike. They're locked out because they will not accept an unfair take-it-or-leave-it contract. These workers even vowed not to strike because they know how important their work is, but they have been locked out even though they have agreed to a no-strike guarantee.

It's wrong, Mr. Speaker. These 1,300 folks deserve better from this company, and I think the time is now for the company to negotiate.

WORST TRANSPORTATION BILL IN HISTORY OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, at this moment, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is working on what is arguably the worst transportation bill in the history of Congress—just when we need the best. It's not just wrong sized with too few resources from the wrong sources. It fails to protect the integrity of the trust fund, inviting opposition from budget hawks.

It reverses 20 years of transportation reform by attacking the cheapest way to develop highway capacity in most communities, transit and cycling. It even eliminates the Safe Routes to School program for our children.

I hope my staff heard wrong that the committee chair will deny participation to anybody who asks for a vote on a provision, not just in committee, but will not even be able to offer an amendment on the floor. Let's get back to the bipartisan tradition to have infrastructure that America needs.

NO-JOBS REPUBLICAN AGENDA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask this Tea Party Republican majority to do something to create jobs.

Last week, the President presented a positive plan to create jobs, but all the American people hear from the Tea Party Republican Party is the same old no-jobs agenda from this no-show Republican Congress.

The economy is improving, but there are still 14 million Americans without jobs. Yet the Republican Congress hardly even shows up for work. Congress met only 6 days of the month of January—6 days in 1 month.

We need to come to work and pass President Obama's jobs plan, level the playing field, force the rich to pay their fair share of our Nation's debt, and put an end to rewarding businesses that ship jobs overseas.

□ 1220

MAKING LAWS THAT MAKE LIVES BETTER

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, for my constituents and I, the work here in Congress is about making laws that make lives better. Last week, our President came to this Chamber and laid out a blueprint to build an America that lasts. That blueprint focuses on manufacturing, education, worker training, clean energy, and ensuring that every American plays by the same set of rules and pays their fair share. By building from the ground up, by focusing on working people, we can build an economy that lasts.

My friends on the other side offer a different path. It's a top-down approach with big tax breaks for the wealthy and subsidies for Big Oil at the expense of new technology and innovators. But we know what happens when you use all of your resources and materials at the top of the building. It topples over.

FRANK BUCKLES WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women who served and sacrificed in World War I. 2014 will be the centennial anniversary of the Great War, and it's my hope that a grateful Nation will come together to pay tribute to the heroes who fought for liberty and freedom almost 100 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to support the Frank Buckles World War I Memorial Act, which would establish a commission to ensure a proper national observance of this historic occasion. Kansas City, which has a long tradition dating back to 1921 of honoring World War I and its legacy, is home to the outstanding National World War I Museum. I ask my colleagues to join in our support of designating this museum the National World War I Memorial.

It's my hope that over the next 2 years, we can come together and recognize the ideals and values that our country's bravest so exemplified in the First World War, and that we continue to uphold today.

BRINGING MARRIAGE EQUALITY
TO MAINE

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in my State of Maine, there are thousands of couples in loving, committed relationships. They share homes and they raise children together. They remain committed to each other through the ups and downs of life, but because they are same-sex couples, they are denied the right to honor their love and commitment to each other through marriage.

This fall, Maine will have a chance to change that and to join a growing list of States around the country that are setting aside discrimination and granting all couples the same right to get married.

We've made progress here in Congress on ending discriminatory practices like "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," but it will be up to us in Maine to bring marriage equality to our State. This is an issue of basic human rights and equal treatment under the law, and I am confident we'll do the right thing.

DRUG SHORTAGE PREVENTION
ACT

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the prescription drug shortage crisis we have today in America. Across the country, patients are being forced to go without the critical medication they need to battle diseases and stay healthy. This crisis is hitting cancer patients especially hard, with serious shortages of chemotherapy drugs.

That's why this week I introduced the Drug Shortage Prevention Act with Representative LARRY BUCSHON, my Republican colleague from Indiana. Our bill helps FDA work with drug producers and distributors to fix some of the regulatory problems that are causing these shortages. It also improves communication so doctors and patients have the information they need to make smart treatment decisions.

This is not a partisan issue. Drug shortages affect all of us, and so I urge my colleagues to quickly pass this bipartisan legislation. When a family gets hit with a diagnosis like cancer, they have enough things to worry about. Running out of chemo drugs should not be one of those things.

SUPPORT THE STOCK ACT

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to offer my support for the STOCK Act, a bill that would make it illegal for Members of Congress to

trade securities on inside information, a restriction that applies to pretty much everybody else. I'm a proud co-sponsor of that act, but only partly proud. I'm, frankly, embarrassed that legislation is necessary to prohibit insider trading by all of us.

I urge the Republican leadership to bring that bill to the floor now. Don't make us go through petitions and this and that and the other thing. Let's bring it to the floor now. And I urge the other body, the United States Senate, to move it now. My understanding is that Senators are attaching constitutional amendments and other irrelevant provisions to a bill that should be a "no-brainer."

If we can't get this done, we will have earned the scorn of the American people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2012.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 2, 2012 at 9:40 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1296.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 588.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3578, BASELINE REFORM
ACT OF 2012, AND PROVIDING
FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R.
3582, PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING
ACT OF 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 534 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 534

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3578) 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 112-9 dated January 25, 2012, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to

final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Jackson Lee of Texas or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3582) 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 112-10 dated January 25, 2012. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

□ 1230

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to be down here with you today, and for the purpose of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, 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, House Resolution 534, this rule before us today, brings the first of two Budget Committee reform bills to the floor. As the Speaker is very familiar, the Budget Committee has been working very hard, not just this year but last year as well, to put together an agenda to make the budget more accessible to the American people, to make budgeting in Washington, DC, look more like budgeting back home around the kitchen table. We have the first of those two reform bills coming to the floor today with the passage of this rule.

This rule is a structured rule, Mr. Speaker, that brings H.R. 3578, the Baseline Reform Act, and H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, to the floor.

We all know it's been over a thousand days since the Senate has produced a budget. But here in the House, not only did we produce a budget last year on time, we will produce a budget this year on time, and we will produce another budget, as we did last year, that the American people can be proud of. Knowing that it's a given the American people are going to be proud of that work product, Mr. Speaker, because you and I will ensure it, the question is, will folks be able to understand it. I confess, as a freshman member on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, it's not always easy to do.

The President is going to submit his budget to us in a couple of weeks. I think it was going to be next week. I think he's put it off for another week. I'm looking forward to seeing it when it finally arrives. But my recollection and expectation is going to be it's going to be more than 12 inches tall. Not because the President's doing anything wrong, but because that's the level of detail and sophistication it takes to produce a budget for the United States of America.

So what can we do to make this budget easier to understand? What can we do to make this budget more like the budgeting that goes on around the kitchen table?

The Baseline Reform Act, the first bill that this rule would bring to the floor, does this, Mr. Speaker. It eliminates the assumption that CBO makes today that every Congress is going to spend more next year than the previous Congress. Now, there are, as a function of law, Mr. Speaker, some areas of the budget that do in fact go up.

We know, for example, that 10,000 new Americans every day apply for Social Security and Medicare. 10,000 new baby boomers every day apply for Social Security and Medicare. We cal-

culate that in the law. It exists in statute today to say let's go ahead and raise that spending level based on those new folks accessing the system.

But there's over a trillion dollars in spending, Mr. Speaker, for which there is no law that says it's going to go up next year and the year after that and the year after that. And yet, the Congressional Budget Office today, when they chart out the budget for the United States of America, assumes that that increase is going to take place.

Well, I'm tremendously proud, Mr. Speaker, that at least in my short time here I've seen just the opposite. Every single bill that this body has brought to the floor and sent to the President has reduced spending. Spending was \$1.91 trillion in 2010. We reduced it to \$1.50 trillion in 2011. We reduced it again to \$1.43 trillion for 2012. That's the trend that my constituents want back home, Mr. Speaker, and I think the trend that America deserves.

But more importantly, we've all been involved in those conversations back home where folks say, when is a cut not really a cut? When is an increase not really an increase? Only here in Washington, Mr. Speaker, can we spend \$10 last year and \$12 next year and call that a budget cut. Only here. The Baseline Reform Act eliminates that.

The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, the second bill that this rule would bring to the floor, adds a new bit of information to the Congressional Budget Office baseline. It's the same information that President Obama asked for in his stimulus bill, to say, when we spend this \$800 billion, what impact is that going to have. We know it's going to be \$800 billion out the door. We know we're never going to get that money back. We know that's going to be money that we have to borrow from foreign lands. But what do we get for that \$800 billion?

We asked the Congressional Budget Office to score it that way and they did.

What the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act says is let's add that feature for every future bill on the tax side of the ledger.

What happens, Mr. Speaker, when we cut taxes? We know that means less revenue comes in from that one tax, but what does it mean for the economy as a whole? We see it over and over again when we have taxes at their highest. Sometimes our tax receipts are at their lowest. When we have tax rates at their lowest, sometimes our tax receipts are at their highest. The Congressional Budget Office can give us that information, and this bill makes it possible for them to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm tremendously proud and tremendously enthusiastic about not only the rule but the two underlying bills, and I look forward to that discussion not just on the rule with my friend, Mr. HASTINGS, but with the Budget Committee later on this afternoon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding me the time to go forward with discussion of this particular rule.

The rule provides for consideration of both H.R. 3578, which is referred to as the Baseline Reform Act, and H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. Both of these bills, in my opinion, impose convoluted new rules on an already complicated budget process, an attempt to enshrine the majority's ideology into what is supposed to be an objective analysis.

What my friends on the Republican side are presenting as commonsense reforms are actually, in my opinion, nonsense reforms. These budget process changes are mere gimmicks to defend the elimination of spending on essential government services and to dress up tax cuts for those in our society who are well-off in the phony disguise of benefiting average Americans.

These changes tie Congress and the Congressional Budget Office up in knots in an effort to prove that conservatives' ideology about taxes and spending is going to grow our Nation's economy—not creating more jobs, not stimulating demand, not investing in infrastructure or education, or any of the many endeavors that are critical to improving the lives of all Americans.

Rather, what my friends, the Republicans, are trying to do is, in my opinion, create a Frankenstein budget process: add a procedure here, add a little bit of a procedure, sever a rule over there, zap it with some electricity or hyperbole, and now you have a budget process that proves tax cuts for the wealthiest among us are the only way to grow our economy. But guess what? It still ain't human, and it certainly isn't humane.

For the Baseline Reform Act, Mr. Speaker, Republicans propose that the Congressional Budget Office not include annual inflation when making their budget estimates.

□ 1240

When I was a child—10 and 11 years old—we didn't get radio programs very much, but we got radio programs on Saturdays. One of the programs that I enjoyed listening to so much as a little boy, while sitting on the rug in the living room, was "Let's Pretend." I never did know then that I would be here in this august institution, sitting around with people who are pretending in the budget process that inflation doesn't exist when they're making budget estimates.

I talked yesterday with one of my friends on the Rules Committee that I'd been down in Florida and that I'd had a major water issue at my home in Florida. For the last 2 or 3 months, my water bill had been exorbitant, and I couldn't figure out why. Ultimately, this morning, I learned for the first time that there is a substantial leak inside the house, so the plumbers are

there, and I'm already out more than \$1,000.

Later on, I'm going to be voting about my salary. Yesterday, I voted about the cost of living for Federal employees. I think we do them a terrible disservice by disallowing them the kinds of increases that take into consideration the exact same kind of things that I and other Members of this House and other people around this Nation are experiencing when it comes to their personal undertakings. We've been without an increase here, and, yes, this Nation is in serious trouble. Yet the people that we tend to attack are the people who are at the lowest end of the scale and the middle class people—the police officers, the firefighters, the schoolteachers—who make \$35,000, \$40,000. One or two of them, luckily, makes \$60,000 a year. What we wind up doing is taking them to task. They have the same plumbing problems that I do. There is inflation, and you can't do a budget without contemplating it; but if you wish to pretend, then I guess that's what we will do is play Let's Pretend.

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 could just simply ignore the costs for everyday items, but I don't know a single thing that I've bought in the last 3 years that has gone down in price. I could just simply ignore the fact that costs for everyday items and activities tend to go up every year, indeed, every month. Around this place, if you're looking at the local gas stations every day, every week, I can just assume that what I'm paying today, if I wanted to, I guess, I could keep paying 10 years from now and still expect the exact same numbers of goods and services.

But, of course, we all know that that isn't true. Simply wishing away or pretending inflation away won't make it so. Fuzzy math does not equal fiscal responsibility. By eliminating inflation adjustments from discretionary spending projections, my friends, the Republicans, are actually just 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.

This morning, I had the good fortune of having in the office a fine group of safety patrol students from Pleasant City Elementary School in Palm Beach County in West Palm Beach. I was talking with them about the fact that I would be here discussing the budget and how everything affects their lives as well as the lives of all American citizens around this country and that, if we were to allow this budget process to take place, all we will have is a continuing decrease over the long term of things that I may wish for those children at Pleasant City Elementary School or at Cove Elementary, whose counselor was also here. We were discussing the number of teachers who

have been laid off and the number of music programs that no longer exist.

So let's just pretend that they don't cost but the same thing at one time, and you will find over the long haul that you'll get these decreases, which will result in massive decreases in essential services like fire services and police services and school teachers that millions, indeed all Americans, rely on.

This technical change then is actually a backdoor effort to slowly starve necessary government programs rather than to be up front about which programs Republicans want to eliminate. The celebrated conservative Grover Norquist made it very clear. H.R. 3578 says that, every year, every program and agency should be assumed to get smaller and smaller automatically. I refer to Mr. Norquist as an ideologue.

He said, "I'm not in favor of abolishing government. I just want to shrink it down to the size where we can drown it in the bathtub."

I somehow or another am at odds with that kind of thinking when we're about the business of helping more people, as I explained to the children, who are in the category of the neediest, and here we are protecting the greediest in our society.

This technical change then is actually a backdoor effort to slowly starve necessary government programs rather than to be up front about which programs Republicans want to eliminate. They would rather put sneaky rules into place to guarantee the outcome they want without having to have an open debate. That's the kind of budget process that only Igor, the Frankenstein monster, could love.

Through the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to introduce dynamic scoring into the CBO's projection process. Once again, this seems like a minor technical change; but when you look closely, you see that this is an effort to zap electricity into Igor-the-monster-budget, which in the final analysis is tax cuts for those of us in society who are better off and for the wealthier even among that class.

Under this bill, the CBO's analyses are tweaked so that tax cuts for the wealthy seem like they grow the economy while actual investments in the needs of everyday Americans do not. Republicans make it easier to cut taxes for those of us who are well off and for those of us who are rich 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, as if spending on things that Americans want and need won't boost the economy. They would have us pretend. The CBO has already projected that extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest among us would actually reduce growth in the long run; but rather than face the facts, Republicans simply want to change the rules so that this analysis is turned upside down.

My friends on the Republican side have been so concerned about building actual bridges to nowhere that they've turned the budget process into its own kind of bridge to nowhere. Rather than using the budget process to lead this country into a new era of economic growth, my friends on the other side of the aisle want to cut taxes for very wealthy people, cut programs for everyone else, and then feel like they've set this country on the right track. This is no way to run an economy, no way to run a budget process, and no way to stick up for millions of struggling Americans who need us to focus on improving the economy.

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

□ 1250

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just really take a moment to think about the doublespeak here in Washington, D.C. That's been the biggest adjustment since having the great privilege of being a Member in this U.S. House of Representatives. What my friend from Florida I know very genuinely calls sneaky, I call common sense.

You know, today in the budget, Mr. Speaker, today in the budget, the CBO doesn't have to follow the law for about a quarter of all Federal Government spending. When they are scoring Medicare and Medicaid, they follow the law to say what's Medicare and Medicaid going to do over the next 10 years. When they're scoring discretionary spending, however, they just guess. They just guess. That's what the process is today: Just guess at what future Congresses are going to be. What are those future Congresses going to do?

Now, I tell you that's an exercise in folly, and you couldn't possibly get it right. That's what the CBO Director told us yesterday, that it's a challenge to put these numbers together. And the more they have to guess, the more inaccurate their result becomes.

So what are these two bills?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Well, now guessing, then why are we mandating 40 years? How in the world are we going to guess and have them predict what 40 years are going to look like?

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for asking.

Reclaiming my time, what those 40 years are are 40 years of congressionally mandated action.

But that's what's so different here, Mr. Speaker. There are things that Congress speaks to and things about which Congress is silent. And for reasons unbeknownst to me or the families back home in my district, what this Congress has said, this body that's been instilled with the power of all of our voters back home, we've said we advocate it, CBO just guess.

You know, when you and I were working together last summer on the Budget Control Act, we went exactly the opposite route. As you know, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Control Act, we said don't guess about what's going to happen next year. We're putting a number in statute for spending. Don't guess about what's going to happen 2 years down the road for that. We're putting a number in statute. And don't guess about another year down the road for that, because we are putting a number in statute.

Look at that, Mr. Speaker. What we've chosen to do, instead of just guessing about the country's future, is to do what the American people sent us here to do, and that's legislate on the country's future. Only here can you spend \$10 this year, \$12 next year and call that a cut. I don't get it. I don't get it, and folks back home don't get it.

Far from being gimmickry, this is unifying the Federal budget process with what that budget process is for millions of families back home around the dinner table. And to be clear about the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make sure that my friend from Florida and I are working on the same information, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act does not change the CBO baseline process at all, not at all. The same score that CBO would have done for legislation yesterday, they're going to do that same score for legislation tomorrow if the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act becomes law. What will be different is—and I love this about the direction of this Congress, Mr. Speaker. The difference will be the American people will have a new piece of information to add to the old baseline, a new piece of information.

During the discussion yesterday with the Congressional Budget Office, we got the CBO baseline, but we also got additional information—what would happen if you extended tax cuts, what would happen if you did alternative things called the alternative baseline. The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act says let's build on that. Because, in these times, we can't afford to have any stone unturned for economic growth for this country; and we certainly can't afford to continue, as this town has done far too long if we're candid with ourselves, far too long, keeping the American people in the dark about Federal budgeting issues.

These two bills, again, these are just the first of 10 bills that will be coming to this floor, Mr. Speaker. But these two bills shine a spotlight on the Federal budget process in ways that we can all be proud, and I can discuss that even further later on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

For a long time, Americans have believed if you work hard every day and play by the rules, you'll be able to earn enough to own a home and educate your children and retire with some dignity. It's the American Dream.

Precious numbers, or large numbers of people, rather, are now disbelieving in that because it's not really happening in their lives. They're working as hard as they can, but they seem to go backwards, not forward, and they work so hard.

You can't reignite the American Dream unless you reignite the middle class, and you can't reignite the middle class unless you reignite small business. Small businesses in this country create about two out of every three jobs created in the country. In the last 20 years, 80 percent of the new jobs have been created by businesses that are younger than a year old. So new small businesses are the key to getting things done.

Now, if you talk to small business people around the country, as we have in our districts, here's what they'll tell you: Their number one concern these days is they don't have enough customers. There's not enough people eating in their restaurants or buying goods in their stores or buying the manufactured goods that they do or buying the software code that they write. They need more customers.

So 147 days ago, 147 days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and said we ought to do four things to stimulate customers for those small businesses and grow the middle class:

First, he said, we should repair our Nation's aging bridges and railroads and highways and put construction workers back to work, and building schools in the process. The Congress has never voted on that proposal.

The second thing the President said is, when a small business hires people, their taxes should be cut, so a tax cut for small businesses that hire Americans. The Congress has never voted on that proposal.

The third thing that he said is, because of the economic distress of our country, cities, counties, and States are laying off police officers, firefighters, teachers, which hurts public safety and hurts education. But it also hurts businesses, because police officers and firefighters and teachers, without a paycheck, aren't going to be buying things in the stores or eating in the restaurants or spending their money. The President said let's take some money and help States and localities rehire and put those teachers back in the classroom and put those firefighters back on the apparatus and put those cops back on the beat. We've never voted on that proposal.

And finally, the President said, look, we cut Social Security taxes, we cut the payroll tax for really all working Americans in 2010, at the end of 2010,

and that tax cut is about to expire; and if we let it expire, it will be about a \$1,000 tax increase for middle class Americans, which will not only hurt those families, but it will hurt the economy by draining their purchasing power from the economy, so let's extend that Tax Code. We did manage to do that for 2 months, and that's about to expire, now, in 27 days. We'll be back at that by the end of the month.

Now, if that's the urgent agenda for the country, what are we doing today? What we're doing today is passing a change in budget rules that essentially says the following: If you're really optimistic about what a tax cut might do to the economy, you can assume that optimism for the purposes of keeping score in the budget. This is like a family sitting down and planning its budget at the beginning of the year and saying, I think we're both going to get a raise this year. You're a teacher. I'm a truck driver. I think we're both going to get about a 5 or 10 percent raise, so let's plan the family budget based on that. I think scarcely any of the constituents who send us here would ever draft their family budget in that way. If this rule goes through, that's the way we'll draft the Federal budget.

It has become an article of faith, religious orthodoxy on the Republican side that tax cuts produce higher revenues. At best, the evidence is ambiguous. Most the time it doesn't. Maybe sometimes it does, but I don't think—I think we should respect the establishment clause of the Constitution and separate church and State. If the Republican religion is the tax cuts always produce more revenue, I don't think we should write that religion into the law of the country because it's not always right.

□ 1300

Now, beyond that, if we go home to our constituents, our middle class families, our businesses, and they ask: What did you do this week?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. They ask: What did you do this week? Did you get any bills that would bring more customers in? Did you help me grow more jobs?

Now, here's what we did: We adjusted the CBO baseline for the consideration of future revenue policies of the United States.

This is a very interesting graduate school debate. Maybe some day if we're flush with cash again it would be a good policy debate. It is the wrong bill at the wrong time, and it shouldn't be on the House floor.

Let's at least put up for a vote the four specific ideas brought to this Chamber by the President of the United States to regrow the middle class and put Americans back to work. And when we've done the real job that we're sent here to do, then we can get to the graduate school seminar on congressional budgeting.

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

I always enjoy listening to my friend from New Jersey because inevitably I agree with about the first six things he says. All of the facts on which he bases his conclusions, I agree on. And I just reach a completely different set of conclusions.

My friend said that one of the challenges we have in America is that folks think that they're working as hard as they can but they're going backwards instead of forwards. I get that in my district, too. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. Hope is so powerful in this country, when we lose that hope, we really get ourselves in a world of hurt. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

The gentleman says we can't get the economy back on track unless we get our small businesses moving again. The gentleman is absolutely right. I know it to be true. I see it in my Chambers of Commerce, Mr. Speaker.

But what then? Agreeing that the American people are working as hard as they can, and they feel like they're going backwards. Agreeing that the small business community is working as hard as it can, but it can't find enough consumers. What's the answer?

My friend from New Jersey laid out, as my President did, four giant spending initiatives with borrowed money that he believes if only the Federal Government would get involved in, we could regenerate those two needy areas. And my constituents tell me exactly the opposite, Mr. Speaker.

My constituents say: ROB, if only the Federal Government were not involved in my life, if only the Federal Government were not borrowing all of this money, if only the Federal Government would leave us alone and let us succeed. The government is not the solution, they tell me; the government is the problem.

These two bills today, sadly, I again agree with my friend, do nothing to stop the government from being a problem. And in fairness, the Budget Committee is not in that business. The Budget Committee is in the planning of the financial future business. We need the authorizing committees to actually shrink the size and scope of government.

But what these two bills do, and it troubles me, candidly, it troubles me that it's even an area of debate. What these two bills do is one thing and one thing only, and that's provide additional arrows in the quiver of information that we provide to the American people about the American fiscal situation.

And on days like today, Mr. Speaker, with challenges like we have today, the American people deserve the truth. It's not always easy to say it, but we owe it to them to say it, and these two bills move us in that direction.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for his friendship and his compliment, and it's a pleasure to serve with him. I would just ask him on the specifics: Do you favor a tax cut for small businesses that hire people?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I absolutely believe that our small businesses are overtaxed today. As the gentleman knows, I've introduced the most cosponsored piece of fundamental tax reform legislation in this House, another version of which has been introduced in the Senate, and has more cosponsors than any other fundamental reform bill in the Senate. And what does that bill do—called the FAIR Tax, H.R. 25, Mr. Speaker, in the House—it abolishes small business taxes entirely. It recognizes the economic truth that businesses don't pay taxes, consumers pay taxes.

I absolutely agree, I don't want to just do a cut, I would say to my friend. I want to abolish those taxes altogether.

And what Congressman PRICE's Pro-Growth Budgeting Act would do is share with the American people, because we know that's going to lose money in year one because we're cutting taxes. The only way the government gets money is from taxes. You reduce taxes, that's a loss in year one. What that bill would do, Mr. Speaker, is provide the secondary impact, the tertiary impact, share with the American people.

Well, what happens in year two? It's like going to college, Mr. Speaker. When you go to college, you lose money. It's a drain on your bank account. And if you equate the drain on your bank account of going to college the same as the drain on your bank account of going to McDonald's, you're going to make some bad decisions. You've got to know the impact of those down the road.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. I'm familiar with his FAIR Tax. I respectfully disagree because I think it imposes a national sales tax, which I don't support. But let me ask two further questions, and I thank him for his time.

Do you think that we should put up for a vote the idea of cutting taxes for small businesses that hire people, and if so, how would you vote on it?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, and seeing the ranking member of the Budget Committee sitting there to my friend's right, I look forward—and speaking candidly to the gentleman, if we bring a budget to this floor that doesn't allow us a vote on cutting exactly the kind of taxes you're talking about, not only will I be disappointed, I'll be voting "no." We're absolutely going to bring a budget to the floor that is going to cut those taxes, that is going to lower the burden on the American taxpayer so that we can get this economy going again.

Again, these are issues that we agree on across the aisle, Mr. Speaker. It's important that we look at the same facts. When we look at the same facts, even as we are today, we can sometimes come to different conclusions. What these two bills do today is just make sure that we're looking at the same set of facts—not just us, but all of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS from Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of having our next speaker be the ranking member of the Budget Committee to discuss these budgetary matters that have been discussed by my friend on the other side of the aisle.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on H.R. 3558, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal to make sure that Members of Congress do not receive a cost-of-living adjustment to our pay in 2013.

At this time, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), and more time, if needed.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS. Before I say a word about the legislation which Members of Congress would have an opportunity to vote on if we defeat the previous question, I just want to say a word about the bills that are the subject of the rule here today.

Mr. HOYER. Would my friend yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would be very happy to yield to Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding.

If Members in fact, not for political gamesmanship, want to vote to restrain and eliminate their COLA this year, they have an opportunity to do that segregated from any other issue on the previous question. I would urge Members, if they want to cap congressional salaries next year at current levels, they vote against the previous question when it is called.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank Mr. HOYER.

Reclaiming my time, with respect to the two bills that are the subject of this rule, we are going to have more time to debate them later. I would just say to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) that the American people would love to be able to wish away inflation. I just came from a hearing in the Budget Committee. I'm sure the Chairman of the Federal Reserve would love to be able to wish away inflation.

What the gentleman is proposing is that we put together a budget that, unfortunately, would get more and more misleading over time, a baseline for our budget, because it would simply wish away inflation.

With respect to the other bill, as some of my colleagues, including the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), have pointed out, what it does is create this mirage that somehow by providing tax breaks for folks at the

very top, you're going to get the economy moving when in fact the most recent Congressional Budget Office analysis shows that at the end of the 10-year period, if you do that, because you add more to the deficit, you actually slow down economic growth. Unfortunately, the way they've got this framed, we don't get that analysis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's one thing that we can do to show families across the country that we get it, that we realize that they're struggling, and that is, every Member of Congress should set an example by voting for legislation that says in these tough times, we are not going to take for ourselves a cost-of-living increase. If Members vote to defeat the previous question, they'll have an opportunity to vote up or down on it.

Now, as Mr. HOYER said, yesterday there was a piece of legislation on the floor that said we're only going to limit the COLA for Members of Congress if we also punish other Federal employees who have been serving this country, employees who have already contributed in the last 2 years \$60 billion to reducing the deficit, folks like people in the intelligence community who helped track down Osama bin Laden and folks who were helping protect the safety of the food supply.

□ 1310

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman.

I think we should be willing to stand up in front of the American people and just have a clean up-or-down vote, just have a clean up-or-down vote on making the statement that we Members of Congress understand how people are struggling and we're not going to take a cost-of-living increase this year. We haven't taken it for the last couple of years. The country is still struggling and people are still struggling.

My friend mentioned American families talking around the kitchen table looking at the budget. Let's show that we understand the reality that many of them are facing. Members of Congress can afford to lead by example, and I hope we will. It will be an important statement, I think, of where this Congress stands.

So, again, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for his leadership. I know at the appropriate time he's going to call for the previous question. If you want to vote to make sure that we pass legislation to not provide cost-of-living increase raises to Members of Congress, then you should vote to defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The last point I would make is that it's very possible

the Senate will not take up the piece of legislation that the House passed yesterday because many of them may not want to punish Federal employees. At the same time, this provision that we're offering, being a clean up-or-down vote, the Senate would have to make a judgment as to whether or not to vote up or down on the question of congressional pay.

So I hope all of our colleagues will vote to defeat the previous question so we can send this important message and make this statement.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again find areas of agreement with my colleagues.

I, too, don't know what will happen with the very fine piece of legislation we sent to the Senate yesterday. If experience is any indicator, it will sit there and do nothing, as have all the other fine pieces of job-creation legislation that we've sent to the Senate. I take no pleasure in that, but I share the gentleman's frustration with fearing that fate.

I also share the gentleman's belief that we need to show the American people sitting around the dinner table that we get it. But when Congress sits around the committee table to budget, we say, okay, if rent is \$1,000 this year, let's just go ahead and plan to pay \$1,100 next year and then \$1,200 the year after that and \$1,300 the year after that. Let's just plan to do it. Let's just guess the money is going to be there.

But that's not what the American families get to do. American families have to say, if rent is \$1,000 this year and rent goes to \$1,100 next year, I've got to find something to cut. I'm not getting a pay raise. I don't see that increase coming through. The economy is not getting better for me. I've got to make those tough choices.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to be honest with folks—and we have to be honest with folks—we've got to tell them there's no spigot of money running on Capitol Hill. If there were, it would be theirs. But there is no spigot of money on Capitol Hill.

And it makes me feel so good to be a freshman Member in this body—more importantly, while it might have been true for the last 50 years that Congress just assumed every year it would spend more than it did the last, not this Congress, not my colleagues and I working together, Mr. Speaker. What we've said is we know there are not unlimited funds. We know the American people don't have more to contribute. We know that the time for tough choices was before, but it was put off, it was delayed and it was ignored, and the time for tough choices then falls to us. And we've been making them. It's not been easy. It's not areas that we always find agreement on, but we battle through it. When we get to the end of the day, we spent less in 2011 than we did in 2010 in our appropriations bills. We spent less in 2012 than we did in 2011, and I hope that's something that the American people will be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would say to my friend, I don't have any other speakers. I am prepared to close if my friend is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'm prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I genuinely enjoy working with my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL). He not only brings passion to the job, but an extraordinary intellect. We serve together there on the Rules Committee.

And I don't mean to make light of the fact of what he just got through saying about our telling the American public that we know that there are no large amounts of funds available because we—and I like the fact that he said "we"—put things off, but I can't ignore the fact that a large part of that putting things off came about by virtue of our being in Iraq and Afghanistan and spending \$1 trillion with borrowed money that we did not have and not going to the American people and asking that we sacrifice to pay for them. Seventy-five billion of it came from passing a Medicare prescription plan that we did not pay for. And there are other measures—and I can cite what the Democrats and Republicans are fond of saying and what my mother said to me, which was true. When she was alive, she said, well, if Clinton is going to blame Bush and Bush is going to blame Carter and Carter is going to blame Nixon, why don't you all just blame George Washington and get it all over with if you keep pointing back to somebody else.

But now the rubber has hit the road. With these two bills, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side want to drastically reduce essential government programs and, second, to enshrine tax cuts—and I don't like talking about the rich, as it were. My ultimate plan would call for all of us that are better off to try and do everything we can to help those who are vulnerable in our society and those who are the neediest in our society. But there are those who are in the super category that have not been paying the kind of taxes that many of us pay. You have to put this stuff in real terms.

Last year, I paid \$41,000 in income taxes. If people don't believe that, I'll bring my taxes down here and show it to them sometime. Now, I don't have investments. I don't have offshore bank accounts. I don't have any stock and any bonds, but the simple fact of the matter is a lot of Americans are in the same category as myself. But they want to give tax cuts to those who are wealthy, who paid less than I did and less than people making \$50,000 did. And to my way of thinking, that's just not fair, and that's all that America is looking for is a level playing field, not one that gives the wealthiest more and the poor less.

If they achieve these changes, they'll succeed in creating a budget process that overwhelmingly favors tax cuts

for those that are wealthier while creating near impossible hurdles for ordinary programs to keep pace with the rate of inflation and, thus, stay in business, while Republicans cry that it's still alive. Millions of other Americans will still be struggling to find jobs, to pay off their students loans, to access affordable health care and decent housing, and to survive in an economy that favors those who have the most rather than those who have the least, favors those who are the greediest rather than those who are the neediest.

Dr. Frankenstein was eventually repulsed by the monster that he created. These technical changes to the budget process are equally repulsive, for they add up to a system of government spending that is helpful to those who need it the least and harmful to those who need it the most.

Tying our hands in convoluted knots in order to advance a conservative ideology is not the way to run an honest, objective, transparent, and open budget process. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the previous question amendment in the RECORD along with the 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. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I'm a few years younger than my friend from Florida. I didn't get the benefit of the "Let's Pretend" radio program that he had in his day, but I feel like I've had a little dose of "Let's Pretend" here on the floor today.

□ 1320

I feel a kinship with my friend and what that must have been like to hear that because what we have heard here on the floor is, let's pretend that there's not a serious crisis that we have to get our arms around. Let's pretend that we do have the money to spend more and more and more each and every year. Let's pretend that if we give the American taxpayer more information with which to make informed decisions, that will somehow do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are about common sense. These bills are about ending the Washington double-speak that has been a frustration to folks back home for far, far too long.

I'm joined here on the floor by Sheriff RICH NUGENT from Florida, one of my freshman colleagues here in this body, Mr. Speaker. And as a sheriff, he told us in the Rules Committee yesterday he had some pretty serious responsibilities. There are no easy parts of

being sheriff; it is all got-to-happen kind of business. But when he made his budget year after year after year, even though lives were literally hanging in the balance, he didn't get to assume he could spend more next year than he did the year before. He had to justify each and every dollar.

And that's important because the budget process is convoluted. We're doing our best to make it simpler, but folks might not understand exactly what's at the heart of these issues. And when it comes to this Baseline Reform Act, Mr. Speaker, what it's saying is, if the law of the land has a program, let's say we're buying flags to fly over the United States Capitol, if that program is slated to last for 10 years, the CBO will fund it for 10 years, they will estimate it for 10 years. If it's estimated to last for 5 years, CBO will estimate it for 5 years. And if it's supposed to last for 1 year, they'll do it for 1 year. What they won't do is say that just because the entire Congress is spending \$50 million, that next year the Congress will be able to spend \$60 million because of inflation. What it says is: don't guess.

If the Congress wants to speak to how much money should be spent, the Congress should speak. And in fact we do, day in and day out, mandatory spending, appropriation spending. But the CBO should not be asked to guess. If you want to know what the challenge is, Mr. Speaker, we heard it in the Budget Committee yesterday when the CBO Director came to testify. We talk so much about the Bush-Obama tax cuts expiring. If we kept them all, if we kept all of the tax cuts—in fact, if we went back to the tax cuts that expired in 2011 and we brought those back, too, reduced the American taxpayers' burden to the tune of every single tax cut that's on the books, America's tax burden would still be higher over the next decade than it has been historically over the last 50 years, if we kept them all.

What if you let them go away, Mr. Speaker? If you let all those tax cuts go away, America's tax burden would rise to the highest level in 50 years, the single highest level in 50 years. How much debt would we pay back if we raise the American tax burden that high, Mr. Speaker? Not one penny. Not one penny. How much of our deficit would we get rid of? Would we be able to finally have at least 1 year of a balanced budget? No. We can raise the American tax burden, Mr. Speaker, to the highest level in the last 50 years, and we still wouldn't balance this budget.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge is not revenue. The challenge is spending. And these two bills make sure that both on the revenue side and the spending side the American taxpayer has access to absolutely every bit of information they need to make good decisions.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I again ask my colleagues for their strong support of this rule and their strong support for the two underlying pieces of legislation.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question to allow us to bring up H.R. 3858, which would freeze salaries for Members of Congress for another year through 2013.

I have consistently supported and voted for freezing member salaries, yet I along with 116 other members—in bipartisan fashion—opposed a bill last night that the Republican Leadership mischaracterized as doing just that. In fact, that bill was nothing more than a Trojan Horse to allow House Republicans to once again use federal employees as a punching bag.

My Republican colleagues thought they were being clever by pairing a continued freeze on member pay with a continued freeze on federal employees. As one reporter correctly pointed out, it was nothing more than a cynical, political dare from House Republicans so they could run "gotcha" ads against those who opposed it.

Of course, the Republican leadership conveniently ignores the fact that our dedicated federal employees already have had their pay frozen for two years, contributing \$60 billion to our deficit reduction efforts.

Just 14 percent of our 2.3 million federal employees live within the National Capital region. The rest provide vital services in communities throughout America every day. They guard our borders, protect the safety of airline travel, fight forest fires, and track down online child predators. So following the cynical approach of House Republicans, one might argue that passage of last night's bill could aid and abet terrorists, cross-border gun runners, and child pornographers, right?

The public holds us responsible for getting our fiscal house in order, and it is appropriate that we continue the pay freeze on member salaries given the current situation. Continuing to go after our civilian workforce not only damages the public service profession, but it also puts at risk those services on which our public relies on a daily basis.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 534 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. 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. 3858) to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during 2013. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon re-

jection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes 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 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3630.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—238

Adams	Denham	Hensarling
Akin	Dent	Herger
Alexander	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Amodei	Dold	Huizenga (MI)
Austria	Dreier	Hultgren
Bachmann	Duffy	Hunter
Bachus	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Bartletta	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bartlett	Ellmers	Jenkins
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Bass (NH)	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Berg	Fitzpatrick	Jones
Biggert	Flake	Jordan
Bilbray	Fleischmann	Kelly
Bilirakis	Fleming	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Flores	King (NY)
Black	Forbes	Kingston
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Bonner	Foxx	Kline
Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Galleghy	Lance
Brooks	Gardner	Landry
Broun (GA)	Garrett	Lankford
Buchanan	Gerlach	Latham
Bucshon	Gibbs	LaTourette
Buerkle	Gibson	Latta
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Calvert	Goodlatte	Long
Camp	Gosar	Lucas
Campbell	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Canseco	Granger	Lummis
Cantor	Graves (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Capito	Graves (MO)	E.
Carter	Griffin (AR)	Manzullo
Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	Marchant
Chabot	Grimm	Marino
Chaffetz	Guinta	Matheson
Coble	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)
Coffman (CO)	Hall	McCaul
Cole	Hanna	McClintock
Conaway	Harper	McCotter
Cravaack	Harris	McHenry
Crawford	Hartzler	McKeon
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Culberson	Hayworth	McMorris
Davis (KY)	Heck	Rodgers

Meehan	Renacci	Smith (NE)
Mica	Ribble	Smith (TX)
Miller (FL)	Rigell	Southerland
Miller (MI)	Rivera	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Roby	Stivers
Mulvaney	Roe (TN)	Stutzman
Murphy (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Nadler	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Noem	Rokita	Tiberi
Nugent	Rooney	Tipton
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner (NY)
Nunnelee	Roskam	Turner (OH)
Olson	Ross (FL)	Upton
Palazzo	Royce	Walberg
Paulsen	Runyan	Walden
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Walsh (IL)
Pence	Scalise	Webster
Petri	Schilling	West
Pitts	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Platts	Schock	Whitfield
Poe (TX)	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Pompeo	Scott (SC)	Wittman
Posey	Scott, Austin	Womack
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Quayle	Sessions	Yoder
Reed	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Rehberg	Shuster	Young (FL)
Reichert	Simpson	Young (IN)

NAYS—177

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

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Filmer	Kaptur
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Honda	Mack
Clyburn	Israel	

Olver Rothman (NJ) Sires
Paul Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ)

□ 1349

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. RICHARDSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated against: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 21, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21, I put my card in the machine and voted “nay,” but my vote was not 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 238, noes 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

AYES—238

Adams	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Alexander	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Jones
Amodei	Ellmers	Jordan
Austria	Emerson	Kelly
Bachmann	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bachus	Fincher	King (NY)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Bartlett	Flake	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Kissell
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Kline
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Berg	Forbes	Lamborn
Biggart	Fortenberry	Lance
Bilbray	Fox	Landry
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Black	Galleghy	Latta
Blackburn	Gardner	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Garrett	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Gerlach	Long
Boren	Gibbs	Lucas
Boustany	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis
Brooks	Gohmert	Lungren, Daniel
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	E.
Buchanan	Gosar	Manzullo
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marchant
Buerkle	Granger	Marino
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Matheson
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McCaul
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McClintock
Campbell	Grimm	McCotter
Canseco	Guinta	McHenry
Cantor	Guthrie	McKeon
Capito	Hall	McKinley
Carter	Hanna	McMorris
Cassidy	Harper	Rodgers
Chabot	Harris	Meehan
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mica
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Cole	Heck	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Cravaack	Herger	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Myrick
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Culberson	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Denham	Hultgren	Nugent
Dent	Hunter	Nunes
DesJarlais	Hurt	Nunnelee
Diaz-Balart	Issa	Olson
Dold	Jenkins	Palazzo

Paulsen	Rooney
Pearce	Ros-Lehtinen
Pence	Roskam
Petri	Ross (FL)
Pitts	Royce
Platts	Runyan
Poe (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Pompeo	Scalise
Posey	Schilling
Price (GA)	Schmidt
Quayle	Schock
Reed	Schweikert
Rehberg	Scott (SC)
Reichert	Scott, Austin
Renacci	Sensenbrenner
Ribble	Sessions
Rigell	Shimkus
Rivera	Shuster
Roby	Simpson
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Southerland
Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Rohrabacher	Stivers
Rokita	Stutzman

NOES—179

Ackerman	Fudge
Altmire	Garamendi
Andrews	Gonzalez
Baca	Green, Al
Baldwin	Green, Gene
Barrow	Grijalva
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez
Becerra	Hahn
Berkley	Hanabusa
Berman	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Higgins
Blumenauer	Himes
Boswell	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Hochul
Braley (IA)	Hochul
Brown (FL)	Holden
Butterfield	Holt
Capps	Honda
Capuano	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Inslee
Carson (KY)	Jackson (IL)
Carnahan	Jackson Lee
Carney	(TX)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Keating
Cicilline	Kildee
Clarke (MI)	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Lee (CA)
Connolly (VA)	Levin
Conyers	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski
Costa	Loeb sack
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowey
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Lynch
Cuellar	Maloney
Cummings	Markey
Davis (CA)	Matsui
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)
DeFazio	McCollum
DeGette	McDermott
DeLauro	McGovern
Deutch	McIntyre
Dingell	Dicks
Doggett	Meeks
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud
Doyle	Miller (NC)
Edwards	Miller, George
Ellison	Moore
Engel	Moran
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)
Farr	Nadler
Fattah	Napolitano
Frank (MA)	Neal
	Olver

NOT VOTING—15

Akin	Hirono
Carson (IN)	Israel
Davis (KY)	Kaptur
Filner	LaTourette
Hinchey	Mack

Sullivan	Terry
Thompson (PA)	Thornberry
Tiberi	Tipton
Turner (NY)	Turner (OH)
Upton	Walberg
Walden	Walsh (IL)
Webster	West
Westmoreland	Whitfield
Wilson (SC)	Wittman
Wolf	Womack
Woodall	Yoder
Young (AK)	Young (FL)
Young (IN)	

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was detained briefly for the vote. If I'd been in Chamber I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3630, TEMPORARY PAY-ROLL TAX CUT CONTINUATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3630) offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, nays 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—184

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

□ 1357

So the resolution was agreed to.

Richardson	Serrano	Velázquez
Richmond	Sewell	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Sherman	Walz (MN)
Rush	Shuler	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Schultz
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Waters
T.	Speler	Watt
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Waxman
Sarbanes	Sutton	Welch
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Schrader	Tierney	Yarmuth
Schwartz	Tonko	Young (AK)
Scott (VA)	Towns	
Scott, David	Van Hollen	

NAYS—236

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

NOT VOTING—12

Carson (IN)	Israel	Paul
Filner	Jenkins	Rothman (NJ)
Flores	Kapture	Roybal-Allard
Hinchey	Mack	Sires

□ 1406

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 23, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 23 on the Michaud (Maine) motion to instruct, H.R. 3630, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “nay” when I should have voted “yea.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD following rollcall vote No. 23.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3764.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as cosponsor of H.R. 3764.

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

There was no objection.

PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2012

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3582.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 534 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. 3582.

□ 1405

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. 3582) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, with Mr. DOLD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, it goes without saying but it unfortunately bears repeating, our budget process is broken.

Last year, the Senate didn't pass the budget. The year before that, the Senate didn't pass the budget. This year, they may not pass one again. The greatest threat to our economy now and our children's future is a fiscal threat, a debt threat, and yet we are on an unsustainable path; and one of the reasons, after the lack of political will among our colleagues, is the budget process. It has not been reformed substantially since 1974. As a result, many Members of this body have put years and hours of effort into fixing this broken process.

I want to say Mr. DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee, and Mr. HENSARLING, our conference chairman, in particular have been two individuals who have put so much work into this. As a result, 10 bills are coming out of the Budget Committee. Ten members of the Budget Committee are putting together an effort to fix this broken Federal budget process to bring more accountability, more transparency, and better results so that we can fix this problem.

This bill is authored by Dr. PRICE of Georgia, which simply says, while we consider large fiscal pieces of legislation, let's have the CBO add an analysis so we know what it does to the economy. That's not a lot to ask. A lot is happening, and we want to make sure that, as we judge large fiscal legislation, that we have the kind of an analysis we need to better judge what it does for our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the author of this bill, Mr. PRICE.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will be recognized.

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

□ 1410

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

Let me start by saying to the chairman of the Budget Committee and all of the members of the Budget Committee that we appreciated the dialogue that we've had on the budget reform bills. There is one bill that I understand we'll take up next week where at least the chairman of the committee and myself were able to find some bipartisan consensus. That's the expedited procedure, legislative line item veto bill where you've got some Democrats and Republicans in favor of it, and some Democrats and Republicans against it.

But with respect to the two bills before us today, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid they fall far short. In fact, I think they would take us in the wrong direction.

First of all, just to be clear, because we'll probably hear a lot of talk today

about the importance of moving the economy forward and jobs: Neither of these bills will do one thing, not one thing to help get our economy moving again. They won't do one thing to create and help create jobs in this country.

Now, with respect to this particular piece of legislation that we're dealing with now, which actually is a step toward requiring some kind of dynamic scoring by CBO and the Joint Tax Committee, it's very misleading. Here's the concern. If you look at the current House rules, current House rules already require that we have an economic analysis for major tax legislation.

What this particular piece of legislation does is say, yeah, we're going to ask for an economic analysis, but it tilts the playing field in favor of one kind of fiscal action. So, for example, it says we're going to consider whether or not tax policy affects the economy. But when it comes to major investments, for example, infrastructure, transportation, investments that we all know have historically helped this country grow, whether it was the highway system, whether it's been investments in other major infrastructure around this country, they've all had major economic growth benefits, but those are specifically excluded to the extent that they're involved in the appropriations process. So we're looking at only one-half of the equation, revenues, not important investments, at least to the extent that they go through the appropriations process.

Now, a word on the revenue piece. What's very curious is the way this bill is drafted. We would not get an economic analysis on one of the most consequential tax changes this body could take in the remaining year. We all know that we face the question of what to do with the expiring tax cuts, the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, both on middle-income Americans, but also the tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the folks at the very top, the top 2 percent.

Now, under current House rules, we get an analysis of any legislation that was designed to extend those tax cuts going forward. But the way this is designed, the statute, we're going to get an answer that says well, we're already assuming the tax cuts for the folks at the very top are going to go on forever. Now, the reason that's very curious is that the Congressional Budget Office has in fact already done analyses in the past of what might happen if we were to extend the tax cuts for the folks at the very top.

And if you look at their analyses, and they did one in September of 2010, you'll find at the end of the 10-year period, they find that those tax cuts will slow down economic growth. Why would that be? Because those tax cuts add to the deficit. That deficit crowds out private investment. That creates a drag on the economy. We had a similar conclusion from testimony that was

given by the Joint Tax Committee in September of 2011, just last September. The same conclusion. At the end of the 10-year period, you'd actually have a slowdown in economic growth.

So it's a little perplexing to find out why we're drafting something that would not require a study of one of the most consequential decisions that this Congress might make.

And so for those reasons, Mr. Chairman—one, that we're not even counting the investment side of the equation with respect to the consequences for economic growth, and number two, the fact that this isn't even going to trigger an analysis of one of the biggest revenue decisions this body will make—we have to oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me first begin by thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee, Congressman RYAN, who has put in an incredible amount of work, diligent work and commitment, in reforming our broken budget process. He and the entire committee staff have worked tirelessly to bring about more accountability and transparency to this process. I thank them for that. In fact, all Americans should thank them.

Budget reforms would also not be in the spotlight were it not for the work of a number of Members, but there's one Member I would like to acknowledge specifically, and that's our conference chairman, JEB HENSARLING, who has been steadfast for many years championing the Family Budget Protection Act of 2007 and the Spending Deficit and Debt Control Act of 2009 that focused on reforming our broken budget process.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that our number one priority in this body must be enacting policies that help our economy create jobs. It is clear that the President's policies have failed and they are making the economy worse. Because the President clearly can't run on his record, he has denigrated into the process of division and envy politics in this country. Terribly distressing.

House Republicans have a plan. We have got a jobs plan. It is a plan to put the American people back to work, and so we are delighted to be able to have an opportunity today to talk about one part of that plan.

The economy is growing way too slowly, as you well know. Not nearly enough jobs are being created, which is one of the reasons that we introduced H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, which as my colleague said, could be titled the dynamic scoring act.

As you well know, the current model for the CBO determines the cost of legislative proposals by a static method that doesn't take into account macroeconomic factors like increasing revenue, reducing the deficit, paying down the debt, things that have economic consequences in our society.

Economists from across the political spectrum agree that major legislation considered by Congress has significant effects on economic growth, and we ought to be looking at that consequence. While current law requires the Congressional Budget Office to provide Congress with information on the fiscal impact of all legislation that is reported from the committee, there is no requirement for analysis of the economic impact. This bill remedies that issue by requiring the Congressional Budget Office to provide macroeconomic analysis for all bills that have a budgetary impact—this is the threshold—a budgetary impact of more than 0.25 percent of the gross domestic product. That equals, Mr. Chairman, about \$39 billion in 2012.

This does not change the traditional CBO static scoring method at all. This analysis will be in addition to current law. It gives Members of Congress more information around which they are able to then make appropriate decisions.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to remember that current policy is what has been utilized as a baseline for the administration, for the Simpson-Bowles Commission, for Domenici-Rivlin. All of those used current policy. This notion that we ought not be using current policy as a baseline is simply folly.

In 2011, only six bills met the 0.25 percent GDP threshold, which means that the CBO ought not be overworked by having this opportunity to provide greater information to Members of Congress.

Everybody knows that CBO scores in the past have been significantly inaccurate. The Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 is but one example. The CBO estimated that that would cost about \$206 billion. In fact, it was \$124 billion. Mr. Chairman, that is a huge difference.

Past CBO macroeconomic work has shown that Federal deficits and tax rates do, in fact, impact the economy. CBO itself has said:

"The reduction in Federal borrowing that would result from smaller deficits would induce greater national saving and investment and thereby increase output and income."

Mr. Chairman, more information from CBO will highlight the need to act positively on fiscal policy here in Congress. And maybe as importantly, this bill will also encourage pro-growth policy ideas from all of our colleagues that will help get our economy back on track, create jobs, and protect hard-working taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

At the outset of his remarks, Mr. PRICE referenced the economy and the President's plan. I think it is important to remember that when the President came before this body for the first

State of the Union address, the economy was in absolute free fall. In fact, we now know it was even worse than people realized at the time. We were losing GDP at a rate of more than 7 percent.

□ 1420

We were losing over 800,000 jobs in this country every month. And as a result of the passage of the recovery bill, the Congressional Budget Office, the same nonpartisan, independent office that this bill is asking for a report from, has told Congress that because of the recovery bill, we saved or created up to 3 million jobs in 2010. Those are the facts reported by the Congressional Budget Office, that we helped reduce unemployment in this country in 2011 by over 1.4 percent.

When you're headed down fast, you've got to stop the slide, pick yourself up and begin to climb back up. And that's what the President and the earlier Congress did together.

Now, are we where we want to be? Of course not. That's why it's important that we begin to move forward on the jobs plan the President asked this Congress to take up last September, major new investment in infrastructure, stuff that will really help move the economy. We haven't voted on that. I hope we'll move forward on the payroll tax cut extension for 160 million Americans. We should do that quickly.

So let's remember that this economy was in tatters. It has at least gotten a little bit back up on its feet, but we have a whole, long way to go still. Unfortunately, this bill today won't do one thing—not a thing—to help it.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, and I just want to say at the outset what a pleasure it is to work with the chairman, the ranking member, and the members of the Budget Committee who, I believe, are sincerely committed to try to help deal with the deficit situation.

But what I find rather baffling, I'll have to admit, is that my colleagues in the majority continue to turn a blind eye to the power of investing so that we can create a major dynamic economy in human capital and in our infrastructure. Their only interest, almost to the point of a fetish, is to favor tax cuts as the only ways and means of growing our economy. And this Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, H.R. 3582, is just yet another example of that, Mr. Chairman.

This legislation would allow Republicans to really understate the effect of tax cuts on the deficit—hiding their impact, masking their real cost, and paving the way for extensions and new tax policies that favor tax cuts only. I mean, Republicans are trying to carve—I have to admire their persistence—they want to carve in supply-side economics and “trickle down,” no matter how long it's failed, into our body

politic forever. As my dad used to say, money doesn't grow on trees. And this is the “money grows on trees strategy.”

I'm sorry, but my colleagues have such a strong bias against any investments that are not tax cuts; and it shows a lack of interest in the investments, I believe, that really have the power to dig us out of this hole we're in, investments like early childhood education. Why don't we do dynamic scoring on that? Health care, what about scoring the impact of what providing health care would do in terms of decreasing the costs to our companies? The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Ms. MOORE. I hear from all walks of life that a transportation budget, reauthorizing the transportation budget, would be such a boon to our economy, training people for the 21st-century skills. But yet here's another backdoor approach to include the Bush-era tax cuts into the baseline, and we already know that that's \$4 trillion worth of debt.

By only allowing for the dynamic effects of tax cuts—not the effect of investments in a better way of life for us all—the Republicans are showing their true colors again.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), our conference chairman.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him and I thank our Budget Committee chairman for their kind words and their great leadership for fiscal responsibility and job growth.

Mr. Chairman, indeed, on Monday, the American people were reminded, yet again, that this President's policies have failed. It was on Monday when the Congressional Budget Office announced that this President is on track to be the first President in American history to produce trillion-dollar deficits every single year that he's in office. Part of what has created these trillion-dollar deficits is the failed stimulus program, which my friends on the other side of the aisle still tout.

The gentleman from Georgia is right: because the President can't run for reelection on his failed policies, he has, unfortunately, resorted to the politics of division and envy. But, Mr. Chairman, the American public isn't interested in a division; they're not interested in envy. They are interested in jobs. And in that respect, this President hasn't just failed; he has made our economy worse.

Almost 2 million more Americans have lost their jobs under this President's policies. We have the longest sustained period of high unemployment since the Great Depression. One in seven are on food stamps. That's the reason, Mr. Chairman, that House Republicans have a plan for America's job creators. Yesterday, we passed a bill

trying to repeal a part of the job-killing health care plan of the President.

Well, today is a very modest step. It says, do you know what, before we pass another plan like the President's health care plan, wouldn't it be nice to get that report from CBO that estimated another million of our fellow countrymen might just lose their jobs. Shouldn't we empower Members of Congress with more information? Let's get the jobs that the American people so richly need and deserve. Let's empower Members of Congress to know how these pieces of legislation are going to impact jobs and economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, we must pass the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope if our Republican colleagues are going to keep asking CBO for these reports that they'll read those reports, because if you read the CBO's analysis of the impact of the Recovery Act, they've been very clear that in the year 2010, it helped save or create up to 3 million jobs. That's what CBO says. It also says in the year 2011, it helped reduce unemployment by over 1.4 percent. That's what the Congressional Budget Office says.

Now we're asking the Congressional Budget Office for a study here. I think we should take into account in some of our comments their findings that they've already delivered to us. With respect to the situation the President inherited, again, the economy was in total free fall.

Yes, it's kind of like when you're trying to run up an escalator that's going down really fast. When you first get on, you're going to go down until you stop it, until you stop it, and then you take action to try to run. You're trying to run in place through the actions you're taking. First you don't feel like you're moving up, but we're finally moving up.

The President inherited an economy like an escalator going down very fast. And we passed a recovery bill. It stopped the free fall and stabilized the economy. We need to take more steps; and I wish our colleagues, Republican colleagues, would bring to the floor some of the bills that will help it. But let's just remember that for the last 22 months, we've actually created up to 3 million jobs, in fact, over 3 million jobs in the economy. Are we where we want to be? No. But let's not go back. Let's not go back to the same policies that got us into this same mess to begin with.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) who has been very focused on budget issues for a long time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to note that today we could be debating a jobs package. We could be debating a comprehensive effort to balance our budget. But instead, we're focusing on a bill to enshrine failed “trickle-down” policies in our already flawed budget process.

Now, let's be clear: this bill is designed to make it easier to pass large tax cuts without having to find real savings in our current budget. It relies on the thoroughly discredited notion that tax cuts do not add to the deficit, that they magically pay for themselves.

This is the height of fiscal recklessness and exemplifies the old adage that "insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results."

After all, Congress experimented with this approach when it passed the Reagan tax cuts and again with the George W. Bush tax cuts.

□ 1430

And the results were soaring deficits. We now find ourselves in crippling debt, unable to pay for needed investments in our crumbling infrastructure, unable to pay for the education and retraining required to maintain American competitiveness in the ever changing global economy.

So I'll vote "no" on this tried and failed approach. And I ask colleagues to return to the pay-as-you-go rules that helped lead us to the balanced budgets and the economic prosperity of the 1990s.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It's curious to listen to my colleague talk about his concern about the debt when, in the last 4 years, the 4 years of this administration, we have the first 4 years in the history of this country where our debt has been greater than \$1 trillion—over \$5 trillion built up in debt by this administration.

I also want to point out to my friend from Maryland, who talks about the wonderful impact of the stimulus bill and how it has created all sorts of jobs and increased GDP, as you well know, Mr. Chairman, as our Members and colleagues know, the Congressional Budget Office periodically updates the information that they provide as it relates to the estimates about what has occurred in the economy from policy here in Washington. The most recent update shows an 8 percent increase in the real GDP growth from the stimulus bill—now, that's down from 1.7 percent growth, and that is down from their estimate before—and a .4 percent reduction in the unemployment rate, which is down from a .8 percent reduction in the unemployment rate.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we wait another quarter or two, we're going to see that, in fact, the real information is out, and that is that the stimulus bill had no effect or a detrimental effect on the economy.

With that, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it's absolutely critical that lawmakers in Washington are informed and aware of how legislation that we introduce will impact our country's economic growth, so today I rise in strong support of the Pro-Growth

Budgeting Act, which will basically give us that information.

If this legislation had already been passed, perhaps our economy wouldn't be saddled with the effects of the President's health care takeover, the stimulus bill, and other legislative nightmares all produced by my Democrat colleagues. These only tie up our small businesses, bog down our job creators, and further bury our economy in massive Federal debt.

If we had any idea of how chilling the effects of these bills would be on jobs and our economy, maybe we would have done the smart thing, which would have been not to pass them and instead stayed within the boundaries of our budget. Except, well, I forgot. We still don't have a budget, thanks to the obstruction of Democratic Leader HARRY REID.

That's why I introduced my Budget or Bust Act just today. It would literally force the House and the Senate to pass a budget or else their salaries would be held hostage until Congress does its job. My bill would also restore the power of the purse to its rightful owner, which our Founding Fathers specifically gave to Congress, not to the President.

I urge my colleagues to support both the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act and my Budget or Bust Act so that we can truly understand how our legislation affects the economy, and so that Washington is finally forced to live within its means and Congress is held responsible and accountable, as hardworking taxpayers deserve.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the Member for yielding.

The simple question now before us is whether it's better for Congress to have more information or less information when it's deliberating on matters that directly affect the economy of our Nation. You'd think the answer would be self-evident, but apparently some Members of this House prefer blissful ignorance rather than going to all of the fuss and bother of actually assessing the full ramifications of the policies that they are enacting. That explains a lot about some of the decisions they've made around here in recent years.

The economy is a dynamic and fast changing thing, responding rapidly to every tax and regulation imposed by government and every dollar that changes hands in markets. Yet the rules under which the Congressional Budget Office operates severely constrain its ability to take this obvious reality into account in the information that it provides us.

This measure doesn't presume to tell the CBO how to do its job or what formula to use in its analysis. It doesn't even change the outmoded static mod-

eling it uses to score the fiscal impact of measures coming before us. All that it says is: Give us the complete picture. If a proposal is going to affect the economy significantly, for good or ill, tell us, tell us what you think and show us why you think so.

I think Patrick Henry summed up this bill perfectly when he said, "For my part, no matter what anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. MCCLINTOCK that more information is helpful. We just don't want to ask for the information in a way that we only get one side of the story.

I hope our colleagues are going to vote for the amendment a little later on the floor that says we should also try and figure out what the economic impact of major investments in infrastructure is through the appropriations process. They've removed that analysis from this bill.

In addition to the fact, it's very curious that when it comes to tax policy, they've written this in a way that when CBO does an analysis of, again, the major decision that would be made by this body in the next few years, whether or not to extend some or all of the 2001/2003 tax cuts, that will show no impact on economic growth because of the way they've written this legislation, when, in fact, we know, at least from earlier CBO reports, that in the out-years, 10 years out, it will actually be a drag on economic growth because it will increase the deficit when you allow the tax cuts for the folks at the top to go on and on and on.

So, yes, we want more information. Let's just not ask CBO for information that is designed to only extract one side of the story. And, unfortunately, that's what the bill does in its current form.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I'm a bit amused, Mr. Chairman, by the tack that the other side is taking on this as they talk about gaming the system, if you will, with this piece of legislation. I would simply call my colleague's attention to the bill itself.

The definition of macroeconomic impact analysis in the bill simply states:

Estimate of changes of economic output, employment, capital stock, tax revenue, an estimate of revenue feedback expected as a result of the enactment of a proposal and the critical assumptions for how they got there.

There isn't any qualitative assessment assigned to this. It's simply, give us more information, as the gentleman from California said.

So it's a bit perplexing why, again, our colleagues on the other side don't want that additional information with which to make decisions, high-quality decisions here in Washington.

With that, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, although the Obama administration may tout signs that the economy is improving, we are still way below past economic recoveries. The reality is the economy is growing too slowly and not creating enough jobs.

Economists agree that legislation considered by Congress can have significant impacts on economic growth, both positive and negative. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office reported this week that we are on track to have our fourth \$1 trillion deficit in a row, despite President Obama's earlier campaign promise to cut the deficit in half by the end of his first term. At such a critical time, we should ensure that all lawmakers have as much information as possible about the effects of proposed legislation on economic growth and job creation.

The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2012 would require CBO to provide lawmakers with a macroeconomic impact analysis for all major legislation reported by a House or Senate committee. The economic analysis would describe the potential economic impact of all major bills or major economic variables, including real gross domestic product, business investment, capital stock, employment, and labor. It would also describe the potential fiscal impacts of the bill, including any estimates of revenue increases or decreases resulting from changes in gross domestic product.

□ 1440

If the last Congress had had this type of real-world economic analysis, it would have never passed the job-killing Democrat takeover of our Nation's health care system in 2010.

In addition, if the last Democratic-led Congress would have known this information when it passed its \$800 billion stimulus bill, it would have known that the elusive millions of jobs that it claimed to create were going to cost about \$400,000 per job. This \$400,000 is about the same amount as the total salaries of seven middle class Americans.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2012, so that we may promote pro-growth policies that will help get our economy back on track, reduce the deficit, and protect hard-working taxpayers.

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

Again, I go back to the fact that you're asking CBO to only give one side of the story, and I would just refer Mr. PRICE, my friend, colleague, to page 3 of the bill, lines 12 through 16, where you say, 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 Senate, in parentheses, except the Committee on Appropriations of each House.

I go back to the fact that every American knows that when we invest in our infrastructure, when the companies invest in their plants and equipment, when we invest in our roads and our bridges and our highways, that can have a positive economic impact. In fact, if this House of Representatives were to take up the President's jobs bill, which he asked us to pass in September, that would invest more in our infrastructure, that would help the economy.

Of course, you wouldn't want to know, apparently, about the positive impact on the economy of the President's jobs bill because that involves investment through the transportation process. So, it does tilt the field in a significant way when it comes to decisions we make here with resources.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my colleague on the Budget Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. This bill, like most that come out here from the Republicans, has a great name. It's a Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. It's not a pro-growth budget—big difference—but a Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. And like so many of the pieces of legislation that they offer us, the substance of the bill does exactly the opposite of the title.

This would better be named the "Dig Deeper Now" legislation, or the "Mandate Voodoo Economics" legislation. It attempts to enshrine Republican dogma that even an elementary arithmetic student would have some question about. It's based on the theology that the best way to get more is to do less; that if you have less revenue coming in, you somehow will eventually get more revenue coming in. And it just hasn't worked that way.

Their approach is much like the alchemist of old, who, when faced with a problem that he could not convert straw into gold, simply responds, give me more straw. They can't get enough straw in the form of tax cuts to talk about at their political conventions. But when they apply them, we don't need dynamic scoring to know what the effect is. We have history, and that history is not very favorable to this whole concept that somehow less means more.

We have the "dynamic" Bush tax cuts to look at and what their effect has been. And the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the effect has been they cost \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion toward the budget deficit that we have, and if we extend the Bush tax cuts for those at the very top, again, it will cost another trillion dollars. That's trillion with a "t" in both cases, and it is a big impact in digging us into the hole that we're in, that we're trying to work our way out of with what should be a Pro-Growth Budget Act, a jobs act, instead of something that is a name that bears no resemblance to the substance of the bill.

How about the experience with economic growth? What American would not like to have the economic growth

of the Clinton years, when the tax rates were actually higher than the experience of the Bush years, where the tax rates may have been lower, but so was the economic growth, almost 4 percent a year under President Clinton, and down to about 2 percent under President Bush from 2001 to 2008.

Likewise, with job growth, dynamic job growth under President Clinton, job losses under President Bush. That's the history, the experience that we have with this theory, this ideology that somehow less revenue means more revenue.

Only yesterday, in the Budget Committee, we heard the testimony of the Congressional Budget Office, objective testimony, that if we extend—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. We heard objective testimony that if we extend all of the Bush tax cuts for the next decade, we will have less economic growth in this country, not more economic growth, as their theology maintains. And the testimony we're hearing is not limited to Democratic witnesses. Even the Republican witnesses who have come before our committees in the past have conceded that these Bush tax cuts did not pay for themselves.

We've seen the result of voodoo economics. We've seen the results of supply side and trickle down. It's time to take a more dynamic approach for the American economy, and that's a jobs bill that will meet the needs of working families across this country instead of playing games with the numbers and trying to show that the impossible is reality.

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

Mr. Chairman, it's kind of like "Alice in Wonderland" actually. I mean, if the gentleman truly wants to have the information that he is demanding, then he ought to be supporting the bill because what he's talking about is dynamism in the economy, and that's what we ought to be looking at, Mr. Chairman. As you know, we need the information to be able to provide us with the kind of data that will allow us to make the best decisions.

For example, this is a chart that shows the employment in this country, and the tax reductions of the last decade demonstrate that employment goes up and unemployment comes down. And then when the stimulus bill that the other side amazingly still wants to tout as the be all and the end all, when it's passed, what happens, Mr. Chairman? Employment plummets. Unemployment skyrockets.

So the gentleman can go back to the nineties, yes, but what we're living in right now is 2012, and the policies aren't working. So what we need to do is be able to provide, hopefully, Members of Congress with more information so they're able to make wiser decisions.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. Just yesterday, the Budget Committee had the opportunity to question the CBO Director about the impact of the President's stimulus on the economy. A few months earlier, his office and mine had a very public debate about the impact of government spending on the economy. When asked to identify a single program, one single program that positively impacted the economy, the CBO could not identify one program.

Then, during the Budget Committee hearing, I asked the Director, is it fair to say that the massive spending of 2009 did not benefit the economy? He said, and I quote: "The extra government spending from the Recovery Act in 2009 boosted the economy in the short term, but we believe, unless there are offsetting changes, the economy will be worse off." From the CBO.

Legislation like the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act will require the CBO to undertake a full analysis of every major legislation, including impacts on the employment and labor supply. Had the previous Congress been able to review the long-term impacts and consequences of a \$1 trillion stimulus boondoggle, perhaps our economy would be better off today. Perhaps the more than 20 million Americans—that's right, 20 million Americans—who are unemployed or underemployed would actually have a job.

Those who care solely about the short-term concern themselves with political gain at the expense of the future. Today I ask my colleagues to support this legislation because they care about the long term, about the next generation, even if it means their short-term political gains cannot be realized.

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

Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the gentleman raised the question of the long term, and it begs the question about why this bill is written in a way such that we would not be requiring an economic analysis of the major change of law that we may be making with respect to tax policy, which would be to extend the 2001, 2003 tax cuts, all or some of them.

□ 1450

Let's talk about the long term because, in fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation which, of course, is the entity that does the tax analysis for the Congressional Budget Office, has said that at the end of that 10-year period, extending those tax cuts actually slows down the economy—page 6 of the testimony of the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation before the House Committee on Ways and Means, September 21, 2011.

What they point out is that at the end of the 10-year period, you're losing

GDP growth. Again, why? Because if you have big tax cuts that are financed by borrowing, as the Republican rules of the House were changed to allow, Hey, we can provide tax cuts for folks at the very top, put it on the credit card, no more pay-as-you-go, that increases the deficit. You increase the deficit, as the economy begins to recover, that's when it really begins to crowd out private investment.

So those tax cuts begin to slow down the economy in the end of the 10-year period, and they're not an efficient use—especially the tax breaks for the folks at the top 2 percent—it's not an efficient means to getting the economy moving again.

We saw in the 1990s under President Clinton we had a higher top marginal tax rate: 20 million jobs were created, booming economic times.

So I'm glad the previous gentlemen raised the issue of the long term. Again, we're all a little perplexed about why this bill is written in a way that the major change in law that we could make either this year or next year with respect to the full or partial extension of the tax cuts wouldn't even trigger this economic analysis. That is astounding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think it's important to point out the CBO Director, indeed, did say the long-term effects of the stimulus are actually depressing, potentially depressing, on the economy. So that's why we need the big picture. That's why we need a dynamic scoring model, an opportunity to look at the macroeconomic impact of legislation that's considered in this Congress in a responsible way.

I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2012.

This would require the CBO to provide lawmakers with macroeconomic impact analysis for major legislation defined by budgetary impact greater than 0.25 percent of annual GDP. Pretty simple.

Current law already requires CBO to provide Congress with the fiscal impact. This bill would require the CBO to give us the economic impact. Now, included in the analysis would be a statement of critical assumptions and also sources of data underlying its estimate, which would provide for maximum transparency.

So if there were questions, we would have the information in front of us so that we could ask additional questions and be sure that we had all of the information in order to make an informed decision.

This is just another tool in our toolkit, and this will help Congress create policy that affects our economy while creating a pro-job agenda, which is on all of our minds and should be our priority. The more information available to policymakers, the better decisions.

There is no panacea in the budget process, but this is one more step in reforming what is a broken process; and we're going to see more information and more bills in the next several weeks talking about this broken process. But this is one more piece to give us one more piece of information.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I just have to emphasize again, I already read from the portion of the bill that says we want economic analyses of major pieces of legislation except from the Committee on Appropriations. Again, transportation and infrastructure investments over the history of our country have provided important economic growth.

The President asked this Congress to take up his infrastructure investment jobs bill last September. Congress hasn't taken it up, and now apparently we don't want to include in the study the positive economic impact that something like that would have.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. What time remains, if I may ask?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman, as he well knows, that current law, section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of '74, requires that CBO produce cost estimates of legislation reported out of every committee except the Committee on Appropriations. To believe that a 1-year appropriations bill could have a CBO assessment of the economic impact 40 years out, which is their appropriate and usual window, it is just nonsensical. So current law simply states that CBO looks at committee action and not appropriations and for good reason.

I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I very much thank my friend from Georgia for yielding. I just want to tell him how proud I am of him for bringing this legislation forward. I know he doesn't need my accolades; but this is the kind of commonsense material that I ran on and that, as a freshman in this body, makes me proud to be able to vote on.

I brought a copy of the legislation with me, Mr. Chairman. I think if you ask folks across the country, they sometimes wonder whether or not we read this legislation.

If folks go to www.thomas.gov, they can actually read the legislation themselves, Mr. Chairman. These things that we're arguing about, they wonder what the truth is. It's only five pages long in its substance.

Let me tell you what it says, Mr. Chairman, if you haven't seen it: The analysis prepared shall describe the potential economic impact of the applicable major bill of resolution on major economic variables, including real GDP, business investment, capital stock, employment, and labor supply.

The analysis shall also talk about revenue increases or decreases that result. The analysis should also specify which models were used, what your sources of data were, and shall provide an explanation as necessary to make the models comprehensible to the public.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides one more tool that the American people and this Congress can use to evaluate the very important legislation that is considered here on this floor.

I hope you will ask your constituents, Mr. Chairman, why is it that folks would oppose giving the American people these answers. You heard me read the bill. All this bill does is provide that information.

I will say to the sponsor of this legislation that information has been missing for far, far too long. I plan to lend my strong support to this legislation. I thank the gentleman for the time and for his courage in bringing this bill forward.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's mistaken. I mean, we do get analyses now with respect to the economic impact. There's a provision in the House rules that I referenced earlier that asked for that, and in fact, Joint Tax has done exactly that. The figures I was reading with respect to the negative impact on growth in the out-years were from a dynamic analysis the Joint Tax Committee has done pursuant to House rules.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will not on my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to be educated by the gentleman if he would yield.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I refer the gentleman to the bill, the piece of the document I've referenced several times already. This kind of work is done.

What you're asking for here is to, again, leave off part of the equation, for example, the recovery bill. The recovery bill was primarily an appropriations bill. Leave off part of the equation, but also when it comes to the revenue piece, skew the request.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1500

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership.

What we're talking about here this afternoon is one of a package of four budget proposals from our Republican friends on the Budget Committee that are, in toto, going to obscure the budgeting process, make it more complex, more expensive, and actually more confusing for the American public.

I agree with what my good friend said about the dynamic scoring. There are already vehicles available to be able to deal with some of these feedback effects but not elevating it to the

level of some sort of official score. Frankly, we've seen when the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, which is established as the impartial scorekeeper, puts out information, like we discussed here today in the Budget Committee, on how much impact the Recovery Act had on employment, on GDP enhancement, on job growth. People just simply refuse to accept the range, the calculations, things that all the independent experts agree upon, including our own official one. So we're going to make their job more confusing; we're going to make it more complex and give the American public a less clear picture.

Get ready folks. My good friend from Georgia wants to deal with freezing all baseline budgets, that are not otherwise specified in law, assuming that there will be no increase for population growth or inflation over 10 years. Everybody in Congress who looks at what has happened over the last 50 years understands there will be some adjustment—we may argue about how much—but if you're going to give the American public an estimate of what is the most likely outcome, having a modest inflation adjustment is the most accurate in terms of what is likely to happen. That would be swept away and an artificial figure established by biennial budgeting.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There is a reason why the number of States, almost all of which used to have biennial budgeting, have moved to annual budgets. It's because they're more accurate; they're less complex; they're less expensive; and it doesn't pose as much of a burden on both the legislative branch and the administration to try and fiddle around with things that we know are inaccurate. Then we're going to have the risk adjustment, which will take something which is already accurately portrayed in terms of the budget, and they're going to be adding and subtracting values that are going to only confuse.

The four of them are an example of why my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to get to work and deal with things that we might agree on, like reforming agriculture. Instead, we're playing games with procedures that are going to give the American public less information, and it's going to cost us more to confuse them.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman talking about other pieces of legislation.

But what we're talking about here is more information, more information for our colleagues, Mr. Chairman; and for the life of me, I can't figure out why our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle simply, I guess, want to keep our colleagues in the dark here so that we can continue to make the kinds of decisions that we've been making. It's just astounding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Arizona, Dr. GOSAR.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act brought today by my friend and colleague Congressman TOM PRICE. This good piece of legislation is a common-sense solution to the growing debt and deficit causing concern among many Arizonans.

While I may be new to D.C. and the Halls of Congress, I am not new to the impacts of Federal regulations and the devastating effects of Congress' ability to live within its means. As a dentist and a small business owner for over 25 years, I faced the uncertainty of additional tax and regulatory burdens because the Federal Government failed to do long-term planning.

This bill states that the Congressional Budget Office provide Members of Congress an analysis of the real and long-term effects that a piece of legislation would have on the economy. This, my friends, should be a no-brainer. It is a necessary step towards taking and regaining fiscal sanity in this Nation. Making wise decisions starts by being properly informed on the facts and the information.

Again, I support this legislation, and I encourage the passage of this good bill today.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is a reason that this institution of Congress is so discredited among the American people. The reason is quite simple. Instead of facing the problem, we come up with ways to avoid it. These two bills—dynamic scoring, which basically has as a premise that any tax cut is going to increase revenues, and baseline reform, which essentially says that inflation is not a factor in depleting resources to meet a need, whether it's the Pentagon or it's health care—we think that somehow that is going to solve the problem with the debt, which is a serious problem in this country.

Do you know what? It's time for Congress to acknowledge the obvious, which is that the problem is the problem. These runaround reforms about the process avoids the direct, head-on confrontation that is the debt, and the debt is a function of too much spending and too little revenue.

Bottom line, if you are a household, if you're a local government, if you're someone who is responsible, when you have a debt problem, you're going to look at everything; you're going to put

it all on the table. There are 100 Members of the House of Representatives who signed a letter and said, Hey, let's put everything on the table—revenues and spending. It's the only way we're going to get a solution.

This approach is avoiding that. It's locking down on the notion that any tax cut is going to increase revenues. It's locking down on the notion that revenues cannot be part of the solution, and it's locking down on this notion that if you wipe away inflation as a factor in what we need to do to maintain level funding that somehow we'll still meet the needs.

We had a war in Iraq and Afghanistan—two wars that weren't paid for, both on the credit card. We had the Medicare prescription drug program on the credit card. Whether you supported those as a Democrat or as a Republican—and we had people on both sides of the aisle who did—you've got to pay for it. We didn't pay for it. We're paying now the consequences of it.

As to the so-called "reforms" about the process, it's always legitimate to figure out the process—how can we do it better? How can we get better information?—but not when it means we avoid the problem.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Again, Mr. Chairman, I'm a little perplexed by the arguments being used in opposition on the other side.

My friend from Vermont says that this assumes that there is a certain premise about tax cuts. Well, the bill doesn't even use the language "tax cuts." It uses "tax revenue." It could be a tax reduction. It could be a tax increase. Let's look. Let's find the information. Let's give our colleagues as much information as possible, which, again, is what my friend from Vermont says every family in this country does when they have a challenge. If they have a debt challenge, they get all of the information that they can. That's simply what we're asking here, which is to provide as much information as possible for Members of Congress to make wiser decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I'm so pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from South Carolina and a member of the committee, Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

As we sit like good Congressmen and -women in our offices and as we watch these debates on television, sometimes we feel compelled to run over and participate in the debate. Certainly, that's what drove me over here today, and it's hard to know where to start. There is a long list of things that we could talk about here today.

Mr. Chairman, we could start, for example, with the gentleman from Maryland, who offered again today, as he did in the Budget Committee, the suggestion that perhaps the Recovery Act generated as many as 6 million jobs. If you actually listen very closely to what he says and read the documents that he cites, that's up to 6 million

jobs saved or created. The truth of the matter is we could make just as easily the argument that the number is closer to 1.2 million jobs saved or created, and that's assuming that a job saved is a job created. We could have a discussion as to whether or not we should have been spending \$400,000 per job, but that's not the reason we're here.

So I would suggest to my friends across the aisle, if they really believed that the Recovery Act was so wonderful, bring it up again. Please offer us another one. In fact, bring us one twice the size, and look the American people in the eye and say that \$800 billion wasn't enough, that we want \$1.6 trillion worth of another stimulus bill. Please, bring that, and let the President defend that as we have this discussion between now and November.

You could also, Mr. Chairman, go into more detail about what the gentleman from North Carolina mentioned about the PAYGO rules, which is something I'm a little bit familiar with. My predecessor was a big supporter of the PAYGO rules. The PAYGO rules were in place when this government ran up its largest deficits in history. The rule was never designed to cut spending, and it was never designed to lower the deficit. It never accomplished what folks so fondly, in hindsight, believe that it did in the late 1990s. You could go back and look. Really, what drove the surpluses of the late 1990s was the reduction in the size of the Federal Government. But, again, it's not what we're here to talk about today.

□ 1510

What the gentleman from Texas was talking about, however, is spot on, and he would come to the well, as so many folks on the other side will, and say that, well, it was those Bush tax cuts that really got us in the hole that we're in. I don't know why we call them the Bush tax cuts, by the way.

They were extended by a Democrat President and a Democrat Senate and a Democrat House at the end of 2010. I have always referred to them as the Bush-Obama tax cuts, but that doesn't seem to catch on.

But the assertion has always been that after those tax cuts, Mr. Chairman, went into place that revenues went down, that when we cut taxes revenue went down, because certainly that's what the CBO, under the current rules, would tell you would happen. Under the static models that are in place now, when we supposedly cut taxes, the CBO will tell you, well, if you lower the tax rates, revenues will go down.

Unequivocally, this is not what happened with the Bush tax cuts in 2000s. Revenues went up every year from 2003 to the beginning of the great recession.

That's why this bill is so important, Mr. Chairman. Washington does not know how to count. We count in this town in a fashion that only this town counts. The whole rest of the world doesn't understand how we count, and

the CBO scoring is a big part of that problem.

Mr. Chairman, that's why I respectfully suggest that we need to pass this bill and send it over to the Senate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of Mr. PRICE if he has any further speakers?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Look, I think everybody in this body understands that the more good information we get the better. That's why it's troubling that in this particular bill we're asking the question of CBO in a way that will only give us partial information. I already mentioned that we left out the impact, the economic impact from what we think should be included.

We think the appropriations investments in transportation should be included in any economic analysis. Clearly, important investments we make in science and research and innovation and our infrastructure have an economic impact, but this doesn't ask for any of that information. There'll be some amendments that say we should. Hopefully our colleagues will vote for them.

But what is very bizarre is the way this is structured so that it doesn't require a macroeconomic, dynamic analysis of the major change in law that we will make with respect to whether or not to extend all or some of the tax cuts, because the way it's written, it will assume those tax cuts are already in place.

Now, we've already had an analysis that was done by the Joint Committee on Taxation, a macroeconomic dynamic analysis. It does say at the end of that period it would actually have a drag on the economy because it increases the deficit.

So let's make sure that we get full information, and that's where I do want to end, by just pointing out that the most recent estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, in terms of the impact of the recovery bill, was in a document dated November of 2011, and there's a chart in there that shows a range. Obviously since the recovery bill is no longer in full effect in this current year, you don't continue to say the positive impacts.

But Dr. Elmendorf has testified numerous times before the Budget Committee and indicated that had it not been for the passage of the recovery bill, had it not been for actions of the Federal Reserve, economic growth today would be much slower. That would mean more people out of work.

We need to do better. We need to get things moving faster. That's why we should take up the President's jobs bill that has been sitting in this House since September. That's why I hope the conference committee on the payroll tax cut extension for 160 million people

will get our job done quickly so that we can provide those opportunities to help the economy grow when it's in this very fragile state.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just close by saying we all want information. Let's just not ask for information in a selective way designed to get a preconceived answer.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I appreciate his perspective.

However, it's clear that every single revised report on the stimulus comes up and states that it is costing more. It's costing the economy more and that the jobs that are created, "created," decrease every time there is a new estimate. And so we're approaching zero jobs saved or created. In a short time I suspect we'll be at jobs lost from the stimulus.

In fact, the CBO Director yesterday, in committee, said, The extra government spending from the Recovery Act of 2009, unless there are offsetting changes made that pay off the extra debt that was incurred, the economy will be worse off. So it's interesting to see our colleagues on the other side continue to grab onto what they think is a lifeline of the stimulus bill that with time looks worse and worse. And maybe, Mr. Chairman, if we had only had this piece of legislation at the time of the adoption of the stimulus bill, so-called stimulus bill, maybe somebody would have thought differently. Maybe they would have recognized that, in fact, that it was going to have the real effect that it has, which is to decrease the vitality of the economy.

Mr. Chairman, it's pretty doggone simple. This bill is pretty simple. You want more information or you want less information.

This is remarkable common sense. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it ought to be common ground upon which this House can stand. I urge my colleagues to adopt this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, while I am pleased that this Congress is looking at reforming the budget process, I do not believe this legislation is the solution. The biggest problem with the budget is that, while the game may not be perfect, the players are the reason it is not working. Even Jim Nussle, former Republican Chairman of the House Budget Committee and Director of the Office of Management and Budget for President G.W. Bush, testified that, "It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that the tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not being used."

It is no surprise that since Day One of this Tea Party Congress, the majority has pushed forward with an array of anti-worker, anti-environment, anti-oversight, and anti-growth agenda, that serves the politics of their caucus rather than the citizens of this great Nation. The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2011 encompasses this perfectly.

As a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I'm very familiar with the "Dynamic Scoring" song and dance. Dynamic Scoring seeks to skirt the fundamentals of Economics 101: less revenue means less money and higher deficits. Instead, under this bill and its dynamic scoring, we will assume tax cuts produce fantasy levels of economic growth and pay for themselves.

The proof is in the pudding. We don't have to look far to see what happened with Bush tax cuts. They led to an explosion of our national debt, and as a new CBO report points out, we could decrease the deficit by almost half if we let the Bush tax cut expire.

We should not enshrine this dishonest, Enron style accounting into law when we have such clear evidence that it is inaccurate. If our goal is to reform the budget process so we can enact sound fiscal policy, then this legislation must be rejected.

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.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee print 112-10 dated January 25, 2012. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3582

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 2012".

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. Such estimate shall be predicated upon the supplemental projection described in section 202(e)(4). 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, 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, 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."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—*The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget 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."

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL CBO REPORT TO BUDGET COMMITTEES.

Section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(4)(A) After the President's budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in addition to the baseline projections, the Director shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate a supplemental projection assuming extension of current tax policy for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year with a supplemental projection for the 10 fiscal-year period beginning with that fiscal year, assuming the extension of current tax policy.

"(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'current tax policy' means the tax policy in statute as of December 31 of the current year assuming—

"(i) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001;

"(ii) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003;

"(iii) the continued application of the alternative minimum tax as in effect for taxable years beginning in 2011 pursuant to title II of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, assuming that for taxable years beginning after 2011 the exemption amount shall equal—

"(I) the exemption amount for taxable years beginning in 2011, as indexed for inflation; or

"(II) if a subsequent law modifies the exemption amount for later taxable years, the modified exemption amount, as indexed for inflation; and

“(iv) the budgetary effects of extending the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010.

“(5) On or before July 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Long-Term Budget Outlook for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year and at least the ensuing 40 fiscal years.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 112-383. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 1, after “**SHORT TITLE**” insert “; **FINDINGS**”.

Page 1, line 2, insert “(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—” before “This Act”.

Page 1, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) On January 8, 2003, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said that President Bush believed that the tax cut package enacted in 2001 and expanded in 2003 would “create additional revenues for the Federal Government and pay for itself.”

(2) Before the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 were enacted, the Congressional Budget Office projected gradually rising surpluses, from 2.7 percent of gross domestic product in 2001 to 5.3 percent of gross domestic product by 2011, with the Federal Government operating debt free by 2009.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 have added over \$2 trillion to budget deficits from 2002-2011.

(4) Despite signing the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 into law, President George W. Bush’s administration had, according to the Wall Street Journal, “the worst track record for job creation since the government began keeping records” in 1939.

(5) From 2001 to 2009, gross domestic product grew at the slowest pace for any eight-year span since 1953.

(6) Median household income declined during the Bush Administration for the first time since 1967, when this data began to be tracked.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Peters amendment to H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2012.

As we consider legislation that would mandate the Congressional Budget Office use dynamic scoring to evaluate the macroeconomic impact of large tax cuts, we literally cannot afford to ignore the lessons of the past decade.

My Republican colleagues want to enact a seemingly subtle change so that they can more easily advance their agenda of tax cuts for the rich while slashing critical programs that American families and workers rely on each and every day.

Dynamic scoring’s supporters back this legislation in large part because it can mask the cost of tax cuts while ignoring the multiplier effects that investments in education, public health, and infrastructure can provide.

In order to evaluate these claims, we need only look at the claims made by those who supported the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts and see how they stacked up next to reality. Despite pledges from the Bush administration that the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 would generate such significant economic activity that they would pay for themselves, we know that this is not the case.

This is why I have put forward an amendment that will simply add a factual findings section that details the impact of the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 without altering the functional aspects of the bill.

These findings include:

1. On January 8, 2003, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said that President Bush believed that the tax cut package enacted in 2001 and expanded in 2003 would “create additional revenues for the Federal Government and pay for itself.”

□ 1520

Two, before the tax cuts of 2001 and ’03 were enacted, the Congressional Budget Office projected gradually rising surpluses, from 2.7 percent of gross national product in 2001, to 5.3 of gross national product in 2011, with the Federal Government operating debt free by 2009.

We know this, of course, did not happen. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the tax cuts of 2001 and ’03 have added over \$2 trillion to budget deficits from 2002 to ’11. Despite signing tax cuts of 2001 and ’03 into law, President Bush’s administration had, according to The Wall Street Journal, “the worst track record for job creation since the government began keeping records in 1939.”

From 2001 to 2009, gross domestic product grew at the slowest pace for any period since 1953; and median household income declined during the Bush administration for the first time since 1967 when this data was first tracked.

We have all lived through this past decade and have seen the damaging effects the Bush tax cuts have had on our Federal budget. I think it’s safe to say that anyone who can possibly claim to belong to the “reality caucus” agrees that the Bush tax cuts not only con-

tributed to taking our Nation from budget surpluses to massive deficits, but also contributed to unprecedented levels of income inequality.

If Congress cannot learn from past mistakes, we are destined to repeat them. I urge my colleagues to support my simple, factual amendment to show that Congress understands the true impacts of the Bush tax cuts and recognizes that, while tax cuts might stimulate additional economic activity, the tax cuts of 2001 and ’03 certainly did not pay for themselves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is a little amusing, I guess, that our colleagues on the other side love to talk about the past. I’m not sure whether it’s a desire for fantasy or misery, but talking about the past is interesting. But this amendment has absolutely nothing—nothing—to do with the legislation that’s being considered. We don’t need to rehash the economic record of the last 10 years; we need to look forward. And that’s what this bill does. It’s a forward-looking piece of legislation.

And looking forward, as the CBO reported on Tuesday, if tax relief is allowed to expire at the end of this year, which seems to be what my colleagues on the other side are advocating, we would then have the largest tax increase in the history of our country. CBO says economic growth would be as much as 3 percent lower than it would be if that tax relief were extended.

So what we need is dynamic appropriate scoring, more information, more data for our colleagues to be able to have that kind of information so when they make decisions, they’ll make, again, hopefully, wiser decisions.

This amendment truly makes no improvement whatsoever to our process, our budget process. I urge its defeat, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, while I find it interesting that the speaker from the other side believes that this is fantasy, these are facts. And he believes that facts should not be part of the debate, which is probably why we are in the trouble that we are in right now when the majority party believes that opinions should not be weighed down by the facts of the situation.

What I’m offering in this statement is simply factual statements that don’t detract in any way from the intended impact of this legislation, but it’s certainly important to having a full and honest debate that we need to have an understanding of what happened in the past. If we do not have that understanding of the past, if we don’t step up to the reality of what actually occurred as a result of missteps in public policy in the past, we will repeat them once again.

What I’m hearing from the majority party is that they want to repeat the

mistakes of the past, mistakes that led to uncontrollable deficits and also mistakes that gave huge windfalls to the wealthiest people in this country at the expense of middle class taxpayers.

As a Democrat, we are very proud to stand up for middle class families and want to make sure that tax benefits to middle class taxpayers continue to go to those families that are struggling each and every day. On the other hand, the wealthiest among us, those with the highest income that have reaped the most benefit, should be paying their fair share. And by having tax cuts, what we will do is cut into those middle class families. This is a factual statement. If we do not recognize the reality of the facts, we are doomed to repeat those mistakes.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 1, lines 14 and 15, strike "(except the Committee on Appropriations of each House)".

Page 1, line 16, before the comma, insert "or as a standalone analysis in the case of the Committee on Appropriations of each House".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, yet important, amendment that will in fact deliver the actual transparency the proponents of this bill claim to be providing. My amendment will ensure the dynamic scoring called for in this legislation and will capture the broader economic effects of Federal spending as well as Federal tax cuts.

The way this bill is written, to exclude appropriations bills highlights the political intent of the authors of this bill to only take into account the effective tax cuts. Both spending Federal tax dollars and sending them back have economic consequences; we all know that. And looking at just one

side of the ledger is nothing more than political gamesmanship.

Of course, my Republican friends have cleverly baked into the base a permanent extension of the Bush tax cuts which CBO already has said will create a drag on the economy in the long term. But I guess we don't want to let the facts or sound economic policy get in our way. That's why my amendment would include the appropriations, will fix that disparity, and provide us a clearer picture of the economic effects of all of our actions.

As my Republican friends seem to have forgotten, the Federal Government has had a long history of partnering with the private sector, and our Nation's universities in support of basic research are a great illustration. These investments spur American innovation and provide measurable, tangible economic benefits.

For example, the Federal Government has invested \$12.8 billion in the Human Genome Project since it began in 1988. According to a recent report by the Battelle Technology Partnership Practice, the total economic investment of that one project and its return has exceeded \$780 billion. In 2010 alone, the field of genomics directly supported 51,000 jobs in this country and another 310,000 indirect jobs. It generated \$67 billion in economic activity last year and resulted in \$3.7 billion coming into the Federal Treasury. The economic return on that single Federal investment has been significant and bears consideration as my Republican colleagues are trying to retrench on such spending.

While not every appropriation will have a similar positive economic result like the Human Genome Project, the economic effect of each should nonetheless be considered by this Congress as it actually appropriates funds.

My amendment will simply correct that oversight and provide proper balance to the accountability and transparency the authors of the bill say they wish to achieve. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. If Congress is serious about capturing the true impact of all of our actions in the economy, we ought to consider all of them, including spending and appropriations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is what professors of logic—now, I know that there's not a whole lot of logic around this town—but professors of logic would call a nullity. Adopting this amendment would not require CBO to prepare an analysis of bills reported from the Appropriations Committee, as my good friend from Virginia desires.

Section 407 of the Congressional Budget Act requires CBO to prepare a

macroeconomic impact analysis of "major bills or resolutions," which is the term that's defined in section 2 of the bill. Section 2 of the bill uses cost estimates prepared by the CBO under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402 does not apply to bills reported from the Appropriations Committee. So this amendment accomplishes absolutely nothing.

Even if the amendment were properly drafted, it would be meaningless to require a 40-year macroeconomic impact analysis for a 1-year appropriations bill. Even the largest appropriations bill, the Defense appropriations bill, is only about 3 percent of the gross domestic product in 1 year, or much less than 1 percent of the GDP over a 10-year period of time. So the macroeconomic impact of 1-year legislation oftentimes approaches zero and then can be changed with the next succeeding appropriations bills in years 2, 3, and 4.

So the amendment is drafted in such a way that it has no effect whatsoever. Even if it were properly drafted, it's a bad idea without providing any new meaningful information for Congress.

I urge defeat of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that the same logic my friend from Georgia uses that a simple 1-year appropriation may not have much measurable impact on the economy could also apply to tax cuts, short-term tax cuts. I would further point out that his opposition to a simple improvement to this bill, I think, sheds light on the intent of the bill. It exposes what's really going on here: Let's try to find a facile way to guarantee the Bush tax cuts are extended and the tax cutting is even easier on the wealthier who ought to be paying their fair share.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, 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 of Virginia. 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. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, insert “interest rates,” after “employment.”

Page 3, line 7, insert “interest rates,” after “employment.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for making my amendment in order and granting me the opportunity to address this.

I rise today to offer what I think is a very commonsense amendment to the underlying bill. There's some of this debate that there's very little to debate about. Our national debt is nearly \$15 trillion. We're borrowing about 30 cents on every dollar. This represents, in my opinion, one of the biggest threats to our economic future, and I believe it needs to be a top priority.

But I also believe the first step in addressing our national debt is getting honest about how we calculate it and the impact of it. That means we have to take the right factors into account, and that includes the impact that higher deficits will have on our economy.

As you know, the main problem with deficits is they push up interest rates. Eventually, it will happen. Higher interest rates hurt the economy by making it more expensive to buy a home or a car. They make it harder for my constituents to afford college for their children, and they make it more difficult for local businesses to get credit they need to grow.

My amendment would simply ensure that the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation expressly include interest rates in the list of economic factors they consider in their studies. If we don't consider interest rates, the underlying bill would underestimate the impact unpaid government spending—or the un-offset tax cuts—would have on the economy and the deficit. Congress has to stop hiding behind the funny math that masks the true costs of our policies.

I'd like to stress that my amendment is nonpartisan and nonideological. It's completely neutral on whether the deficit is increased by unpaid-for spending or un-offset tax cuts. The effects are the same. It simply ensures that Congress, when we take a vote, takes into account whether it was done in a fiscally responsible manner. We must let facts drive our decision-making, not ideology. If the facts dispute our ideology, we need to change our ideology, not the other way around. As a high school teacher, one thing I know for sure is you need to start by getting the math right.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I'm not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I want to commend my colleague from Minnesota for recognizing the wisdom of the legislation and the importance of looking at the dynamism of the economy and effects that ought to be relayed to us from the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office's macroeconomic analysis oftentimes already includes interest rates if the effects are relevant; however, we believe that this amendment helps clarify that, and we have no objection to the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for having that opportunity and for allowing this to go forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. FUDGE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Ms. FUDGE. 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 2, line 14, strike “and” and on line 15, before the period, insert “, and income inequality”.

Page 3, line 7, strike “and” and on line 8, insert “, and income inequality” after “tax revenues”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee and I thank the chairman for making this amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2012.

The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act requires the Congressional Budget Office to provide an impact analysis, in addition to a score, when legislation would have a budgetary effect greater than one-quarter of 1 percent of GDP.

The bill requires certain variables to be considered to determine economic impact. As the bill is currently written, the variables considered include impact on real GDP, business investment, the capital stock, employment, and labor supply. The bill describes these variables as major economic variables.

One of the most important economic variables is missing from H.R. 3582. My amendment would insert income equality among the variables used to determine economic impact. It would also require an estimate of the change in in-

come equality to be included in an impact analysis.

Income inequality is real in America. It is time we start making sure our laws strengthen the middle class, not weaken it.

America is indeed the land of opportunity. It is one of the principles upon which our great Nation was founded. Yet in 2012, if you are born into a low-income family, you will most likely grow up to be poor. Sixty-five percent of Americans born into families with earnings in the bottom fifth percentile stay in the bottom two-fifths, while 62 percent of those raised in families with earnings in the top fifth stay in the top two-fifths.

America has become a wealthier Nation, but the wealth has bypassed the middle class. Between 1979 and 2007, overall American household incomes grew by 62 percent. The top 1 percent of earners saw their incomes increase by 275 percent over the past 30 years. That means their incomes nearly quadrupled. In comparison, one-fifth of households with the lowest incomes only saw their incomes increase by 18 percent. Although the pie is growing larger, middle-class Americans are watching their slices get smaller. Even some of my Republican colleagues have acknowledged the problem of economic immobility and wealth disparity in this Nation.

Clearly, if impact analyses are going to be required of the CBO, the factors considered must include income inequality.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to draw attention to the fact that this appears to be essentially where our colleagues across the aisle will probably be taking the national debate for the next 11 months. This is the politics of division. This is not the politics of unity. This is not the politics of trying to bring people together and seeing the country succeed. It's the politics of trying to break us down into different classes.

We hear a lot of talk and will hear a lot of talk this year about fairness, about the 1 percent. What we won't hear, Mr. Chairman, is that, for example, the top 1 percent of the wage earners in this country make 20 percent of the income but pay 40 percent of the taxes.

□ 1540

You won't hear the other side define what is fair; they just want more and more and more. In fact, when you do ask them to talk about what they would specifically have us do—which is go back to the Clinton era tax rates on the top 1 percent—it would pay only 8 cents of every dollar of deficit in this

Nation. It's not designed to solve any problems, Mr. Chairman, and neither is this amendment. It is designed to continue to try and define us.

You can look at this amendment and know that it is simply offered for political gain. It doesn't even attempt to define income inequality in the amendment. It's simply designed to make a political point. Furthermore, you can get this information from Joint Tax if you simply ask for it. That tool is already available to us.

Mr. Chairman, Americans are not envious. They are more interested in how they are doing than whether or not their neighbors are succeeding. They are not envious, and we should not pass an amendment that assumes that they are.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Can the Chair tell me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say for the record that I did not talk about class; my colleague did. Let me as well say to you that if you talk to the American people, they believe in fundamental fairness. I don't think that the American people do not believe in fairness. I further don't believe that the American people live in a Nation where they don't believe that they can ever accomplish the American Dream. I don't believe that the American people believe that they cannot climb the ladders to success. I do not believe that we live in a Nation where people do not believe that they can rise above their circumstances.

So let me just say to my colleague, it's not about class. It's about the Nation in which we live, the Nation where people come from all over the world wanting to see what it means to be great, what it means to realize the American Dream. That's the America that I'm talking about.

This is not frivolous, this is what is right. This is what the American people want, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, it's the 2nd of February. We have roughly 10 months between now and the next election. It's plenty of time for the folks across the aisle to let us know what they mean by fairness. Tell us, what does it mean? When you say that we want a fair Tax Code, we want people to pay their fair share, would you please just let us know what that means in terms of raw numbers. Give us a real proposal as to what that means, and give us a real proposal that actually solves the problem, because raising taxes on the top 1 percent simply will not accomplish what they say that it will. Again, it pays only 8 cents of every dollar worth of deficit. Let us know what fairness is, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, it is not this amendment. For that reason, I think we should defeat it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE).

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 18, after the period insert the following new sentence: "The analysis shall also include estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZones (as such term is defined in section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)))".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, 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 of Texas. I, too, want to express my appreciation to the Rules Committee for allowing my amendment to come in. And I acknowledge the ranking member of our Budget Committee for his excellent service, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank Dr. PRICE for his presence here today and engaging in this discussion.

In a few days, I will be meeting with a number of my clergy, along with my small business community, coming from all walks of life, and all of us have found in our hearts and our minds to recognize that small business is in fact the backbone of this country. So I would ask that, as we look at the issue of macroeconomic analysis of this legislation, that we include a well-defined concept to understand what the impact will be on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

H.R. 3582 would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a macroeconomic impact analysis for bills that are estimated to have a large budgetary effect, and under this bill, there would be analysis that would come about on a number of issues that would, in fact, involve the gross domestic product.

The Small Business Administration administers several programs to support small businesses, including Historically Underused Business Zone empowerment contracting, better known as the HUBZone. The HUBZone program is an effective program. It's a small business Federal contracting assistance program that crosses the land. Wherever you live, you have the opportunity to participate in a HUB pro-

gram, whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities, irrespective of your location and your background. 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-aside, sole-source awards and price evaluation preferences.

Mr. Chairman, this could happen to any community. One moment you could be thriving, and a tornado could come to you in the next moment and you fall in the category of a HUBZone to revitalize small businesses. So I ask my colleagues to support an amendment that spreads across America, and to make the determination that the vitality of small businesses is important to all of us and an assessment should be made using the HUBZone and the impact such legislation would have.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady from Texas for offering this amendment. But I would suggest that the macroeconomic impact analysis that's required already by the legislation will analyze the effect of job growth and capital formation and economic growth. To add an additional criteria in the analysis is unnecessary, and truly encourages focus on the interests in particular locations as opposed to the general welfare.

This is one of those areas that is rightly worked out in committee, the discussion of these issues in committee. So I would suggest to the gentlelady from Texas that this is not the appropriate opportunity to try to add items to the bill that actually continue to confound the information that would be provided to Members and focus on dividing things as opposed to general information.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I just want to return to the bill itself and to discuss for just a moment the notion that there is some type of bias within the piece of legislation itself. We've heard our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about that it's biasing positive information as it relates to tax cuts or tax reductions.

Again, I would urge my colleagues who are listening to this and will be considering this piece of legislation in short order to read the legislation. The legislation says nothing about whether or not the dynamic scoring, the flexible scoring that ought to be available for Members, that kind of information is going to look at tax reductions or tax increases, whether it's going to look at how that affects the overall vitality of the economy. In fact, again, what this does is to provide much greater information for our colleagues here to be making decisions.

And, as so many of my friends on our side of the aisle have testified to during this discussion on this piece of legislation, what's needed around here is more information. We now have an administration that has been marching to the Treasury to spend more and more and more and more and more money, plunging us into incredible debt—\$1 trillion deficits for each of the 4 years of this current administration—\$1 trillion, Mr. Chairman. We've never been there before. And it's clearly having an incredible dragging effect on the economy.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to be able to have Members offer pieces of legislation and have the Congressional Budget Office be able to tell us, say look, if you're going to insist on continuing down this road of debt and doubt and despair, this is the consequence in the real economy; the consequence is that it will continue to have a drag on the economy, jobs will not be truly created? In spite of the guise from the administration that they talk about jobs being created or saved, jobs won't be created. There's a better way. There is a better way. And the American people know there's a better way.

□ 1550

And they know there's a better way that we can be informed. They know that more information for their Member of Congress will allow their Member of Congress to make wiser decisions. So all this bill is about, the Pro-Growth Budget Act, all it is about is an attempt to give you, to give me, to provide for every single Member of this body not biased information, not information that's gaming the system, information that allows for us to make wiser decisions.

Wouldn't it have been wonderful, Mr. Chairman, if during some of the major legislation of the past couple of years, wouldn't it have been wonderful to have had an outside entity, hopefully objective entity, be able to weigh in and say, goodness gracious, if you spend \$1 trillion of money that we don't have, this is going to be the consequence in the economy; this is going to be one of the outcomes of it, which is you're going to increase the debt in this country; you're going to decrease the sense that businesses out there have any certainty in the economy; and, therefore, they're not going to be able to create the kind of jobs that all of us desire and all of us want?

That's the kind of information that we would have liked to have had. That's what we were saying at the time, and now it's beginning to play out, but it's playing out with incredible destruction in our communities across our great land, playing out in ways that makes it so that individuals are hurting and are harmed by the actions that were taken by the previous Congress and this administration.

Wouldn't it have been wonderful to have that information so that people could weigh the options?

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and adopt the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for extending his analysis, but I am saddened by the fact that issues dealing with income inequality, where we're simply trying to acknowledge and overtake comments by Presidential candidate, Mitt Romney: I'm not concerned about the poor—my point about the poor is that you're rich today and poor tomorrow. Catastrophic illness, devastation through a natural disaster, man-made disaster, a terrorist act will put many of us in conditions that we would have never imagined.

What Dr. PRICE has failed to acknowledge, and our Republican friends, is that the dynamic scoring is rooted in anti-tax. It is clear that the bill's language and approach is designed to make it easy to enact deficit-increasing tax cuts.

Keeping the Bush tax cuts are not going to improve the economy. Small businesses will. And ensuring that we don't have revenue will definitely send this Nation down a periled road of no return.

Their own friend, former chairman of the Budget Committee, Jim Nussle, testified it may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, the tools are broken, but it may be that we're not using it. He, too, acknowledged the faultiness of dynamic scoring.

What I'm doing here today is to ask for this amendment to take into consideration hardworking small business owners, assess whether or not they will be impacted negatively.

We already know that agencies are going to have a difficult time in scoring this. We already know that this scoring will have no impact on improving the economy. But the increase in taxes that our colleagues want to do, with no balancing increase in revenues to be able to bring down the deficit, is the peril that they're sending us to.

They have had hearings, and there have been those who've acknowledged that dynamic scoring does little; but it may impact negatively those hardworking businesses that need to have the resources that would be provided to them by the Small Business Administration in their time of need or in their time of growth.

I ask my colleagues to add one more element of information that will give us guidance as to what dynamic scoring will ultimately mean. There is no doubt that an overwhelming number of Americans agree that we must do revenue, and certainly we must respond to the needs of the American people.

None of us are reckless with taxes or increasing taxes, Mr. Chairman. We want to be balanced in what we do. I believe my amendment is a balanced amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment #5 to H.R. 3582, "The Pro-Growth Budget Act of 2011." My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUB ZONE areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

H.R. 3582, would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a macroeconomic impact analysis for bills that are estimated to have a large budgetary effect. Under this bill the CBO would be required to provide an analysis of the impact on the economy of any bill that would have an estimated budgetary effect of greater than 0.25 percent of gross domestic product, GDP, in any fiscal year.

CBO macroeconomic analysis would include the estimated effect on revenues and outlays of a change in GDP resulting from the legislation being evaluated. Those estimates would have to assume that certain tax policies not currently in CBO's baseline are extended. Furthermore, CBO would be required to publicly provide the assumptions and models underlying those analyses.

In all actuality, Mr. Chair, this bill could very well be entitled the, Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Champions Act, because that is in essence what is 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 affect, should this measure pass, on HUB Zones, 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 HUB Zone program. The HUB Zone 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 on the House Floor today.

The Budget Committee has held two 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.”

And 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, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, even though I have serious reservations about dynamic scoring.

[From Center for American Progress, Nov. 23, 2011]

FIVE PROBLEMS WITH DYNAMIC SCORING (By Sarah Ayres)

Dynamic scoring—an attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen—continues to pop up everywhere, even in negotiations by the erstwhile Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, better known as the super committee. Long a favorite tool of antitax zealots, dynamic scoring poses a number of problems that make it a poor tool for estimating the cost of proposed legislation, and the agencies tasked with making these estimates have rightly rejected it for years.

Among those who advocate this method, it is confined to revenue estimates, but it could be applied to spending as well. Fans of dynamic scoring argue that tax cuts pay for themselves, generally by spurring so much economic growth that revenues will actually increase on net. In particular, the Bush administration lobbied for 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. Of course the Bush tax cuts did no such thing, instead causing our national debt to explode.

Dynamic scoring was a bad idea then and it is still a bad idea today. Here are five reasons why we shouldn’t use dynamic scoring.

Conventional revenue estimates already include behavioral responses

While some proponents of dynamic scoring explain it as an alternative to “static” standard scoring estimates, the conventional cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, and the Joint Committee on Taxation, or JCT, are not actually static. In estimating the budgetary effects of proposed legislation, CBO and JCT both incorporate the microeconomic behavioral effects of policy changes into their estimates. For example, when they score a gas-tax increase, they account for the reduction in gas purchases that would result.

What they don’t do is attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects—the effects a policy will have on the overall growth of the economy. As JCT explains, “estimates always take into account many likely behavioral responses by taxpayers to proposed changes in tax law . . . [including] shifts in the timing of transactions and income recognition, shifts between business sectors and entity form, shifts in portfolio holdings, shifts in consumption, and tax planning and avoidance.” The official JCT scores do assume that GDP will not change from the projected CBO baseline.

We cannot accurately measure the macroeconomic effects of tax changes

One problem with attempting to measure macroeconomic feedback is that estimates depend on a lot of assumptions. Broad economywide responses to tax policy changes are complex and often contradictory. This reflects the wide range of effects a tax change can have on different actors.

As an example, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, or CBPP, notes that reducing marginal tax rates can lead to two different behavioral responses. Increasing the after-tax compensation that a worker receives for an additional hour of work could incentivize the worker to take on additional work because the awards are greater. At the same time, increasing a worker’s take-home pay for the same hours of work could also incentivize the worker to work a fewer number of hours for the same amount of money. Which of these two effects will be larger, and by how much? The empirical record simply does not offer us a clear-cut answer to that question. The same is true of myriad other questions that dynamic scoring implicitly or explicitly raises. There is no set of accepted rules that can be applied universally to all tax-policy changes occurring in a variety of economic environments.

Even if we had clear-cut answers, there are practical limits to the level of sophistication that the estimating agencies could bring to dynamic scoring. Former CBO director Rudolph Penner describes the problem: “Consistent dynamic scoring is logistically impossible given current technology. Scoring is a hectic process. The CBO and JCT produce hundreds of scores each year. Congress always wants scores instantaneously, and analysts often work through the night to keep them happy. Dynamic scoring would force analysts to make many more judgment calls than they do today. Quality control would be difficult, and that implies a high risk that ideological biases will pollute the analysis.”

Estimates require making assumptions about future policies

Will a tax cut be paid for by spending cuts now or by taking on future debt? Macroeconomic responses may differ greatly depending on how policymakers choose to pay for the policy. Requiring budget analysts to guess how the policy will be paid for in order to score it opens up the possibility that their assumptions will influence the projected macroeconomic changes as much or even

more than the policy itself. In testimony before the House Committee on Rules in 2002, CBO director Dan Crippen expressed concern that his office would be stepping into a political minefield by making these guesses: “CBO could make an assumption about what the next five Congresses and at least two presidents will do, but doing so would subject us and the results to a chorus of controversy.”

Even if dynamic scoring worked as advertised, there is evidence the effects are quite small

In 2006 a CBPP analysis of cost estimates for President Bush’s proposal to make the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts permanent found that the dynamic estimates did not differ greatly from conventional estimates. Two dynamic estimates prepared by the CBO differed by less than 4 percent from the conventional estimate. Even the Bush administration’s own estimate found that macroeconomic feedback would offset less than 10 percent of the conventionally estimated cost. There is no evidence that we are missing out on large macroeconomic effects using conventional scoring methods.

Lawmakers can pass policies regardless of their score

If Congress and the president believe a policy will have positive macroeconomic effects, nothing about conventional scoring prevents them from passing it into law. The Bush tax cuts were enacted despite their score because policymakers believed they would be good for the economy. With conventional scoring, everyone generally knows what’s included in the estimate and can make their own judgments based on that knowledge. Dynamic scoring would only introduce more obscurity to the process.

For these five reasons, CBO and JCT have rightly chosen not to include dynamic scoring in their official cost estimates. Switching to dynamic scoring would greatly reduce transparency in the revenue-estimating process. Macroeconomic forecasting is an imperfect science and the underlying evidence can be interpreted in many different ways. Using dynamic scoring would greatly pressure estimating agencies to make assumptions—assumptions that would be hard to pick out, difficult to evaluate, and likely very important at their extremes. CBO and JCT already incorporate behavioral responses into their cost estimates, and attempts to measure macroeconomic effects of the proposed policies will be fraught with inaccuracies and perceived as politically biased.

We may be able to resolve some of these problems in the future but for now there are many reasons why it doesn’t make sense to use dynamic scoring.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The 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 of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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, after line 2, insert the following:

“(C) TAXPAYER RECEIPT.—The Director shall create and maintain a permanent website with the domain name TaxpayerReceipt.gov (or a similar name if that is unavailable) and that includes a calculator that allows taxpayers to enter their annual income and receive an estimate of the amount of their projected contribution to or receipt from any applicable major bill or resolution in the budget year and the succeeding nine years, assuming the taxpayer has a constant annual income.”.

Page 3, line 3, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would create a simple CBO-sponsored Web site where taxpayers could learn how much they would be contributing to major Federal spending programs under consideration by Congress. Similarly, it would allow taxpayers to learn how much their taxes would increase or decrease under any major tax legislation being considered by this Congress.

The fact is, we don't do a good enough job communicating with our constituents. There's too much misinformation out there, and good information isn't accessible enough to Americans without connections to Washington. Try digging through a government Web site, and you'll see the difficulty. My staff gets calls all the time from constituents who are having trouble finding good information about our budget and our Tax Code.

My amendment would take a significant and necessary step towards increasing transparency and accountability. If Congress wants to pass a major new spending program, the tax and the costs to the taxpayer should be made transparent. If the Congress wants to pass a tax increase, the costs to the taxpayer should be transparent. And if Congress wants to pass a tax cut, taxpayers should know exactly how they or someone in their tax bracket would benefit.

Transparency is the best way to hold lawmakers in Washington accountable, and it's the best way to rein in out-of-control deficits. Our constituents have a right to this information, and we shouldn't skimp when it comes to transparency.

I've been working on this taxpayer receipt idea since 2010, and 15 of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined me in supporting similar legislation to this effect.

However, at this time, I understand the gentleman from Georgia is opposed to this amendment, which pretty much guarantees that it will go down in a blazing ball of martyrdom. And while I'm a Cubs fan and my team hasn't won a World Series since before manned flight, I am realistic. So I will offer to withdraw this amendment if the gen-

tleman will commit to work with me to move this idea forward in a separate venue.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

Am I to understand that the gentleman has withdrawn the amendment?

The CHAIR. The amendment has not been withdrawn.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Not formally, if I could respond.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Has the gentleman yielded back?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has yielded back.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And the gentleman is able to withdraw the amendment after he has yielded back?

The CHAIR. Yes, by unanimous consent.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his amendment. But as we have had our staffs discuss, the amendment would truly mark a significant departure from CBO's historical mission of providing information to policymakers on fiscal and economic implications of a legislation.

It would impose a significant new requirement on CBO to calculate the taxpayer benefit or the cost of major legislation, something that, candidly, Mr. Chairman, the CBO lacks both the expertise and experience to be able to provide. So though it's commendable, I don't think it has a thing to do with the underlying bill.

I do believe there are some private sector solutions out there and look forward to working with the gentleman from Illinois, given that he has agreed to withdraw his amendment in the future, as we move forward to, again, do something that I believe to be commendable, and that is to provide much more information for hardworking taxpayers as well.

And given that he has agreed to withdraw the amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to give the gentleman an opportunity to explain his point. I thank him for his willingness to work on this issue together. I now withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, lines 20 through 22, strike “.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic

product of the United States” and insert “\$5,000,000,000”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1600

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me start by congratulating the Budget Committee and the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this bill to the floor. We need to have more honest budgeting, and this is a step in the right direction. I plan to support it. I have long supported the use of dynamic scoring in particular. I'm pleased to see this issue on the floor today.

It's necessary to ensure that Congress has the most reliable information possible. Not all tax cuts are created equal when it comes to the ability to actually generate tax revenue, and I think that we ought to recognize that, and that's what dynamic scoring is all about.

H.R. 3582 requires CBO to provide a supplemental dynamic analysis for a bill with a gross budgetary impact greater than a quarter percent of the U.S. gross domestic product in any fiscal year. Based on the current GDP, I believe the threshold would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$40 billion, meaning the dynamic scores would be limited to bills with a gross impact of \$40 billion a year.

Unless I'm mistaken, I believe that setting a trigger for a supplemental macroeconomic analysis would have yielded dynamic scores for somewhere in the neighborhood of a couple dozen bills introduced last year, let alone the number that we considered. The amendment that is ruled in order here would lower the threshold for requiring a supplemental dynamic score to any legislation that would have a budgetary impact greater than \$5 billion in a year.

Now, I understand that there are concerns with setting the trigger considerably lower than the quarter percent of GDP, including it would mean that CBO would have considerably more work to do. I am sensitive to that. But I do think that we ought to set the standard a little lower, or the trigger a little lower than \$40 billion a year.

CBO scores hundreds of bills a year. This is a lot more analysis that they would have to do, but I think it is important. But, as I mentioned, I'm sensitive to the concerns that have been raised that this would require too much work or too much additional work, which might require additional staffing and everything else at the CBO, so I'm prepared to withdraw this amendment. But I hope that, as this process moves forward, we can set a standard or a threshold a little lower than \$40 billion a year. I think that that would benefit lawmakers as we consider the impact of this legislation.

I'm prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I'm happy to yield to my

friend from Georgia the time that he might need.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I want to commend him for his wonderful work throughout his congressional career on the fiscal responsibility appropriations process, having a more transparent and fiscally responsible governance and a more open budgeting process and more responsible budgeting process.

We both recognize the imperative of a greater dynamic analysis to the legislation that we have coming before us. What the appropriate threshold is, I think we're probably in the ballpark, but I'm happy to work with the gentleman as we move forward with this legislation to determine what that appropriate threshold is for legislation to be considered in a macroeconomic fashion from CBO.

And I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and also appreciate him working with me in the future.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to say I support this legislation. It's good legislation. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we move ahead, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 112-383.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Jobs Score Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974.

Section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (2), by striking "and";
- (2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and
- (3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) an estimate of the number of jobs which would be created, sustained, or lost in carrying out such 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."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, a little over a year ago when the Repub-

lican conference was meeting to discuss changes to the rules of the House for the 112th Congress, I offered a commonsense proposal. In a letter I sent to the chairman of the Rules Committee in January of 2011, I shared my belief that our priority in this Congress must be to enact legislation that will lead to job growth. I further stated that, given our priority of job creation, the new rules of the 112th Congress should require disclosure of the impact on job creation of any legislation being considered by the full House. That was 1 year ago, yet here we are today rehashing a seemingly age-old debate over trickle-down economics.

While we debate back and forth about whether H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, is just another attempt to strengthen the case for passing large tax cuts while minimizing the actual costs, back home in my State, the State of Rhode Island, more than 60,000 men and women are without jobs. While we debate a bill with dim prospects of ever passing the Senate, more than 13 million Americans remain unemployed.

Just as many of you have seen in your own districts what I've seen firsthand in my district, the toll that this recession has taken on our families, our businesses, and our communities. My State was one of the first States in the Northeast to be hit by the recession, and like many other States, our recovery is slow; and with 10.8 percent unemployment, the toll continues. That's why, 1 year later, I'm still here expressing the same urgent need for Congress to understand, as we consider legislation, whether our legislative actions will result in job creation or job loss, and this is precisely what my amendment would do.

My amendment would strike the underlying language in H.R. 3582 and replace it with the text of the Job Score Act, which I introduced earlier in this session. This proposal would amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that, in addition to cost estimates, the Congressional Budget Office also prepare an estimate of the number of jobs which would be created, sustained, or lost by enactment of the legislation reported by the committee, including regional and State-level estimates.

A companion to the Job Score Act has been introduced into the Senate with bipartisan support, Republicans and Democrats. A commonsense approach, there's no voodoo economics in this amendment. There's no controversial provisions requiring budget estimates that assume the extension of the Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. My amendment would not require the inclusion of subjective and uncertain macroeconomic feedback in revenue estimates. This amendment goes beyond reviewing only major legislation and requires a jobs impact assessment for every bill that requires a formal CBO score.

My amendment is simple, straightforward, and should be a proposal that

any Member who's serious about focusing on jobs can support.

Given these challenging economic times and their profound impact on the lives of men, women, and families throughout America, we need to ensure that the policies deliberated in Congress include an evaluation of the impact on job creation. This amendment puts politics, partisanship, and controversial economic policy aside.

Americans deserve to know whether the actions taken in Washington are likely to result in job creation or job loss. My legislation will help provide Congress with this vitally important assessment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The gentleman from Rhode Island says that this is a simple proposition, and in that, he's correct. It's simply terrible.

What he does with this amendment is to take away the entire underlying bill, and then he has the audacity to say that the bill, itself, does not provide any constructive information for Members.

So I guess what the Member is saying is that an estimate of changes to economic output for legislation that we bring forward that is significant and has a huge effect on the gross domestic product, I guess that's not consequential. I guess that's not in order to be considered. I guess that means that the gentleman doesn't think that that affects unemployment.

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, employment, on page 4, line 24 of the legislation. I guess the gentleman thinks that that's not important, that the dynamic consequences of legislation that's brought forward here that has significant effect on GDP ought not be considered.

□ 1610

I guess the gentleman believes it is tax revenue, not tax cuts, as I have stated from this position all afternoon. Our friends on the other side seem to believe—in fact, the gentleman said—the bill would "assume the inclusion of tax cuts."

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill that assumes any inclusion of tax cuts or of tax reductions or tax increases. All that this says is, with legislation that has a significant effect on our gross domestic product of .25 percent, which is about \$40 billion, as has been talked about, that the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office—our arm of the Congress that is providing us with information and is able to give us the most information so that we can make the wisest decisions—ought to look at these things in a dynamic way and look at economic output, look at employment, look at tax revenues. Is it going to be positive or negative? Is it going to affect the economy positively or negatively? Would that we would

have done that over the past number of years, Mr. Chairman, maybe we would have made some better decisions.

So it is important for Members to appreciate that this amendment strikes the entire bill and inserts in its place something that I believe to be, for the bill, redundant but incredibly and remarkably burdensome to the Congressional Budget Office. The macroeconomic analysis required by the base bill already requires an analysis of the effect of major legislation on employment and on labor supply.

The entire point of the bill is that Congress ought to consider and have better information on the economic impact of major legislation that's being considered. The extension of this jobs analysis to every bill reported out of a House committee will generate an incredible amount of work and burden.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we oftentimes get criticized for naming post offices. We're going to assign somebody at the Congressional Budget Office to determine the jobs impact of renaming a post office. That's right. You talk about a redundant and worthless activity of the Federal Government. This would be decreasing the efficiency of an already remarkably inefficient process at a time when we're appropriately decreasing spending at the Federal level, which—yes, Mr. Chairman—also includes the Congressional Budget Office. They're above where they were in the midportion of the last decade, but we're beginning to get that spending under control. This bill would indiscriminately add to the workload, and it would provide, really, no new information to Members of Congress.

My friend from Rhode Island is correct. This is a simple amendment. It is simply a terrible amendment, and it would completely end the underlying piece of legislation.

So I urge the defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CICILLINE. The amendment that I've offered does substitute the existing bill, and that's because, in fact, it is a terrible bill. And that's why I proposed this amendment—to substitute it—to avoid what the bill that is on the floor does.

It avoids the partisanship, the controversial economic policy for which there is so much disagreement and which we've heard about for the last hour. There is no hidden agenda as to high tax cuts while trying to use as a baseline the Bush tax cuts. It puts aside all of the disagreements about which we've just heard for 1 hour, and it uses common sense.

I certainly suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, that, in fact, the single most important analysis we should be doing on every single bill that the CBO does an analysis of is

jobs. Will this bill create jobs if we pass it? Will it cause the loss of jobs? That is the most urgent responsibility we have in Congress right now. This bill simply says that the analysis that should be done on every bill that the CBO does is to ask: Will it create jobs? Will it cause the loss of jobs? We would do that statewide and regionally.

Why is that information valuable? Because we should be singularly focused on job creation. We should avoid the kind of partisanship in disputes about trickle-down economics, voodoo economics; about the tax policy and about using the Bush tax cuts as the baseline. We need a commonsense approach that simply says that Members of Congress should have the information and should know does this create jobs or does it not before making a decision.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman uses the appropriate buzzwords: trickle-down, voodoo, partisanship, and all that. The fact of the matter is that none of that is in this bill. What is in this bill is an objective, commonsense, common ground attempt to provide greater information to Members of Congress, and his amendment strikes the entire underlying piece of legislation.

Again, at page 4, line 24, it calls on the CBO to address the issues of dynamism as it relates to macroeconomic factors when bills are coming to the floor—unemployment, unemployment, Mr. Chairman.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to adopt the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. 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 gentleman from Rhode Island 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 112-383 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. FUDGE of Ohio.

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

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

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. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) 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 174, noes 244, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

AYES—174

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

NOES—244

Adams	Austria	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Bachmann	Bass (NH)
Akin	Bachus	Benishkek
Alexander	Barletta	Bigert
Amash	Barrow	Bilbray
Amodei	Bartlett	Bilirakis

Bishop (UT) Hall
 Black Hanna
 Blackburn Harper
 Bonner Harris
 Bono Mack Hartzler
 Boren Hastings (WA)
 Boustany Hayworth
 Brady (TX) Heck
 Brooks Hensarling
 Broun (GA) Herger
 Buchanan Herrera Beutler
 Bucshon Huelskamp
 Buerkle Huizenga (MI)
 Burgess Hultgren
 Burton (IN) Hunter
 Calvert Hurt
 Camp Issa
 Campbell Jenkins
 Canseco Johnson (IL)
 Cantor Johnson (OH)
 Capito Johnson, Sam
 Carter Jones
 Chabot Jordan
 Chaffetz Kelly
 Coble King (IA)
 Coffman (CO) King (NY)
 Cole Kingston
 Conaway Kinzinger (IL)
 Cravaack Kline
 Crawford Labrador
 Crenshaw Lamborn
 Cuellar Lance
 Culberson Landry
 Davis (KY) Lankford
 Denham Latham
 Dent LaTourette
 DesJarlais Latta
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (CA)
 Dold LoBiondo
 Dreier Long
 Duffy Lucas
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer
 Duncan (TN) Lummis
 Ellmers Lungren, Daniel
 Emerson E.
 Farenthold Manzullo
 Fincher Marchant
 Fitzpatrick Marino
 Flake Matheson
 Fleischmann McCarthy (CA)
 Fleming McCaul
 Flores McClintock
 Forbes McCotter
 Fortenberry McHenry
 Franks (AZ) McIntyre
 Frelinghuysen McKeon
 Gallegly McKinley
 Gardner McMorris
 Garrett Rodgers
 Gerlach Meehan
 Gibbs Mica
 Gibson Miller (FL)
 Gingrey (GA) Miller (MI)
 Gohmert Miller, Gary
 Goodlatte Mulvaney
 Gosar Murphy (PA)
 Gowdy Myrick
 Granger Neugebauer
 Graves (GA) Noem
 Graves (MO) Nugent
 Griffin (AR) Nunes
 Griffith (VA) Nunnelee
 Grimm Olson
 Guinta Palazzo
 Guthrie Paulsen
 Pearce

NOT VOTING—14

Berg Hinchey
 Cardoza Kaptur
 Carson (IN) Mack
 Cassidy Pascrell
 Filner Paul

□ 1645

Messrs. GUINTA, GARY G. MILLER of California, CRAVAACK, SHUSTER and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CLEAVER and COSTA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Pence Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scallise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 24, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 24, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 237, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

AYES—177

Ackerman Frank (MA)
 Altmire Fudge
 Andrews Garamendi
 Baca Gibson
 Baldwin Gonzalez
 Barrow Green, Al
 Bass (CA) Green, Gene
 Becerra Grijalva
 Berkeley Hahn
 Berman Hanabusa
 Bishop (GA) Hastings (FL)
 Bishop (NY) Heinrich
 Blumenauer Higgins
 Boswell Himes
 Hinojosa Hirono
 Brady (PA) Hochul
 Braley (IA) Holden
 Brown (FL) Butterfield
 Capps Holt
 Carney
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline Jackson (IL)
 Clarke (MI) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) (TX)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Cohen Jones
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick

Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (NH)
 Benishek
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Cooper
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth
 NOES—237
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Hastings (WA)
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scallise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Filner
 Gutierrez
 Hinchey
 Kaptur
 LaTourette
 Mack
 Pascrell
 Paul
 Rothman (NJ)
 Royal-Allard
 Schock
 Sires
 NOT VOTING—18
 Berg
 Canseco
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carson (IN)
 Filner
 Pascrell
 Paul
 Rothman (NJ)
 Royal-Allard
 Schock
 Sires

□ 1649

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 25, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. FUDGE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]
AYES—171

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

NOES—243

Adams	Akin	Amash
Aderholt	Alexander	Amodei

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

NOT VOTING—18

Berg	Garamendi	Paul
Canseco	Hinchey	Rothman (NJ)
Cardoza	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Mack	Sherman
Dicks	Miller (NC)	Sires
Filner	Pascrell	Sullivan

□ 1652

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 26, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commit-

ments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have “aye.”

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 26, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]
AYES—173

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

NOES—243

Adams Goodlatte
Aderholt Gosar
Akin Gowdy
Alexander Granger
Amash Graves (GA)
Amodei Graves (MO)
Austria Griffin (AR)
Bachmann Griffith (VA)
Bachus Grimm
Barton (TX) Guinta
Bass (NH) Guthrie
Benishek Hall
Biggart Hanna
Billray Harper
Bilirakis Hartzler
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
Black Hayworth
Blackburn Heck
Bonner Hensarling
Bono Mack Herger
Boren Herrera Beutler
Boustany Huelskamp
Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI)
Brooks Hultgren
Buchanan Hunter
Bucshon Hurt
Buerkle Issa
Burgess Jenkins
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL)
Calvert Johnson (OH)
Camp Johnson, Sam
Campbell Jordan
Cantor Kelly
Capito Kind
Carney King (IA)
Carter King (NY)
Cassidy Kingston
Chabot Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz Kline
Coble Labrador
Coffman (CO) Lamborn
Cole Lance
Conaway Landry
Cooper Lankford
Costa Latham
Cravaack LaTourette
Crawford Latta
Crenshaw Lewis (CA)
Culberson Lipinski
Davis (KY) LoBiondo
Denham Long
Dent Lucas
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
Diaz-Balart Lummis
Dold Lungren, Daniel
Donnelly (IN) E.
Dreier Manzullo
Duffy Marchant
Duncan (SC) Marino
Duncan (TN) Matheson
Ellmers McCarthy (CA)
Emerson McCaul
Farenthold McClintock
Fincher McCotter
Fitzpatrick McHenry
Flake McIntyre
Fleischmann McKeon
Fleming McKinley
Flores McMorris
Forbes Rodgers
Fortenberry Meehan
Foxy Mica
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL)
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI)
Gallegly Miller, Gary
Gardner Mulvaney
Garrett Murphy (PA)
Gerlach Myrick
Gibbs Neugebauer
Gibson Noem
Gingrey (GA) Nugent
Gohmert Nunes

NOT VOTING—16

Berg Hinchey
Broun (GA) Kaptur
Canseco Mack
Cardoza Napolitano
Carson (IN) Pascrell
Filner Paul

□ 1656

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 27, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 24, 25, 26, and 27, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 8 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 245, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

AYES—174

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

NOES—245

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

NOT VOTING—13

Cardoza	Mack	Rothman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Pascrell	Royal-Allard
Filner	Paul	Sires
Hinchey	Payne	
Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1701

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 28, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, 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. 3582) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 534, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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

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

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

Mr. BOSWELL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Boswell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3582 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

After section 407(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as added by section 2, insert the following new subsection (c) (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

"(c) IMPACTS ON MEDICARE BENEFITS, BENEFICIARIES, THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE TRUST FUNDS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall 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, an impact analysis of the budgetary effects of such bill or resolution on Medicare benefits, beneficiaries, the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds 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 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."

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. The passage of this amendment will add protections for America's seniors to the bill. It will not, I repeat, it will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, the amendment will be incorporated in the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

My motion to recommit will protect Medicare and Social Security beneficiaries and repair, yes, repair the trust between seniors and this body.

The Republican leadership has, for more than a year, promised that slash-and-burn legislation would revitalize this Nation and empower employers. Well, we're still waiting on millionaire job creators to show us the jobs.

To date, we have seen nothing from the Republican Party that would encourage job growth, stabilize the American family, or help seniors pay for their Medicare. Instead, the policies we have seen attempt to take from hard-working Americans the assistance they have been promised and that they have paid into their entire working careers, throughout their lives.

Last year we were promised legislation that would fuel job growth. We ended up with a budget that would pay for a tax break for the wealthy by dismantling Medicare. Instead of providing the benefits these workers had earned, the Republican budget attempted to charge seniors higher premium costs for fewer benefits.

Seniors were let down when this plan had enough Republican support to pass the Chamber. Like me, again, seniors will be disheartened once more when the Republican budget on the floor next month again attempts to end Medicare.

Seniors have a right to know when their benefits are being cut or when their Social Security trust funds are being drained. They should not have to fear each day what this Chamber's leadership is going to do to their benefits.

American seniors have the right to know. That is why we are offering this amendment today, to ensure that Iowa's 450,000-plus seniors know when legislation could tamper with their hard-earned benefits. This amendment will side with our seniors by requiring an assessment of each bill to show how it will affect the programs our seniors rely on.

Voting for this amendment will prove to the American seniors that you are on their side and that you care about the programs that made this country great. The greatest success of Medicare and Social Security is that, in a time of need, these programs brought Amer-

icans over the age of 60 out of poverty and ensured their access to care. These programs honor America's work ethic and the communities that we build together.

This amendment would provide peace of mind by ensuring that any attempt to change Social Security, Medicare, and the Medicare trust fund will be reported to Congress and the public. Should a bill harm the solvency of the trust fund, lessen the benefits owed to American workers, or command seniors to pay more in premium costs, our seniors will know.

Americans who are enrolled in Social Security and Medicare have paid into these programs throughout their entire careers, and they have helped to make this country what it is today. It is our responsibility—our responsibility—to work together and preserve the structure of Medicare.

We must provide America's seniors with a viable safety net and insurance plan for their future. So I will fight to—continue to fight for proposals that strengthen Medicare and the benefits that American retirees have worked for throughout their lives.

I hope, again, I hope you will join me, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have good news, good news for my friend from Iowa. This isn't necessary. It's already done. The Congressional Budget Office already prepares these macroanalyses any time we consider legislation affecting these programs.

More to the point, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get the kind of detailed analysis on how policy changes affect Medicare and Social Security beneficiaries, that is done by the trustees, by the actuaries at CMS and HHS and at Social Security, SSA, not by the CBO. But the other part of the good news is they do that as well.

So what is good for us is that we do not need to pass this. It's unnecessary. It's already done. CBO already produces this kind of analysis, and the trustees at Medicare and Social Security produce it at the very level that the gentleman from Iowa is hoping for.

I would be more than happy, whenever legislation comes up to the House dealing with these issues, to provide that analysis and show it to my friend from Iowa.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think we've said enough. I don't want to consume all the 5 minutes. There's no point in passing this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 15-minute vote. The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

AYES—183

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

NOES—237

Adams Berg Bucshon
Aderholt Biggert Buerkle
Akin Bilbray Burgess
Alexander Bilirakis Burton (IN)
Amash Bishop (UT) Calvert
Amodiei Black Camp
Austria Blackburn Campbell
Bachmann Bonner Canseco
Bachus Bono Mack Cantor
Barletta Boustany Capito
Bartlett Brady (TX) Carter
Barton (TX) Brooks Cassidy
Bass (NH) Broun (GA) Chabot
Benishek Buchanan Chaffetz

Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loong
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
Gerlach
McHenry
Gibbs
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Filner
Hincey

NOT VOTING—12

Hoyer
Mack
Pascrell
Paul
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Sewell
Sires

□ 1727

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 29, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—242

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

NOES—179

Ackerman Berman Butterfield
Altmire Bishop (GA) Capps
Andrews Bishop (NY) Capuano
Baca Blumenauer Carnahan
Baldwin Boswell Carney
Bass (CA) Brady (PA) Castor (FL)
Becerra Braley (IA) Chandler
Berkley Brown (FL) Chu

Ciilline	Honda	Peterson
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Polis
Clay	Israel	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cohen	(TX)	Rangel
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Cooper	Kaptur	Richmond
Costa	Keating	Ross (AR)
Costello	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kind	Rush
Critz	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Langevin	T.
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Levin	Schiff
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schwartz
Deutch	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott, David
Dingell	Lowe y	Serrano
Doggett	Luján	Sewell
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Sherman
Doyle	Maloney	Shuler
Edwards	Markey	Slaughter
Ellison	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Eshoo	McCollum	Stark
Farr	McDermott	Sutton
Fattah	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	Meeks	Tierney
Garamendi	Michaud	Tonko
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Towns
Green, Al	Miller, George	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Moore	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Moran	Velázquez
Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky
Hahn	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Hanabusa	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Schultz
Heinrich	Olver	Waters
Higgins	Owens	Watt
Himes	Pallone	Waxman
Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)	Welch
Hirono	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Hochul	Pelosi	Woolsey
Holden	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Holt	Peters	

NOT VOTING—11

Cardoza	Mack	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Pascrell	Sires
Filner	Paul	Yoder
Hinche y	Rothman (NJ)	

□ 1734

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 30, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 2012, I missed rollcall votes 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 because of district business. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall 21, “no” on rollcall 22, “yes” on rollcall 23, “yes” on rollcall 24, “yes” on rollcall 25, “yes” on rollcall 26, “yes” on rollcall 27, “yes” on rollcall 28, “yes” on rollcall 29, and “no” on rollcall 30.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the Record that on February 2, 2012, I missed the last seven rollcall votes of the day.

Had I been present I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall vote No. 24, on the Peters Amendment; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 25, on the Connolly Amendment; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 26, on the Fudge Amendment; “yea”

on rollcall vote No. 27, on the Jackson Lee Amendment; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 28, on the Ciilline Amendment; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 29, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 3582; “nay” on rollcall vote No. 30, on H.R. 3582, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2011.

BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2011

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 534, I call up the bill (H.R. 3578) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 534, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 112-9 dated January 5, 2012, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3578

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 “Baseline Reform Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. THE BASELINE.

Section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 257. THE BASELINE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) For any fiscal year, the baseline refers to a projection of current-year levels of new budget authority, outlays, or receipts and the surplus or deficit for the current year, the budget year, and the ensuing nine out-years based on laws enacted through the applicable date.

“(2) The baselines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be prepared annually.

“(b) DIRECT SPENDING AND RECEIPTS.—For the budget year and each outyear, estimates for direct spending in the baseline shall be calculated as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Laws providing or creating direct spending and receipts are assumed to operate in the manner specified in those laws for each such year and funding for entitlement authority is assumed to be adequate to make all payments required by those laws.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—(A)(i) No program established by a law enacted on or before the date of enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 shall be assumed to expire in the budget year or the outyears. The scoring of new programs with estimated outlays greater than \$50,000,000 a year shall be based on scoring by the Committees on the Budget or OMB, as applicable. OMB, CBO, and the Committees on the Budget shall consult on the scoring of such programs where there are differences between CBO and OMB.

“(ii) On the expiration of the suspension of a provision of law that is suspended under section 171 of Public Law 104-127 and that authorizes a program with estimated fiscal year outlays that are greater than \$50,000,000, for purposes of clause (i), the program shall be assumed to continue to operate in the same manner as the program operated immediately before the expiration of the suspension.

“(B) The increase for veterans’ compensation for a fiscal year is assumed to be the same as

that required by law for veterans’ pensions unless otherwise provided by law enacted in that session.

“(C) Excise taxes dedicated to a trust fund, if expiring, are assumed to be extended at current rates.

“(D) If any law expires before the budget year or any outyear, then any program with estimated current year outlays greater than \$50,000,000 that operates under that law shall be assumed to continue to operate under that law as in effect immediately before its expiration.

“(3) HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall be included in all calculations required by this Act.

“(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For the budget year and each of the nine ensuing outyears, the baseline shall be calculated using the following assumptions regarding all amounts other than those covered by subsection (b):

“(1) ESTIMATED APPROPRIATIONS.—Budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level provided for the budget year in full-year appropriation Acts. If for any account a full-year appropriation has not yet been enacted, budgetary resources other than unobligated balances shall be at the level available in the current year.

“(2) CURRENT-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, for any account, a continuing appropriation is in effect for less than the entire current year, then the current-year amount shall be assumed to equal the amount that would be available if that continuing appropriation covered the entire fiscal year. If law permits the transfer of budget authority among budget accounts in the current year, the current-year level for an account shall reflect transfers accomplished by the submission of, or assumed for the current year in, the President’s original budget for the budget year.

“(d) UP-TO-DATE CONCEPTS.—In calculating the baseline for the budget year or each of the nine ensuing outyears, current-year amounts shall be calculated using the concepts and definitions that are required for that budget year.

“(e) ASSET SALES.—Amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall not be included in estimates under section 251, 251A, 252, or 253 of this part or section 5 of the Statutory-Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 if that sale would result in a financial cost to the Government as determined pursuant to scorekeeping guidelines.”

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL CBO REPORT TO BUDGET COMMITTEES.

Section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4)(A) After the President’s budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in addition to the baseline projections, the Director shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate a supplemental projection assuming extension of current tax policy for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year with a supplemental projection for the 10 fiscal-year period beginning with that fiscal year, assuming the extension of current tax policy.

“(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘current tax policy’ means the tax policy in statute as of December 31 of the current year assuming—

“(i) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001;

“(ii) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003;

“(iii) the continued application of the alternative minimum tax as in effect for taxable years beginning in 2011 pursuant to title II of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, assuming that for taxable years beginning after 2011 the exemption amount shall equal—

“(I) the exemption amount for taxable years beginning in 2011, as indexed for inflation; or

“(II) if a subsequent law modifies the exemption amount for later taxable years, the modified exemption amount, as indexed for inflation; and

“(iv) the budgetary effects of extending the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010.

“(5) On or before July 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Long-Term Budget Outlook for the fiscal year commencing on October 1 of that year and at least the ensuing 40 fiscal years.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 112-383, if offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), or her designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3578.

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

There was no objection.

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

I first want to start off by thanking Mr. WOODALL and Mr. GOHMERT, two of the leaders on this policy. This is the second of 10 bills on fixing the broken budget process that we're bringing to the floor to try to bring back accountability, transparency and responsibility to our Federal budgeting process. What this bill does is it removes the pro-spending bias that currently exists in the baseline we use as a starting point in Federal budgeting.

The baseline we currently use assumes automatic increases in spending in the discretionary budget. So, for instance, instead of basing next year's discretionary budget on what we spent this year, we don't do it that way. The way it works is we automatically assume spending increases. We automatically assume that government agencies can't live with what they had last year, can't be more efficient, can't be more productive, and we assume inflation in it already.

We think for honesty, for transparency, if we spent X dollars this year, that is the base on which we ought to consider next year's budget. And for all those programs where inflationary updates are already legislated, such as Medicare, Social Security, or the tax brackets to prevent inflation, this doesn't affect those. Those pro-

grams by law adjust for inflation and, therefore, so should their baselines. Discretionary spending, something Congress controls every year, does not have that because Congress legislates every year.

So what we're simply saying is let's err on the side of the taxpayer. Let's not err on the side of assuming every government agency automatically needs a spending increase one year to the next. If we think they need more money, then we should measure it on an honest basis and then legislate more money for those agencies.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will turn over the rest of my time to Mr. WOODALL, the author of this legislation, and reserve the balance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia will control the remaining time.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is the second budget bill that we've had today. There's been a lot of talk about what we need to do to help move the economy forward, to help put people back to work.

Let's be clear: as was acknowledged earlier, these bills do none of that. This will not help create one job; this is not going to help grow the economy. We've got a lot of work that we should be doing, including taking up the President's jobs bill, which has been sitting in the House since last October.

The economy remains very fragile. Those infrastructure investments and helping rebuild and repair our roads, our bridges, transit ways could be put to good use right now.

With respect to this bill, the concern is that this creates actually a very misleading picture of what we can purchase in terms of goods and services with our dollars, and it gets more misleading over time. Why do I say that?

Every American knows that when you're comparing the amount something costs between different periods of time, you have got to take into account inflation. You know what, \$10 back 40 years ago bought a lot more than \$10 today. What this bill does is it tries to kind of wish away inflation and, in that sense, it creates, as I say, a misleading sense of what we can expect in terms of goods and services purchased for taxpayer dollars going forward.

I think every taxpayer would say that if we did not, we did not index their taxes for inflation, that would be a tax increase. That's why we index taxes. If we decided to pass a law saying no more indexation of taxes, it would be a hidden tax increase.

Now, here I want to give a very clear example.

□ 1740

In fiscal year 2013, we're going to spend \$61 billion to help support our veterans, to help support our veterans, provide for veterans health care and other services. This is part of the discretionary budget. We also provide help in some of the mandatory budget.

Now, this bill would have you believe that 10 years from now, that \$61 billion is somehow going to provide you the same amount of goods and services to take care of our veterans. We know that's not true. We know that \$61 billion 10 years from now is going to provide a lot less health care for people who served this country. And so let's not play make-believe, and that's what this bill does.

What the Congressional Budget Office does right now is they make the assumptions that reasonable forecasters would make. As the author of the bill has said, there's no law right now that tells CBO how to do it. We leave it to the independent, non-partisan body, the Congressional Budget Office, to figure out what's the best way, what makes the most sense for budgeting purposes. And they say, you know what; we should do what every American does when they're comparing dollars spent in the past or in the future. We need to normalize that. We need to index that to get a real sense of what taxpayer dollars will be able to purchase; otherwise, it creates a misleading impression.

And so CBO, the independent group, said we need to take an account of inflation. What this bill does is says as a matter of law, ignore that. As a matter of law, we're not going to wish away inflation. We're going to pass a law that says for these purposes, don't take it into account. And as I say, it will create a very misleading picture of what it will take to support investments like veterans' health.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) who has been battling in the trenches over this idea for a number of years and whom I'm just as pleased as can be that his idea has come to fruition today.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns of my friend across the aisle, but I'm telling you, this is a great day for Congress, for America. Going back to 1974, the most liberal Congress in America until the time when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, in 1974, rules for CBO were put in place making it difficult to ever make actual tax cuts to help the economy grow, as John F. Kennedy made clear and showed by his actions. But that was also a time when Congress thought it would be a good idea to create automatic increases of every discretionary department's budget in the Federal budget, automatic increases.

I mean, there are times when increases would be appropriate, and there

are times when it would not be. But why should the government not have to deal with financial issues, like any responsible American, like any responsible family? There will be times when you should have to make cuts. There will be times when you should have to make increases. But what we saw through the 1990s, back during my days when I was a judge, I heard a guy named Rush Limbaugh bring up why do we have this automatic increase, because then when conservatives try to slightly decrease the amount of increase, they're said to be making draconian cuts. Well, I made a mental note.

When I got to Congress in January of '05, I couldn't believe it, to find out that we still had those automatic increases every year. And then to be going through a troubled time like we are now when families across America are having to learn to do with less and make cuts across the board, Congress was still dealing with decreasing the amount of increase because we had these automatic increases.

We had a supercommittee that was formed last fall, and try as they might, they didn't even deal with the issue of the automatic increases. The committee's projections have had to be used because CBO, because of the same 1974 rules, ended up saying, well, gee, the formula can slightly change each year so there's no way to know exactly what it will be over 10 years. Well, one thing's pretty clear, it would have been enough to clear the \$1.2 trillion threshold in cuts, and all it would have been doing is decreasing the amount of increase.

This is a great day for America when Congress, after all of these years, 37-38 years now, Congress is dealing with a financial issue that should have been dealt with long ago.

I brought this up back in 2005 and 2006 when Republicans were in the majority, and I was told back then by the chairman of the Budget Committee that, well, the law is that we've got to do the automatic increases, so we're just going to do it.

It is really thrilling to me to have a chairman of the Budget Committee who saw this as a real problem. This should have been low-hanging fruit, as people like to say. This should have been an easy no-brainer. Cut out the automatic increases. We have a chairman of the Budget right now who saw it as a problem. And it was also exciting to me to have a freshman like ROB WOODALL come in and see it as a problem and collaborate, discuss the matter. Because, really, to get a bill like this through, you need to have somebody that will shepherd it all the way through—subcommittee, committee—to get it to this point. So I'm very grateful to Chairman RYAN, and I'm very grateful to Mr. WOODALL. Amazing, as a freshman, he's done an outstanding job.

And now here we are, about to do what could be the most responsible fi-

nancial thing this Congress has done, this House has done in the whole last year. It could be \$1.4 trillion in cuts over the next 10 years, and all we're doing is just stopping the automatic increase.

There's a lot to be said for finally coming around to responsibility. There's a lot to be said, if you need an increase, come justify it, don't get it automatically. And we now have responsible action being taken, and I urge adoption.

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

I think it's important to underscore the point, and I think the author of the bill would agree, that this legislation didn't save the taxpayer one dime. That's not what we're talking about. This bill, when you pass it, doesn't save one penny. Every year, with respect to the discretionary budget, we have Appropriations Committees in the House and the Senate who go through the budgets, and they decide what's appropriate and what's necessary to be budgeted for those agencies and those accounts every year. They can cut them. They can increase them based on the needs that are perceived by Members of Congress who are acting on that. That's not the issue. We need to tighten our belts. In fact, back in August, we made some significant savings. We need to continue to find savings.

In fact, my view is, if we're really going to be serious about reducing the deficit and the debt, we've got to do this in a balanced way like bipartisan commissions have suggested. You've got Simpson-Bowles; you've got Rivlin-Domenici. All of them have said we've got to do a combination of cuts, and we also need to deal with the revenue. We can no longer afford to have tax breaks for the folks at the very top, that we can't keep all of these tax loopholes open that disproportionately benefit certain people over others, and tax breaks that actually encourage in some cases the export of American jobs when we want to be encouraging the export of American goods and American services.

So that's a very important debate that we should have, but that's not what this does. This just has to do with how we present the baseline as to what can be purchased in terms of goods and services for certain dollars. And moving to this will create a very misleading perception, everyone knows.

Let's say it took a certain amount of money to buy an aircraft carrier today and we wanted to know how much it was going to take to purchase an aircraft carrier 5 years from now. Let's assume over the next 5 years we're in the midst of rising inflation. What this would do is create the idea that since the number was the same this year as 5 years from now, hey, we can buy the same number of aircraft carriers. That's not true. You're going to get a quarter of an aircraft carrier, and that isn't going to do anybody any good.

So again, Americans know that when they're comparing dollars and the value of their dollars over time, you have to take into account inflation.

□ 1750

It happens every day in terms of financial transactions all over the country. So, again, this bill doesn't save a penny. This has to do with just how you present the budget in terms of a picture for the American people to look at and whether it's realistic in comparing what you can buy for a dollar today versus what you can buy for a dollar 5 or 10 years from now. And what we're saying is you should compare apples to apples so people know what the purchasing power of those dollars are in terms of goods and services. Then we, as the Congress, can decide whether we want to increase that amount or cut it, as we do every year. But this bill doesn't mandate any kind of cutting of that nature.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to a real leader for fiscal responsibility on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation by my good friend, Mr. WOODALL of Georgia. This legislation makes really significant reforms to the way the CBO develops baseline calculations for discretionary spending. Under current laws, we all know the CBO automatically budgets for inflation of discretionary spending in our baseline projects.

This process runs completely counter to what every American does with their own budget. No family sits down and assumes that they will automatically have an inflationary increase in their budget next year. No small business sits down and says, my sales or my revenue will automatically move up. As a matter of fact, using that approach actually is counterproductive because it actually discourages the search for savings and efficiencies.

I am an appropriator, and I can tell you this is the road to deficit spending. Getting rid of this will help us bring our fiscal house back in order. We should have done it a long time ago. The last time the Republicans were in the majority—and I'm very proud that Mr. WOODALL, Mr. RYAN, and other Members, and particularly this new freshman class, are pushing to do this. This will allow us to reduce the size of government, it will increase transparency, and we'll be able to put our house where we ought to put it.

Of course, the legislation is just one piece of a broader set of reforms. As Chairman RYAN indicated, we need to bring those up systematically. But this is the first step and the right step in the direction of getting our fiscal house in order. I commend my friend for bringing it to the floor. I look forward to its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from

Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), also a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, which would remove consideration of inflation from congressional budget baselines. Instead of beginning this year by putting forward legislation to create jobs, spur growth, and address the economic challenges that we face, the majority is trying, yet again, to achieve their ideological goals, this time by playing an accounting trick on the American people.

At its heart, this bill is a backdoor attempt to enact the same radical cuts the majority attempted last year and to further reduce the spending caps agreed to in last August's Budget Control Act. By eliminating inflation from our official budget considerations, this bill represents a freeze on all discretionary programs that, over time, would become a devastating cut to critical programs.

Within 10 years, all discretionary programs would see their funding slashed by as much as 20 percent. Among the priorities that would be gutted are scientific and medical research, financial aid for college students, assistance to elementary and secondary education, and investments in water and sewer systems. No discretionary program would be spared the axe. Disaster assistance, food safety, medical care for veterans, meals on wheels, community health centers, support for law enforcement and nutrition programs, all of these across the board would be slashed by leaving inflation out of the budget equation, and millions of middle class families would be harmed. Why don't we index tax brackets?

This dangerous cut aside, this legislation makes no sense from an accounting standpoint. Why don't we all put our heads in the sand, this bill argues, and just pretend that inflation does not exist? Now isn't that foolish? Then we can just pretend to be fulfilling our responsibilities to the American people.

Closing our eyes to inflation is not a solution. This is not a serious bill. It does nothing to cut the deficit. Do you want to try to cut the deficit? Let's look at the tax cuts for the oil and gas industry. Let's look at ending the subsidies to those multinational corporations that take their jobs overseas. Do you want to do something about the deficit? Then let's cut the Bush tax cuts for the richest 1 percent of the people in this Nation. This does nothing to cut the deficit. And like every other initiative from this majority, it does nothing to address the top priority of the American people, and that is jobs, growing the economy, and investing in the economy to put us on a glide path to economic sustainability in the future.

I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

say to my colleague who just spoke, I've introduced a bill in this House that not only repeals the Bush tax cuts, the Obama tax cuts, and every tax break for every multinational corporation and every special interest favor and every deduction and exemption and favor in the entire United States Tax Code, but it does so in a way that would actually bring in more revenues for those priorities that you mentioned. That's H.R. 25, the Fair Tax, and I would welcome the gentlelady's support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to one of the finest young leaders on the Budget Committee, my freshman colleague from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3578, the Baseline Reform Act, and to commend my hardworking colleague from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for leading in this effort.

Now this is straightforward legislation. It removes the pro-spending bias that currently exists in the baseline that we use here in Congress as a starting point for our annual budgeting. The baseline should be a neutral starting point for considering fiscal policy. It shouldn't presume any spending by this body.

Now we've already heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle numerous examples of programs that they fear will be cut in the future as a result of this legislation. Well, this legislation just says that without the sanction of Congress, without a free and open debate about the merits of any given program, there will not be any automatic increases to that program.

Today, the baseline does assume an automatic increase for inflation each year in the discretionary budget. Instead of looking at what each agency actually needs each year to fulfill its mission, we simply assume that that agency needs more money than it had the previous year.

Well, these assumptions add up. In fact, they add up to approximately \$1.4 trillion in outlays over a 10-year period to last year's discretionary spending baseline. This bill would change that pro-spending bias by setting the baseline at the previous year's spending level—and not a cent more. The effect would be to put an end to the longstanding and confusing Washington practice of characterizing any effort to maintain the same level of funding as last year as somehow a "spending cut." It's time to bring Washington definitions of "spending cut" in line with America's definition of a spending cut, and that is an actual cut in spending. This bill does that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, once again, instead of debating a bill that would create jobs and

bring this economy back or a comprehensive effort to put our fiscal house in order, we're here on this floor tonight focusing on a so-called budget reform bill.

This bill will do nothing to spur economic growth, it will do nothing to bring us closer to a balanced budget, although it could greatly confuse and complicate the budget process.

We must be clear what this bill does, Mr. Chairman. The bill pretends that inflation doesn't occur. It's a pipe dream. By eliminating baseline calculations, it would make it far more difficult to estimate future budget needs. We need to know exactly what it would take to maintain the current level of effort and the current level of services in governmental programs. With that knowledge, we can make realistic decisions, knowing what result those increases or decreases would produce. But this bill would deny us that knowledge. All too often, we'd be making budget decisions in the dark without knowing their full implications.

Efforts like this should find bipartisan opposition. Make no mistake. This bill would—or it could—not only lead to the slow starvation of funds for Democratic priorities like Head Start, clean energy research, and WIC, but it also could starve all programs, including the Border Patrol, military health and veterans' programs, and the FBI. At the very least, it would make budget decisions, both increases and decreases, less precise and less efficient.

I'm voting "no" on this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same. Let's stop wasting time on so-called budget reform bills. Instead, we need to get to work on the real budget to hammer out a comprehensive agreement, to bring this economy to full strength, and to get our fiscal house in order.

□ 1800

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, my hero, Thomas Jefferson, always said that if you apply core principle to any problem, no matter how difficult, the knot will always untie itself. It was true then, and it's true today. If we would apply the core principles of the Constitution to the problems we face as a government, the knot will untie itself. And here just applying common-sense principles to our fiscal problems, the knot will untie itself. This is a remarkably simple and remarkably effective reform. We will no longer assume inflation into the beginning of our spending bills on the Appropriations Committee.

Now, unfortunately, we only control on the Appropriations Committee about 39 cents out of every dollar of spending the Federal Government does. But that 39 percent that we do control will no longer increase automatically year to year. These procedural institutional reforms that House conservatives are enacting into law will make

a dramatic difference in changing the direction of our Nation from insolvency and bankruptcy to getting back on a path to a balanced budget.

I'm very proud to help our colleagues, my chairman, PAUL RYAN, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. GOHMERT of Texas in enacting this fundamental, commonsense reform to put America back on track to a balanced budget. And Americans should take heart that constitutional conservatives in the House are doing the right thing for the right reasons for the country and redesigning the way we spend money in favor of taxpayers and not in favor of Washington bureaucrats.

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

Again, just for people who are trying to get educated about the budget process who may be watching, and among our colleagues, we put together a 10-year projection of the budget in a lot of different categories. The appropriators on a year-to-year basis can decide how much or how little to give any program, and every Member of this body gets a chance to vote up or down on that. So that's not what this is about. This is not about saving money. I hope we will all save money and get the deficit down. This is about what information is presented in terms of giving an accurate picture of what the cost is of providing goods and services.

So I'm going to give the same example very clearly. Again, it's a very clear example. In fiscal year 2013, we're going to have \$61 billion in the budget for discretionary spending for veterans' programs. Now under the current procedure, the Congressional Budget Office tries to figure out 10 years from now, knowing what we do about inflation expectations—and everybody calculates those into their financial decisions—what would it take to provide the same services for our veterans?

Now what they're proposing is to put in \$61 billion in year 10. But that's misleading because you're not going to be able to provide the services to our veterans at the same level for that amount. In fact, that will represent a 23 percent cut. So I would ask my colleagues, what 23 percent cut are you proposing to make in veterans' programs as we go through this budget? And why do you want to build in what is misleading in a sense that it creates a false impression of what a dollar will purchase 10 years from now compared to what it will purchase today?

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. CULBERSON. I chair the Veterans Administration and Military Construction Subcommittee in Appropriations, and I assure you we all work arm in arm together. My friend, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and I will make sure veterans are taken care of. We will still be able to with this reform, but in the light of day look at inflation, medical

inflation, which is generally higher than regular inflation, we will build that in, I promise you, as we go through our hearing schedule. But we will do it in open public hearings. It won't be built in automatically. That's all this does is remove the automatic increase and lets the people's elected Representatives do it in the sunlight of day in an open hearing. And I assure you that veterans will be taken care of.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, thank you. And taking back my time, you really made my point, which is that if the purpose of a budget is to try and provide the most realistic projection of what services we're going to provide in the future compared to today, you should take into account the cost of those increases.

The gentleman has just said that of course we're going to build in inflation with respect to veterans programs. In fact, we're going to do better than that. And I'm glad to hear that because we're going to take into account the fact that medical inflation runs higher than regular inflation. But the point is, if you put different numbers in year 10 that don't take into account inflation, you're going to give people a very misleading sense of what can be purchased for their tax dollars in terms of goods and services.

The same holds true with respect to DOD, in other words, the Defense Department. Why don't we want to present the American people with an accurate representation of what it will actually cost to maintain the current defense or current discretionary veterans programs? That's the whole purpose of this. The Appropriations Committee can do what it wants with respect to decisions in increases and in cuts.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, just for the sake of clarity for the American people, I'd like to yield 2 minutes again to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure the gentleman from Maryland. And as we all recall, the Military Construction and VA Appropriations bill passed the House almost unanimously because all of us in this Congress are arm in arm in support of our veterans, in support of our military to ensure that they get the very best medical care possible, that we're providing every benefit that they have earned by their service to the Nation.

And the only thing this bill will do is remove the automatic blind increase in the starting point for our spending. And we in the Appropriations Subcommittee, in the full sunlight of day on C-SPAN and public hearings, will go through and build in that increase that has actually occurred in medical inflation and regular inflation to ensure that we have compensated our veterans for that increase that has already occurred. But we'll do it in a public hearing; we'll do it in the full light of day.

We'll do it so the taxpayers can see what we're doing.

The game is rigged today against American taxpayers; and House conservatives, constitutional conservatives are following core principle. We're honoring the Constitution. We're looking for ways to restore the 10th Amendment and individual liberty, shrinking the government, getting control back in the hands of individual Americans and State and local governments.

And then when it comes to the budget, we're implementing commonsense reforms that every American understands. We don't get an automatic increase in pay. If you're working for a company, you've got to earn it every year. We on the Appropriations Committee are going to go through and analyze every one of these accounts and make sure that we have built in, but in an open public forum, any increase as a result of the increase in medical inflation or baseline inflation.

We will, on the subcommittee, I assure you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, make sure that our veterans are fully compensated, as all of us take great pride in their service. And, truly, you see more unanimity on the Veterans' and Military Construction Appropriations bill than almost any other bill that we pass because we take such great pride in them.

So I urge my colleagues to please remove that argument from your repertoire, and let's focus on what's really going on here. The game is rigged today against taxpayers, and House Republicans are rigging the game today in favor of taxpayers in sunlight and transparency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

I hear what you're saying with veterans. Absolutely true, on a bipartisan basis, we understand we're going to make sure we support the veterans and we're going to make sure they get the cost-of-living increase. And the reality is, you mentioned the defense budget. That's 50 percent of the discretionary budget right there.

□ 1810

Are we going to make sure that we provide increases to make sure that we can maintain the same national defense?

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure. BILL YOUNG's going to do that. BILL YOUNG's going to take care of it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So here's the point. So you're going to create a document for the American people that says, hey, we're going to be spending this much in year 10 for veterans when we know that that's not true. We know right now, in fact, you've just said on the floor of this House, that number's going to be a lot bigger.

And my point is we can make it bigger, we can make it smaller. This bill

doesn't save a dime in terms of what decisions we make. But why would we want to present the American people with a misleading sense of what it's going to cost in real dollars and cents? I agree with the Member.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Just for a friendly conversation.

Truly, there's nothing misleading. We're doing this in the light of day. What we're, through this reform, going to do, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, is have these hearings in public, in front of C-SPAN and the world, and talk about what actually has been the level of inflation this year, what actually do we need to do to increase funding this year for the veterans, for medical inflation, for regular inflation.

BILL YOUNG, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee and a great leader from Florida who works in a bipartisan way with NORM DICKS, your leader on the Appropriations Committee, they're going to build in, they're going to analyze what inflation's been.

The difference here, truly, all we're doing is doing it in the light of day. We're removing the automatic increase. That's all. I want the pilot with his hand on the steering wheel of the airplane.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Reclaiming my time, but look, we're doing everything in the light of day. The issue isn't whether it's done in the light of day or not. Of course it's done in the light of day. It's what picture we're presenting to the American people in terms of the budget numbers on what their tax dollars will be able to purchase in terms of goods and services.

And in my view, it's misleading to say we're going to be spending the same nominal dollar amount for veterans 10 years from now in the budget when we know, according to your own testimony and according to what we know, that that's not going to be the case. That's why we try and put together a document that gives us the best representation of the information we have as to what it will cost; then we can make a decision to add or subtract. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it pleases me to be able to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), one of my freshman colleagues, a leader on the committee.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the things about being a freshman in this body is walking in and trying to learn the numbers game. On the Budget Committee, there are a million different variations to the numbers, a million different options with the numbers. And it's amazing to me, in Washington, DC, when you try to say what's the number, you'll get five different numbers.

So I think the best thing that we can do is clarify the system and say, give

the numbers out there. We know what inflation's going to be, but give the numbers out there so the numbers are the numbers, and we can say to the American people when we talk about controlling spending, this is what it is. We're not cutting off what was the automatic increase and trying to have two different sets of numbers and saying we really cut but we really increased. We're able to have a flat line number out there that everyone can see and that everyone can process through.

So while we're fighting to be able to manage the budget and to be able to work through the realities that are out there of inflation—and I understand fully the principle of inflation and how that fits into your buying power. But while we're fighting through those realities, we're not fighting against ourselves. We understand that the number that's been presented to us is not including some arbitrary number that's been invented that Congress did not come up with, but it's a number that we came up with, as Congress, and said this the projection and this is where we're headed.

So the best thing I think we can do is create a neutral budgeting process, and the way to do that is to have this kind of simple reform in baseline. Control the baseline spending by not having the automatic increases. Have the baseline be the baseline. Don't put something out in the future that was not passed by Congress and assume Congress is going to then follow the lead of CBO, but assume that Congress is going to pass the budget and that next year we're going to look at exactly what that's going to be.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Maryland, the distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, for yielding.

I, unfortunately, have not been able to listen to all of the debate, but I've listened to enough of it. This week we're playing let's pretend. We're playing the game of let's pretend that if we solve the process, we'll solve the problem.

There's an excellent article that I think everybody ought to read. Stan Collender, who is a real expert on the budget process and who has been involved in this budget process for a long, long period of time, quotes in an article that he wrote—that I hope most of you read—in Roll Call. He quotes Rudy Penner. Rudy Penner was the Director of CBO—not a partisan individual, in my view—that I've had the opportunity of dealing with for some period of time. And his quote is: A process, no matter how well designed, cannot make difficult problems easy.

I think my friend, PAUL RYAN, would agree with that. It's not the process that's the problem. The problem is we don't have the courage to make deci-

sions which are clearly necessary for us to make, and no amount of jiggering around the edges is going to change that.

Now, as all of you know, I'm a strong supporter of a Bowles-Simpson approach to bringing our country to a fiscally sustainable path. Unlike many of you, I believe that revenues have to be part of that process and cuts have to be part of that process and restraints of entitlements have to be part of that process. I've been saying that for 2½ years now. It's somewhat controversial, but I have three children, three grandchildren, two great-grandchildren. If we don't do that, they're going to be hurting.

But, frankly, we ought not to pretend that the process is the problem. The problem is the problem, as Rudy Penner's said. The problem is the problem, and we ought to address it. And we ought to have the courage to tell the American people that it's not a question of process, not a question that we don't have the right process in place in Washington. The problem is we don't have the votes in Washington.

This Congress is dysfunctional. That doesn't mean we don't pass things. We do. But this week, frankly, what we're dealing with will not affect any of the significant problems that we have, whether it be jobs or fiscal responsibility.

So I'm opposed to this bill. Why? Because I think it's a let's pretend. It's a let's pretend that if you have \$100 to spend on defense this year, that you can get that same defense for \$100 next year. You can't.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. You can't, and the American public knows that.

We talk about, well, we ought to operate like a family. Family understands that. They know their electricity bill goes up, and they know they can't get the same kind of heat this year or next year that they got last year because they know their electric bill has gone up, and they need to know what that is.

So what we said, the Congress said, we want a baseline budget. What does it cost to get that \$100 of value next year? And so we get that.

The previous speaker I heard speaking—I don't know who it was; I apologize for that—said, you know, we ought to have an honest budget. Well, you can argue it's honest both ways. Either it's honest that that's what we spent last year, 100 bucks, or it's honest that, in order to do next year what we did last year, you need \$101.50. Both of those are honest answers. Nobody ought to think that that's a dishonest answer.

The answer is: Do you want to know what you spent last year? Look at the budgets. Do you want to know what it would cost you to do the same thing? Then you get the baseline. So either one is honest. It's just a judgment.

But you're pretending that you're saving money by having that kind of budget. Baloney. Baloney. The only way you're going to save money is to have the courage to vote to do so.

My friend, PAUL RYAN, is shaking his head. He and I have some significant disagreements, but very great respect, I hope, for one another. I know I have great respect for him.

□ 1820

I think we are advantageous as a country having Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. RYAN, who are both very bright, able, committed people dealing with this. The trick is coming to agreement irrespective of process. It's substance that matters. The American public will be affected by the substantive judgments we make, not about whether we do it with a baseline budget or a static budget or dynamic scoring.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. I don't believe in dynamic scoring. I think dynamic scoring is a liberal, radical idea. Why? Because it pretends something you don't know.

George Bush said we had \$5.6 trillion we could rely on and therefore have very deep tax cuts. Didn't work out. I would much prefer to not use dynamic scoring and have more money than I thought I was going to have that I could apply either to reduction of the deficit or some other priority that I thought was important, rather than find out, oops, I was wrong on dynamic scoring, I have less money and I'm deeper in the hole. Now, you can differ on that, but that's my view.

I'd rather be conservative and say, Gee, I hope investing in infrastructure, cutting taxes, doing whatever you think is going to get better education is going to get you better results; I hope it does get better results. That's the purpose of investing in it. If it does, you're benefited if you didn't count on it because you have more than you thought you would. That's the place to be, not having less than you thought you would.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, to adopt reality. It cost us to do this yesterday, and now it cost us to do it today. I think that's a responsible, smart way to budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding this time. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your light touch.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me great pride to yield 5 minutes to my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. WOODALL for his leadership.

I simply want to say I deeply respect the minority whip, and I agree with a lot of what he just said. First of all, he's totally correct when he's saying there's no substitute for discipline, meaning Congress has got to make decisions, and nothing can substitute for that.

He's also half right when he says Congress is dysfunctional. Where he's half right, it's the other body over on the other side of the rotunda, the Senate, because last year in the majority they didn't pass a budget.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I was just going to kid him that he's just now trying to get to things that we can all agree on.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That's right. Trying to get some consensus here.

The year before when they had a supermajority, no budget.

To budget is to decide. To budget is to make a decision. They haven't budgeted for over a thousand days.

The budget process we have here, which we've had in place since 1974, requires the House pass a budget by April 15, the Senate pass a budget; and they didn't do it for over a thousand days.

So when we look at the process, we see that it's not working the way it needs to. It's no substitute for personal discipline, for Members making decisions, for compromising; but in this particular case, we think the process is part of the problem. We think the process needs to be improved to make it more likely that we make these decisions, that we get to exercising that discipline.

On this particular bill, we are assuming \$1.4 trillion in automatic spending increases and discretionary spending over the next 10 years. We probably shouldn't do that because even though it happens—this is not a spending-cut bill. This is a measurement bill. But the way we measure it leads to a bias in more spending.

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is in 2009 and 2010, domestic discretionary spending, including the stimulus, increased by 84 percent. So this category of government has grown very, very fast; and we're saying let's stop automatically assuming that it needs to grow every year. Let's put the taxpayer first and the government agencies second as far as who gets the money first.

What I'm trying to say is if we want to put a bias in favor of requiring agencies to do more with less, be more productive, more efficient, then we should not assume they automatically get a spending increase every year. That's how businesses do it. That's how families do it.

A lot of families don't get raises, but their expenses go up. Gas prices go up. Insurance costs go up. Grocery prices go up. But they don't get a raise, so they have to prioritize. We think government should do the same, and we shouldn't just assume they are going to get a raise.

This is not going to fix our budget problem, but we think this and the other bills we bring to the floor will improve the process to get us to what we need to do, which is come in here agreeing, compromising, and then de-

terminating and having decisions made, which is budgeting, so we can save this country from a debt crisis.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Frankly, this issue is of such importance, it is a shame we don't have a lot of time to discuss it because I think in many respects we do agree.

Where we disagree, however, is when you say that body that is dysfunctional—the gentleman just referred to that. I kidded about it. Both parties are dysfunctional to the extent that we are not making determinations to spend just the money we have. We haven't done that for some period of time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. You're talking about deficit spending?

Mr. HOYER. Yes. Not spending money we don't have.

From my perspective, we did that when we cut taxes. We didn't pay for that. It wasn't like we had a real surplus. We had a projected surplus. We banked on that; and as I said earlier, we lost on that proposition.

I suggest that whether or not, as I said, you use what you think is the bias towards not spending as opposed to a bias for spending, as someone who served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years, we all know what will happen. The agency will come in and say this is what we are doing for 100 bucks, and this year we need 150 if you want us to continue to do that.

My point is the Congress has the authority to say, no, we want you to do less. It is the Congress' role to make priorities. I suggest to the gentleman it won't be easier for us to do it under either scenario because it is hard to do. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to do it.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. I simply don't think this bill or any other bill will get us to that end if we do not have the courage and, your word, "discipline," to effect that end.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, I agree with that. I think the gentleman is right about that. There is no substitute for courage. This bill in and of itself won't fix the problem.

What I would simply say is that this bill helps remove what I think is a bias in favor of not pressuring government to be more efficient, more lean because they will think they will automatically get a spending increase year after year after year. That is the point. There is no substitute for discipline. I completely concur with that.

This helps us get the system pointed in the right direction. That is why I encourage all Members to support this.

I thank Mr. WOODALL and Mr. GOMMERT for their leadership.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if my colleague from Georgia is prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I am prepared to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think we have had a good debate. There have been a couple of themes. One is that this bill in and of itself, I think everyone acknowledges, won't save the taxpayer one penny. It doesn't do that.

In order to save the taxpayer money and reduce the deficit, we have to make the tough decisions that Mr. HOYER and Mr. RYAN mentioned. There are obviously disagreements as to how we go about doing that. We've talked about the importance of trying to make sure that as we go forward we have a budget that reflects the values and the priorities of the American people, and one where we are covering our costs. That means paying our bills.

A lot of us believe that in order to do that we've got to get rid of some of the tax breaks for the folks at the very top, that we need to close a lot of the special interest loopholes. That is a very important debate.

The question here is just how we put together an accurate reflection for the American people about our best guess of what I think should be a budget that shows what their taxpayer dollars will purchase in terms of goods and services.

□ 1830

It is a question of measurement. How do you measure what you're going to be able to buy for the American people or buy for our veterans 10 years from now? When you put \$61 billion in the budget today, which is what we pay for veterans' health issues and for other veterans' programs in the discretionary budget—and as Mr. HOYER says, let's pretend we're going to put \$61 billion in for that program 10 years from now—that is a cut when you take into account inflation and what we know about the increases.

In fact, Mr. CULBERSON, from the Appropriations Committee, was here on the floor, and he's absolutely right. He says you can be sure that the appropriators are going to build in inflation. We're going to make sure we take care of that. In fact, we're going to do a little more than that because medical inflation runs higher. If we're trying to give an accurate measure to the American people about what the budget is going to look like every 10 years, why would we put a number a member of the Appropriations Committee said is not going to be realistic and that we know, as we gather here, is not realistic?

If we are going to be serious about budgeting, we need to have the best

and most accurate sense of what taxpayer dollars are going to buy in terms of goods and services. What this does, as Mr. HOYER says, is to play let's pretend. Let's pretend that, for the same nominal amount, you're going to be able to get as much in terms of veterans' health care 10 years from now as you are today. If we do that, the real question to ask up front is: What veterans' services and benefits are we going to cut?

Now, the Appropriations Committee decides each year exactly how much to cut and how much to add. That's why, at the end of the day, this is all a question of the will of this body to make tough decisions; but let's make tough decisions off an accurate measure of what things will cost both now and in the future. In order to do that, we should maintain the existing practice, which shows us exactly what that is, and not create what I think will be a misleading sense that we can get more for our buck than we really can.

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

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

I just want to begin by thanking the folks on the Budget Committee who made it possible to bring this bill to the floor tonight: Nicole Foltz, Jon Burks, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, and on my staff, Nick Myers.

This is a team effort, and it was led by the gentleman from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT, who has been working on this issue year after year after year, but he could not find a Budget Committee chairman who was willing to prioritize process—and process matters. I've learned in my 1 year here as a Congressman, Mr. Speaker, that we spend a lot of time arguing about process. If we could find that common ground on process, we could get on to the substance. This is one of those issues.

I'd like to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Maryland. He says the question is: How do we put together an accurate picture of the budget process for the American people? That is exactly the right question to ask. When I ask that question of my constituents back home, they say, Rob, cut out those phony numbers of automatic increases every year.

We absolutely agree on the question, Mr. Speaker. It's how you answer the question that divides us.

As the minority whip said earlier, this isn't a bill that deals with our priorities for spending. Our appropriators are going to do that. This isn't a bill that cuts one penny. This is a bill that changes the way we measure the pennies that get cut.

I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, I start getting nervous when I hear the Washington political class talk about changing the way we measure, because I just assume they're going to come up with some new phony way to make it happen. Yet in this case—and perhaps this case alone—what we're saying is, for

far too long, we've had those conversations during town hall meetings when we spent \$1 million last year and when we'll spend \$1.1 million next year, and they call it a cut—"they" being the Washington measures.

That's nonsense, nonsense.

Is there a cost of living issue? Absolutely. Do we have to spend more on health care next year than we do this year? Absolutely. Do we have an unlimited spigot of cash that we can turn on to meet those needs? The answer is no. The answer is no.

This isn't a little issue, Mr. Speaker. \$1.4 trillion over the 10-year window is what this automatic phony budgetary gimmick increases the budget to be. We're cutting that out. We're cutting that out.

We're saying, Congress, if you care about veterans as our veterans' committee chairman does and as our appropriating chairman does, stand up and put your money where your mouth is—and I guarantee you we're going to do it. If you care about seniors, stand up and put your money where your mouth is—and I guarantee you we're going to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, if we gave folks \$500 last year to go out and buy their new iPhones, that iPhone has gone down. If we gave folks \$100 at the beginning of the Obama administration to buy gas, clearly, that \$100 is not enough to do it anymore because gas prices have doubled.

We already have a phony budget mechanism to project and bias towards increased spending. This is a bill—a simple bill—to which folks back home ask time and time again: Why hasn't it happened before? I don't have the answer, but it's not about blaming folks in the past for not getting it done, Mr. Speaker. It's about coming together, as we are tonight, to get it done.

This is a bill that has the support of the National Taxpayers Union. This is a bill that has the support of Citizens Against Government Waste. This is a bill that has the support of FreedomWorks. And this is a bill that has the support of the American people.

I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it, and let's move this bill on to the Senate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas will not be offering her amendment.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3578 is postponed.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My name is KEITH ELLISON, and I am a cochair of the Progressive Caucus. The Progressive Caucus, for people just tuning in, Mr. Speaker, is a group of Members of Congress who believes that America is a place where the idea of liberty and justice for all must prevail.

It has got to be more than the words that we say in the Pledge of Allegiance. It has got to be something we actually live.

“Liberty and justice for all,” that means everyone. That means we don’t exclude people based on their religion, and we don’t demonize them because of it. We embrace people in all their racial and ethnic diversities. We say that Americans born in America and that those who have come here are Americans all the same. Whether you’re straight or gay or whether you’re male or female, we believe in all America—one America—indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We believe in civil rights. We believe in human rights. We believe in the importance of economic opportunity being wedded to social inclusion. For the working people every day—Americans of all backgrounds—that means, if you work every day and if you work hard, you ought to be able to put food on the table for your families.

□ 1840

You ought to be able to organize in a union on your job. You ought to be able to expect a good, decent retirement after a whole life’s-long work. You ought to be able to expect that you can affordably put your kids through school. You ought to be able to expect that we will have a strong social safety net if you happen to hit hard times.

This is the Progressive Caucus, the caucus that believes that it’s better to talk it out than to shoot it out. Diplomacy is better than war. We should try to work out our differences with other nations, and saber rattling and investing in warfare armaments and outside and above protecting the American people is a problem.

We should be talking about things like environmental protection. We should be protecting our natural world. We should be addressing the dangers of climate change, and we should be affecting that change to make sure that America is greener and cleaner and more sustainable.

That’s the Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker. We’re the ones who could be found standing up for the Constitution, standing up for the idea of freedom of expression, freedom of religion, freedom of the press. We will be found standing up for the idea the government must have the proper authorization and justification to violate people’s right to be left alone.

We also want to stand up and say that we believe that the progressive motion in America is what has made

America this great Nation. We recognize our wonderful Nation, our great Nation had a dream. From the very beginning we had a dream, but we also had a reality. The dream was liberty and justice for all, land of the free, home of the brave. The dream was that all Americans and all men will be created equal, endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That was the dream. But the reality was America held slaves. The reality was women couldn’t vote. The reality was the original people were relegated to an inferior status.

So people who believed in that dream, people like Martin Luther King, people like Harriet Tubman, people like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and people like Susan B. Anthony, people like Eugene Debs, and people like Walter Reuther and other great Americans, they believed that that dream was worth fighting for and got out there, Mr. Speaker, and made the dream reality.

We weren’t trying to conserve the old order and status quo; we were trying to progress toward a better America that really reflected that dream that I was just talking about. The dream was that all Americans are created equal. The reality was segregation.

But Americans who had a progressive vision said we’re not going to stay, we’re not going to conserve segregation. We’re not going to conserve robber barons who controlled all the wealth in the 1890s. We’re not going to conserve the abuse of our environment.

Rachel Carson said, we’re not going to conserve that. We’re not conservatives. We’re trying to make America better. We believe in the greatness of this country, and we are not going to stop until we get it.

So people like Rachel Carson said we’re going to have a clean environment, and she wrote about it and she fought for it. And people like Martin Luther King fought for civil rights, and people like Walter Reuther fought for the right to organize. And sometimes people who were in these movements gave their lives for the changes that they stood for, and other times they were able to survive.

But the fact is they were all united in one progressive vision of what America should be about, not trying to preserve racism, slavery, segregation, gender oppression. The progressive movement is what we stand for, not conservatism. That’s not us, we’re not them and don’t want to be confused with them.

So tonight we’re here for a progressive message, and we’re going to be talking about jobs and unemployment, but I did want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, just to let everybody know who the Progressive Caucus was, because we don’t want anybody to think that we’re something else than what we are, the people who embrace the American Dream and believe that America is such a great country we can

overcome all the sins of the past and don’t want to conserve any of them.

Mr. Speaker, we want to go into a few key points tonight. We won’t be here the whole hour, but we want to be strong while we are. And so today we bring the people, Mr. Speaker, the progressive message to illustrate what’s at stake in America today. What are the things that we’re competing for? What are we contesting for? We come down, we watch the events on the House floor and all across the America, but what is the fight all about?

Working families are getting crushed and our middle class is shrinking every day. The working people of America are fighting to preserve a quality of life because a set of ideas has prevailed in America which basically says that any regulation is bad, and what we say is that regulations, if they’re protecting life, protecting the environment, and they’re helping the rules be fair and allowing Americans to succeed and have opportunity, they’re not bad.

But there are some people who never saw a regulation that they liked. We believe protecting health and safety is a good thing. We believe that getting rid of bad regulation or old regulation is just fine, but these folks over here have an ideological commitment to any, to ending any regulation, and we recognize that this is exactly what has ruined our environment, exactly what has caused global climate change, and exactly what caused the financial disaster.

What’s at stake in America?

Here in America some folks believe that if the economy is going really, really well, what they need to do is have a tax cut for the wealthy. If the economy is doing really, really bad, well, what they need is a tax cut.

If the economy is doing sort of good and sort of bad, what we need is a tax cut. In other words, the guys on the other side of the aisle, they don’t believe in taxes. We in the Progressive Caucus believe that you shouldn’t tax Americans any more than is necessary, but we believe that taxes are the dues that we pay to live in a civilized society.

We believe that if our taxes go so that there can be Head Start for our poor kids to be able to have a chance in life, that’s all right. That if we have to pay taxes for police officers and firefighters and people who work on our roads to make them safe and make sure bridges are safe to cross, we’re all right with that.

We’re not these folks who believe that you want to cut, slash, and burn, and act like public workers and public employees are just, you know, not valuable. We recognize they are valuable, and I’m talking about people who work in parks and rec, the police, the firefighters, but also the people who make sure that our water is clean and our environment is safe. Also, people who make sure that our economic and financial system is safe, people who make sure that when people, that when

some folks want to cut corners and just want to make a quick buck, that they're not going to be allowed to do that.

You need a cop on the beat, a financial cop on the beat to make sure that good actors are rewarded and bad ones are punished. So people who say, oh, we don't want any regulation because it would hurt jobs, we don't agree with that. We believe that jobs are going to come when we have middle class people having enough money to spend, and then the businesses of our country have enough customers so that they can then add new people.

Whereas our friends on the other side of the aisle believe that if you give people like Mitt Romney a lot of money, maybe, just maybe, it might trickle down to the rest of us. Something might land on our heads. Well, something has landed on our heads, but it's not rain or a good job; it's hard times economically.

Trickle-down economics, supply-side economics is a failed policy. It never worked. They always want to say Reagan, well, look at Reagan. Reagan raised taxes plenty of times, and so they even misappropriate his legacy. But the fact is the Progressive Caucus is here to talk about what's at stake in America today.

Now, if you want to know what's really going on, you could just look at this week. Here we are in Washington, supposed to be working hard on people's business. It's not like a lot of big things aren't going on. We've got a payroll tax that's about to expire.

Did we take that up on the House floor today? No.

Did we make sure that Americans don't end up with a thousand dollars extra to pay over the course of a year as the payroll tax deduction goes up? No.

Oh, this summer student loans are going to go up, are going to double if we don't extend the law that would allow them to stay lower. Did we work on that? No, didn't touch that. But here's what we did do. This week in Congress the Republican majority didn't bring up a single bill to create jobs, none of that.

□ 1850

They didn't bring up a single bill to help Americans stay in their homes as we are in the midst of this foreclosure crisis that seems to never end. They didn't bring up any bills to make sure that our air was clean and our water was safe to drink. Nor did they bring up any bills to rebuild our country. No, instead, they were busy playing politics while people are hurting.

Yesterday, they brought up a bill to repeal an effort to help seniors get health care called the CLASS Act. Now, the CLASS Act was a piece of the Affordable Care Act. Some good-faith people working in our government said, you know, there are some things that we need to fix with this bill before it works the way we want it to.

Anybody who has ever made anything knows that sometimes that happens. Sometimes you've got to mend the thing that you're working on. If you've ever cooked a meal, sometimes, you know, you've got to put a little more sugar or salt or add a little more water. Legislation is exactly the same way. You pass a law, you think it can do certain things, but when you get into the actual operation of it, sometimes it doesn't work like you thought.

With this long-term care bill, some good public servants said, you know, there are some kinks we've got to work out. But instead of working out those kinks, the Republican majority just decided to strip the whole thing away. So seniors who need long-term care, the Republican majority didn't say, You know what, here's our fix. They just said, Get rid of what was already done. We say build on what was done. They say strip it away. It's too bad that's the position that they took, but that's the position they took.

Let me tell a few things about long-term care and why we need to strengthen long-term care and not strip away what's already been passed. We have a long-term crisis in the United States today that the Republicans, who are in the majority in the House, are not dealing with.

Do you know, 10 million Americans, Mr. Speaker, need long-term care. Over the next decade, another 5 million Americans will require this care, bringing the total to about 15 million people, Mr. Speaker. The problem is only getting worse, and we've got to do something about it. I wish my friends on the Republican side would help us. But even though they are in the majority, they're not.

Nearly 70 percent of all people will need some level of long-term care after turning 65 years old, Mr. Speaker. That means anybody lucky enough to get to 65, there is approximately a seven in 10 chance you're going to need some long-term care assistance. The number of Americans 62 years and older is 20 percent higher than 10 years ago, so America is aging. And you know what, this is a good sign. We want Americans to be healthy. We want our seniors to be healthy, and we want them to be strong. And when they get into a health crisis, we want them to have the care that they need.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's also important to point out here that about 62 million unpaid family caregivers, about 62 million unpaid family caregivers, that's adult children of seniors, about 62 million of these families provide care which, if you put a dollar figure on it, would amount to \$450 billion in 2009, more than the total spending on Medicare that year. So families are stepping up, but families need a little help. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, people are coming into my office every day. People my age, I'm 48, and they say, My mom is getting older. She needs help. Or she got sick, something's going on. We need a fix for the long-term care.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with all of these problems that we're facing, with 70 percent of people who will need some level of long-term care by the time they turn 65, with the number of Americans 62 years of age and older being 20 percent higher than 10 years ago, with all of these issues, Mr. Speaker, you would think that the Republican majority would step up and do something about it. They're in the majority.

But what has been their response? An attempt to score political points, not solutions. They haven't come with any solution. They haven't come with a proposal to fix long-term care. They just want to strip what President Obama and the Democratic majority did, and I think that's too bad.

Now, that was what we did yesterday. We messed around. They tried to embarrass the President. It didn't work because Americans know that President Obama cares. In fact, I think Republicans know it, that's why they call it ObamaCare. Well, he does care, so they can say whatever they want.

But my point is today they were back up to their old tricks. Today, we in Congress voted on a budget gimmick bill—that's all you can really call it—a bill to make it easier for Republicans to pass more tax giveaways to the top 1 percent. They call it the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. And, Mr. Speaker, if I had a dime for every deceptively named piece of legislation during this 112th Congress, I think I'd be a wealthy man right now.

This legislation would rig the rules, play games with the rules, funny accounting, Mr. Speaker, to make it easier for the GOP budget priorities to pass, like the Ryan budget, which included deficit-busting tax cuts for the wealthy and cuts in job-creating investments like education, estimated to cost about 1.7 million jobs by 2014.

This bill, this funny-math bill, this bill requires the Congressional Budget Office to use what they call dynamic scoring—that's the word they like to use—as part of a macroeconomic impact analysis of tax provisions. That's a whole lot of long words, Mr. Speaker, which basically says that they want to score it in a way that makes them look good. That's what they're trying to do. And what they want to do is include calculating their effect on the economy like GDP—that's all of the goods and services in a year domestically, investments and employment—which past budget analysts have said are really not going to be an accurate reflection of what's going on when preparing supplemental cost estimates for major legislation.

Such an analysis is designed to hide the impact of tax cuts on the budget deficit, making tax cuts easier to enact or extending by masking their true costs. This bill, this funny-math bill, injects supply-side economics into the Congressional Budget Office scoring, which has been discredited time and time again. It has no place in the non-partisan analysis provided to Congress.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the CBO was set up so that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats, the conservatives or the progressives, none of us with our points of view could get in and mess around with the way the Congressional Budget Office scored a bill.

What it means to score a bill, Mr. Speaker, is to analyze the costs of the bill, or analyze the financial impact of the bill. So it might be how much taxes is this going to generate. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, would give us an estimate. Or how much is this program going to cost. The CBO tells us what are the budgetary implications of what we're doing. Historically, Republicans and Democrats have just had to live with the CBO score because it's a nonpartisan office, meaning neither party controls it. But now what the Republicans want to do is come up with this dynamic scoring thing to make their estimates look better. This is wrong. They shouldn't do it. They shouldn't do it.

The underlying assumption behind the bill is that tax cuts pay for themselves. This is obviously wrong. The reason we are in this monumental debt and deficit situation that Republicans like to talk about, they're always going on about we're leaving debt on our children and grandchildren. They always say it like that in a real dramatic way, Mr. Speaker.

The reason we're in this mess is because we got two unpaid-for wars under a Republican administration and huge tax cuts under a Republican administration. They cut taxes during a war. When you're really supposed to be raising taxes to pay for the war, they cut taxes during the war which exploded all this debt. That's the truth. If they come down here and tell you the truth, that's what they would say. That two unpaid-for wars and the Bush tax cuts are what exploded the debt and the deficit. It's why we're in the situation that we're in.

They always want to say, oh, ObamaCare. That's not the cause of it. They want to say, oh, oh, the stimulus. That's not the cause of it because that was an expenditure in a short period of time that didn't have long, long tails like these tax cuts do or these wars.

□ 1900

That's what has exploded the deficit. And now, instead of owning up to it and saying we need to tax Americans more fairly, not just take care of the rich people, but take care of everybody and make sure the burden is shared and not just the rich get to escape with not doing anything, or not doing much. Some folks running for President are worth hundreds of millions of dollars and only pay 13.9 percent on it; whereas if you make 50,000, 60,000, you're going to pay 25 percent, 28 percent or 35 percent, depending on exactly how much you make. It's unfair. What the Republicans want to do is instead of just owning up and saying, yeah, we were fiscally irresponsible, they just want to

have dynamic scoring so it doesn't look so obvious.

Now, I talked about what we did yesterday, which is try to do nothing about long-term care except embarrass the President and strip the CLASS Act out. Today, we played games with the budget again with budget-counting measures trying to interfere with how the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office does the scoring. Well, what are we going to do tomorrow, Mr. Speaker? Certainly, tomorrow must be better than the last 2 days, particularly given the fact that we got the payroll tax deduction running out and other things, important things, going on. Are we going to take up the payroll tax deduction issue tomorrow? No.

Tomorrow, we're going to do something else, another budgeting gimmick bill, this time called the Baseline Reform Act. This is another one to try to hide the reality. It requires the Congressional Budget Office—and, Mr. Speaker, you'll recall I explained that Congressional Budget Office is sometimes referred to as the CBO—it requires the CBO to unrealistically assume in its baseline that spending in the future will stay the same and not grow to keep pace with inflation, thereby facilitating cuts in real terms in job-creating investments.

This bill ignores the impact of inflation on the discretionary budget which gives an unrealistic picture of what it will take to maintain basic services. So, understand it this way, Mr. Speaker, if inflation is making everything cost more but you try to hold the line, then the cost of things will not be accurately reflected if you don't account for inflation. But this is exactly what they don't want to do.

Republicans want to starve these programs, and they could lead to long backlogs for services and other types of problems such as the major issues at the Walter Reed Hospital during the last decade. Relative to the traditional baseline, a freeze would reduce investment for long-range programs such as rebuilding and educating America by over 20 percent and by the 10th year.

So there you have it, Mr. Speaker. Three days of not dealing with what we need to deal with, 3 days of playing games, 3 days of not dealing with the people's business, 3 days of not focusing on what America needs us to focus on.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the American people. They have rejected the Republican budget scheme that ends the Medicare guarantee to pay for tax breaks for Big Oil millionaires and corporations that ship jobs overseas. For the last year, if you're not a CEO or a wealthy special interest, the Republican Party of the 1 percent says you're on your own. I often wonder what they meant when they said the "ownership society." What they really mean is the "you're on your own society." They mean, hey, we got to cut cities and towns, and we got to cut States, and we can't be there for you

anymore. You are on your own. We're going to lay off teachers, we're going to not give the cities enough to make sure there's enough police, water, fire, all that stuff. You're on your own.

But Mitt Romney is not on his own. If you need a bailout, you're not on your own. But if your house is underwater, don't look to the majority for help. If you're a father who lost your job through no fault of your own, a mother struggling to make ends meet, or a family kicked out of your home, the majority of the 1 percent says you're on your own. Turning their backs on ordinary Americans may pad the profits of corporate donors and hedge funds of billionaires bankrolling their campaigns, but it won't grow the middle class.

It used to be that working hard and playing by the rules meant you got a fair shot. We've got to restore that dream. We're not talking about an American fantasy where everybody is—you see it on TV sometimes, Mr. Speaker, where you're going to be living in some lavish place and fancy this and fancy that and lifestyles of the rich and famous and all this kind of stuff. We're not talking about an American fantasy. We're talking about an American Dream, which is realistic because it's not too much to ask that if you're willing to work hard in this country that this country should work for you.

But many Americans out there are under a lot of stress, and it's because from a policy standpoint, their elected leadership is catering to the people who have the most under the philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that if you give it all to the rich, they will invest in plants and equipment, and then it will trickle down to everybody else. That philosophy has failed, and it's time for them to admit it.

We need leaders who understand that when we all do better, we all do better. Americans have got to have a better shake. And we in the Progressive Caucus are standing up for hardworking taxpayers of the great American middle class and working class and poor. We in the Progressive Caucus are not ashamed to stand up for the poor, Mr. Speaker. We believe that poor people, low-income people, what you call poor people, are poor if they're too old to work or too sick to work or too young to work. Anyone else might be poor by circumstance, but they would love to join that great American middle class if they could just get a chance. And that means an education, that means job retraining, and that means an economy where we're literally trying to do something to protect the American worker from off-shoring by investing in our infrastructure, putting people back to work, and by doing things to make this economy strong.

The best way to get our economy going is to put America back to work. There's a lot of work to be done. The best way to cut spending is to cut

spending on tax handouts to millionaires, billionaires, and corporate special interests, while we give \$4 billion to the oil industry while they're making the most money they ever made, and they still come down here and scream, oh, don't take away our subsidies.

The American people know that the best way to cut spending is to cut spending on big special interests like Wall Street and Big Oil. But instead, Republicans would rather make the rest of us pay for tax giveaways for millionaires and Republican corporate donors like big oil and pharmaceutical companies.

So we want an America where the burdens are shared and where the benefits are also shared. We want an America where there is true economic opportunity and inclusion. We want an America where it doesn't matter whether if you're born here or you came here, it doesn't matter what color you are, it doesn't matter what religion you are, it doesn't matter whether you're male or female or who you want to be married to, that all of us can have a good, prosperous life based on an economy that works for everybody.

And so I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I begin to wind up my remarks, that this Progressive Caucus is going to be here standing up for the American people. We will be there for the 99 percent. We will work to get money out of politics, as we're pushing constitutional amendments to do so. We will stand up to Citizens United. We believe that corporations are not people, money is not speech. And in America, democracy is not for sale.

We believe unemployment insurance should be there for people who have fallen on hard times. And we believe that the social safety net is something that's important so that when people need help, they can get back up on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, as I wind down, I just want to point out that, with nearly 14 million people unemployed today, they deserve an opportunity in an America that really works for them. They deserve leaders who care about their plight. They need leaders who care about their plight and are willing to stand up and push policy that will make the American Dream attainable for anybody who wants to work for it.

I just want to say, as I close out, America is a wonderful idea. And the American Dream should be in the grasp of every American. And great Americans have overcome some of the bad things in the past as they reached out to build the American Dream for all.

And when I say liberty and justice for all, Mr. Speaker, I mean it. And I just don't mean social equality, I mean economic opportunity too. And it's going to have to start with asking everybody to pay their fair share, recognizing that trickle down never worked and never will, and that we've got to invest in America, educate America,

and protect America so we can get this economy working again.

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

□ 1910

REPEALING OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BENISHEK. Tonight, my colleagues and I have come to the floor, both as Members of Congress and physicians, to discuss the urgent need to repeal and replace the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Like many of my fellow Members here this evening, I've spent the last decades of my life as a physician, a surgeon. Unlike our President, I was on the front lines of medicine. I went to medical school in Detroit, Michigan. I did a family practice internship in Flint. I returned to Detroit to do a surgical residency, and then moved to the upper peninsula of Michigan, where for the last 28 years until I took this job, I was taking care of patients in a rural general surgical practice.

I know what it's like to be in a small town where people depend on their local physician, and it's 2 hours in an ambulance to get to the nearest hospital. And the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is affecting rural hospitals to such a degree that many of these hospitals are going to close. And I just want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of this problem.

It's been a pleasure being a surgeon. It's a pleasure being here in Congress. As a matter of fact, sometimes patients of mine still call the congressional office inquiring about scheduling a case. One of the very reasons I ran for Congress was because I felt those with real health care experience needed to contribute to the national discussion on health care reform. Tonight, along with other members of the Doctors Caucus, I'd like to dispel some of the myths associated with the President's health care bill.

It's time to set the record straight. It isn't enough to just say this bill must be repealed, we must tell you why it has to be repealed, explain to you the really bad aspects of this bill. I'm proud to say that one of my first votes as a Member of Congress was to repeal it. Tonight, we're going to go through some of the provisions of the bill which make it so onerous.

While I disagree with the President's health care bill for a number of reasons, I'm particularly appalled at the recent regulation issued by the United States Department of Health and Human Services as a result of the bill, requiring all employers, even if they have a religious or moral objection, to offer health insurance that includes

sterilization, abortion-inducing drugs, and contraception.

I offer for the RECORD an excerpt from a letter from Bishop Sample of the Catholic Diocese of Marquette, one of my constituents. Here is a quote from Bishop Sample's letter:

In so ruling, the Obama administration has cast aside the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, denying to Catholics our Nation's first and most fundamental freedom, that of religious liberty. And as a result, unless the rule is overturned, we Catholics will be compelled to either violate our conscience or drop health care coverage for our employees and suffer the penalties for doing so.

The Obama administration's sole concession was to give our institutions 1 year to comply. We cannot, we will not comply with this unjust law. People of faith cannot be made second-class citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a fellow Catholic and a physician, I agree with Bishop Sample. It's my belief that the government has no right to mandate that employers purchase health insurance for their employees in the first place. But this law is made even worse by demanding that those who support life, regardless of their particular religion, provide coverage for abortion-inducing drugs.

Mr. Speaker, Federal conscience laws have existed since 1973 and have protected many health care providers from discrimination due to religious and moral values. Unfortunately, President Obama's health care bill contains no language protecting the conscience of health care providers.

I recently cosponsored H.R. 1179, the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act, which was introduced by my colleague, Mr. FORTENBERRY of Nebraska. If signed into law, this bill would amend the Affordable Care Act to permit a health plan to decline coverage of specific items and services that are contrary to the religious beliefs of the sponsor of the plan without suffering consequences. While I and other Members of Congress continue our efforts to repeal the President's health care plan in its entirety, bills such as H.R. 1179 are necessary while the Affordable Care Act is still law to ensure that the Federal Government does not mandate any American citizen to defy their own religious principles.

I certainly have many other issues with the President's health care bill, but I'd like to give some time to my other colleagues here tonight a chance to speak as well.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. You know, the gentleman's been talking about the President's health care bill. I assume you don't mean President Reagan's health care bill, you don't mean President Bush's health care bill. You're talking about—because a lot of people at home might be a little confused, you're talking about ObamaCare, I take it?

Mr. BENISHEK. Right.

Mr. HARRIS. And when you talk about the conscience protection that

has been infringed in the last week, is it correct that that is directly a result of the ObamaCare legislation?

Mr. BENISHEK. That's correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And in fact, as you well know, you're a surgeon, I'm an anesthesiologist, as physicians, when we were trained, the whole idea behind that part of the law would treat pregnancy as a disease. Because in my understanding, isn't that correct, that part of the law dealt with preventing disease? And in some strange way, shape, or form, what a lot of Americans think about as a thing of wonder, pregnancy—you know, the ability to bring a new life into the world—for the first time is treated as a disease to be prevented using taxpayer dollars to the point where, and correct me if I'm wrong, the Secretary of Health—because that's her title, the Secretary of Health and Human Services—is treating pregnancy as a disease. And not only saying that, but that it's so important to prevent this disease that every American employer should be forced to pay every penny of the prevention. Is that what I understand the Secretary's decision to mean?

Mr. BENISHEK. That's correct, as I understand it.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, as the doctor has said, this is a very strange path to go down, from a bill that was brought to the American public as a bill that will help the uninsured get insurance has now gone to the point of not dealing about whether someone has insurance, but whether every employee should pay what we call first dollar coverage—that is, no copay, no deductible—free treatment to treat what the Secretary of Health now I guess considers a disease, pregnancy. Now, if that's true, you know, I've got five children, I guess my wife was struck with that disease five times.

But I will tell you, as a physician who's treated patients, Mr. Speaker, as the other gentleman from Michigan has, with diseases, to put pregnancy in the same category as breast cancer, as colon cancer, as prostate cancer, as leukemia, as other diseases that have screens that can be done, where, yes, maybe to prevent those life-threatening diseases—because, doctor, if you can correct me, I don't think it says that this is only for life-threatening pregnancies. I think this dictate from the Secretary of Health and Human Services of the United States is to prevent and treat, in whatever fashion someone decides to treat this disease—it doesn't have to be life-threatening; it's not a cancer, it's a pregnancy.

□ 1920

To place that in the same category and to use our precious health care resources to treat disease and a pregnancy is a very different objective than to pass a bill to provide basic important health insurance. And I think the gentleman, as I say, you're being very generous and perhaps confusing to the

American public, because I think they've come to understand this bill. It's ObamaCare.

I'll tell you what's interesting. Most of the time, when someone here has a piece of legislation, signature legislation that passes, they're thrilled if the legislation is referred to by their name, and there are plenty of examples. But interestingly enough, as the doctor may know, when we write a letter to our constituents and refer to the Affordable Care Act, we've actually been told we can't use the name that all Americans know this bill by. They call it ObamaCare. For some reason, someone's sensitive. I guess the President's too sensitive. Why wouldn't he want—if he is so proud of this bill, why, every time we refer to it by the name all America knows it by and, I might add, dislikes it by, is ObamaCare.

We know what the public polling says. A majority of Americans know it was a mistake. Interestingly enough, a third of Americans don't realize it's still the law of the land. But they did get a rude awakening last week when, if you happened to be a member of a religion that doesn't believe that pregnancy ought to be treated as a disease, that doesn't believe that you ought to be forced to fund sterilizations with no copay or deductible as part of your insurance policy you provide to your employees, that that comes under the ObamaCare legislation that is still in effect.

Mr. Speaker, you know that if you travel through your district and you talk to the small business men and women in your district, you know how afraid they are of this bill being fully implemented. They understand that it will break the bank in their business, it'll break the bank in their State, and it'll break our bank here in Washington.

We have a \$15 trillion debt, and everyone knows, when you add 14 million new people to a government entitlement, as this bill did, all that you're going to do is make that situation worse. And our small business men and women realize this. They know that cost is going to be born to them.

We know what the unemployment rate is. It's not under 8 percent like the President had promised when that stimulus bill was passed in this very Chamber 2 years ago, I will say, when the other side was in charge. The unemployment rate's over 8 percent. The Congressional Budget Office, just this week, projected it will be 9 percent by the end of the year.

Times are tough. Gasoline is \$3.60 a gallon. And what is the President's administration doing? Going full steam ahead on implementing a bill, ObamaCare, that Americans don't want and can't afford.

So I'm going to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the time to me and thank the gentleman for bringing this up to the American people once again, to remind them ObamaCare is with us. It may not be after the next

election. We don't know. But we know that America agrees, this was a bad idea at a bad time, and due to what happened last week with the conscience protection that's always been present in Federal law being abridged by our Secretary of Health.

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you, Dr. HARRIS, for being here tonight. We certainly appreciate your comments.

Let me add, at a town hall in New Hampshire in August of 2009, President Obama stated: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. The President made this statement several times as he attempted to gain support for his health care overhaul.

After the last Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, the Obama administration began its job-killing regulatory spree. Instead of allowing Americans to keep their health care plans if they're happy, this new law could cause as many as 87 million Americans, nearly a third of the population, to lose their coverage.

As a physician, I understand the importance of consumer choice when it comes to health care. Personally, I don't think government should be in the business of mandating the purchase of health care insurance at all. Why in the world would you pass a bill that mandates the purchase of health care insurance and then potentially kicks 28 percent of the population off their plans?

I can tell you from experience, this has nothing do with affordable care. Again, this is just not another reason to replace President Obama's Affordable Care Act with real health care reform.

I look forward to replacing this plan with a bill that expands health care choice, like H.R. 3000, a measure introduced by my colleague, Dr. PRICE, that I cosponsored. This bill expands health care access and availability, making provisions for selling insurance across State lines and addressing medical liability reform. This is a real step forward in health care reform, unlike the previous Congress's attempt.

With that, I'd like to introduce Dr. GINGREY of Georgia for his comments.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan's First Congressional District for yielding the time, and I thank him for putting together this Special Order hour. And, indeed, I thank our leadership for making this the designated leadership hour for the Republican Conference this evening and all of my colleagues that are participating.

The gentleman spoke about some of the things in ObamaCare. As the gentleman from the eastern shore said, the name of the bill that the patients know it for—or dislike it for, I think is the way he put it. And certainly 60 percent or more still, 2 years after its passage—I guess when former Speaker PELOSI said they'll have to find out what's in it and I think they'll like it, well, they found out what's in it and they don't like it.

And one thing that was in it, still in it, unfortunately, that nobody really likes, yet our Democratic colleagues fought tooth and nail yesterday on the House floor to keep the CLASS Act in this ObamaCare, Affordable Care Act. We call it the “unaffordable care act.” And the CLASS Act was a provision that was inserted, Mr. Speaker, on the Senate side in the latter stages just before, in fact, they voted on the Senate side to approve the bill.

In the CLASS Act is this so-called long-term care provision that former Senator, God rest his soul, Senator Kennedy had worked on for years, and this was something that his staff wanted to have in the bill as a legacy to his memory. I understand that. But not only was it half-baked, I think it was about quarter-baked, and it was a bill, a section of the bill, 2,700 pages, so it was just one section, but one of the most egregious provisions in regard to what it’s going to cost our poor, burdened American taxpayer, this CLASS Act, in regard to long-term care provisions.

And thank goodness for our former Senator, Judd Gregg, who was chairman of the Budget Committee on the Senate side, is now retired. But he was on the Health Committee in the Senate and proffered an amendment that said you couldn’t go forward. The Secretary would not be allowed to go forward with this CLASS Act provision on long-term care unless she could certify that it was fiscally solvent in the out-years.

And another Member, the current—in fact, the current Budget Committee chair on the Senate side, Democrat KENT CONRAD, said in 2009 that it was a Ponzi scheme of the highest order. In fact, he even said it would have made Bernie Madoff proud. I couldn’t have said it any better than that, because what it called for, or what it calls for is something that absolutely is a Ponzi scheme. It requires people that sign up for this CLASS Act, long-term care insurance, to pay premiums for 6 years before they would be eligible to have a benefit if they were disabled and they needed care with daily living activities in their home.

□ 1930

So it looked like this part of the bill was going to generate \$80 billion in cost savings, and boy did they ever proffer that point. Eighteen months later, the secretary of Health and Human Services finally says we can’t make this work, we have looked, turned it upside down, inside out, backwards, eight ways to Sunday.

In fact, they had a flowchart that had an algorithm of how they could possibly make this program work. It included things like saying that people with preexisting conditions had to wait 15 years before they were eligible for a benefit, that these preexisting exclusions would go away. Then they said, no, maybe we ought to eliminate anybody. Our colleagues on the other side

of the aisle yesterday said you mean you’re going to deny coverage to people with Alzheimer’s and with metastatic cancer and with type 2 diabetes and renal failure, and all this stuff? These are the things that the Secretary wanted to say, We are going to have to not allow them to participate with these preexisting conditions; not us, not our side of the aisle.

In fact, let me make this point before I yield back to Dr. BENISHEK so he can yield to others that are here on the floor.

The only thing that they could come up with, Secretary Sebelius, that would make this program work was the ninth thing, and that was to make it mandatory, say everybody has to sign up for long-term care insurance whether they want to or not.

I think they already know they have a little bit of a problem in regard to mandating health care in regard to the case that is before the Supreme Court now. They will have 5½ hours of testimony in March and a decision probably in June. I don’t think they wanted to go down that road again, and so she threw up her hands and said, We are not going forward with it.

We voted on the House floor yesterday to strike that bill from the law, remove it from the books because, if we don’t, here is the problem with the CLASS Act still being kind of inactive, sitting there in the statute, in law, even though the Democrats say you don’t need to remove it because the Secretary says she is not going to go forward.

But the law says very specifically that she will have a program for people to participate in by October 1, 2012. That is less than 9 months from now, if my math is correct. Someone could simply say, You didn’t provide this and the law requires it, and therefore I’m going to bring suit against the Federal Government. This could go on and on and on.

Then the people who are trying to develop a long-term care insurance policy so that folks could afford it and it would work, they are not going to work on that until they know that the Federal Government is not continuing to mess with the system and cause more and more delay. I wanted to mention that because I thought it was very important.

The vote yesterday to repeal had 26 of our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. That is pretty darn good in this body in regard to bipartisanship.

We hope and pray, as this bill goes over to the other body and gets to the desk of the majority leader, Senator REID, that it won’t just stack up like one more piece of cordwood as did the 30 bills that we’ve passed in the first session of the 112th Congress. Hope springs eternal. I think we did a good piece of work yesterday. I am proud to be here with my colleagues.

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you very much. I really appreciate my colleague

from Georgia’s comments, Dr. GINGREY. Excellent.

The minority leader, then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI, once promised that the President’s Affordable Care Act would create as many as 4 million jobs. Despite these promises, over 13 million Americans have been unemployed for the last 31 months. Instead of creating jobs, the President’s health care plan is working against America’s economic heartbeat—small business. According to a study by the National Federation of Independent Business, new taxes created by the employer mandate provision in President Obama’s health care bill may eliminate as many as 1.6 million additional jobs by 2014.

During his State of the Union address last week, President Obama stated:

Companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and everybody knows it. So let’s change it.

I couldn’t agree more with the President on that statement.

One easy place to start would be the passage of H.R. 1370, a measure introduced by my colleague, Dr. BOUSTANY. This measure repeals the annual fee, meaning a tax, that the President’s health care plan places on health care insurance providers. Instead of raising taxes by \$500 billion on the American taxpayers to pay for the Affordable Care Act, President Obama should follow his own advice and encourage the Senate to repeal his health care plan.

With that, I would like to introduce my colleague from Louisiana, the former Louisiana doctor of the year, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Dr. BENISHEK. That was an unexpected recognition there. I thank you, sir, for that.

I’m just going to give a brief top-level overview of where we started with health care in this Nation and why we are here today.

I have to take you back to post-World War II, where we began to have the indication of a crisis protection form of insurance; that is, insurance that is there just to keep the family from going bankrupt over medical bills. That seemed to be well received.

Over time, it became obvious that there were other people, the people who were poor, people who were elderly, who could not get coverage in the normal marketplace of insurance. As a result, Congress in the mid-1960s, created Medicaid, health care coverage for the poor, and Medicare, health care coverage for those who are 65 and over.

That was all well and good; however, this was the first real foray of the government managing health care, that is, the financing of health care. The promises were great to the doctors to get them to go along with it. The promises were great to the patients. It has rocked along for a while pretty well.

People who receive Medicare benefits enjoy them. The problem is that we know in government that the cost has risen and risen and risen, and now what

we have is a situation where Americans who are on Medicare enjoy very good health care benefits, but the explosion in cost and the pressure it is putting on the rest of the health care system is becoming unsustainable. In fact, if left alone, Medicare will totally displace all discretionary spending in the government today; therefore, something has to be done about it.

We got about halfway through government-run health care, and our friends on the other side of the aisle have had this vision for many years of having government totally control health care for everyone. They attempted to do that with the passage of ObamaCare, which took us, I would say, to about 95 percent complete government control of health care.

What was the promise? The promise was that your insurance rates would go down, your coverage would go up, that your choices would go up, and things would be fine and dandy.

What have we found thus far? And it hasn't even been nearly fully implemented. That is that the cost of insurance premiums have gone up.

We now have a board called IPAB, which is 15 bureaucrats who will be appointed by the President, not necessarily health care workers. Everything that may affect you in your life with regard to health care may well rest in the hands of this 15, even usurping Congress itself when it comes to decisions such as what doctors you can see, what it will cost you, and certainly what the health care system itself will be paid.

What I would submit to you tonight is that any time government runs a system of economy—which certainly it has done in education, and we see the failures in secondary and primary education there, and now in health care—that costs skyrocket. They become very inefficient and they become unsustainable.

Remember that when it comes to Medicare that, for every \$1 that a recipient puts into the system in the way of premiums, they get \$3 in benefits.

□ 1940

That means that even the very wealthy—even the Warren Buffetts of the world—actually get subsidized health care. We just simply can't afford it. We'd love for our recipients—our voters—to get this, but we can't afford it. So now what do we have? We have ObamaCare, which is a fixed top of Medicare and Medicaid, and we have nearly a 100 percent government-run system.

You just heard my colleague from Georgia talk about the fact that one of the ways to fund it is by this CLASS Act, which is long-term health care. It's unsustainable. It will collapse. Actuaries tell us it's not going to work, so we're in the process of repealing it. We know that there is an amazing number of taxes that go with this—a tax on the sale of your home as an investment—and many other pieces. An-

other big piece toward funding it is by taking out a half a trillion dollars from Medicare, which only makes Medicare go out of business even faster. Right now, we're looking at about 10 years for that to happen; and our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, have no solution for that whatsoever.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we have gone from the frying pan into the fire when it comes to health care by way of government. There are those who say, Well then, what is your solution? Mr. Speaker, our solution is very simple. Our solution is: Let's re-invoke the marketplace, the forces of the market—economic freedom and patient choice—back into the system, and let's get government out.

Government has a role. Government's role is to protect its citizens and to ensure there is an even playing field. Yet we know that no way will costs go down in any open economy, in any free economy, unless there is robust competition. But we do not have that today, not among insurance companies, not among large, vertically integrated governmental systems. It's not there—it never will be—and we will continue to have waste. No matter what any politician says that he's going to do to get rid of fraud, waste, and abuse in the system, he is incapable of doing that. Only a free market can do that.

I will refer you back to PAUL RYAN's budget, which actually gives Medicare recipients a free market choice, which is the same kind of choice that we in Congress have today. That is: We can go to a Web site or we can go to a book, and we can choose from one of hundreds of excellent health care systems out there by which we can be covered.

Why can't Medicare recipients and why can't Medicaid recipients have exactly the same thing? Why can't we tear down the State walls that exist that make, in most cases, one insurance company totally control the market in an entire State? Why can't we do this?

The answer is: This body right here has not allowed that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I submit to you this evening: Should we repeal ObamaCare?

I am convinced now that we will; that perhaps it will be H.R. 1 in 2013, the full repeal of ObamaCare; that we will quickly replace it with piecemeal pieces of legislation that do many things, including reforming liability insurance, re-invoking the free marketplace, patient choice; and that we will get on with making this a much more efficient system, one that is much more user friendly and one that we can all be proud of.

I thank the gentleman, and I thank my fellow physicians in the GOP Doctors Caucus. It is always an honor to serve with these ladies and gentlemen. It's not only physicians, but nurses and other types of health care workers. There are truly great things that are happening in this body.

Mr. BENISHEK. I appreciate that, Dr. FLEMING. Thank you for your comments.

I just thought I'd make a few comments of my own about your discussion of the IPAB board and make sure that the American people know what this is. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is a board of bureaucrats appointed by the President, without appeal, that will determine whether or not procedures, if they are overpriced, will be available to the American people.

I've talked to patients in many difficult situations, where I have had a very sick patient and have taken care of the patient myself and the patient's family, where difficult decisions are being made affecting the life or death of the patient. These decisions are not easy to make. You have to discuss the alternatives with the patient and with the patient's family; and usually, through the coordination of what the patient wants, with what the physician recommends and in discussion with the family, we come to a decision.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board may decide completely differently from what we decide. Certainly, some patients deserve different types of care; palliative care rather than aggressive care, comfort care measures versus complete major surgery. These are decisions that have to be made personally—on an individual basis—based on sound medicine, what the family needs, what the patient wants, and not with an unappealable bureaucratic decision made in Washington by someone who may or may not know the patient and who certainly may not be educated in medicine or compassion. From my eyes, it's really a scary thought for the American people, and I just wanted to put my perspective on your comments there.

Now we have my colleague here with us this evening, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUERKLE), as a member of the Doctors Caucus. Ms. BUERKLE is actually a nurse, yet we have health professionals of all varieties here tonight, so I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BUERKLE. I thank my colleague and friend from Michigan for yielding to me, and thank you so much for having this evening's Special Order regarding health care.

I think it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that the American people hear from health care professionals. There is such distrust of politicians in Washington, so for the American people to have the opportunity to hear from those who have invested their lives in health care and who really do care deeply about our health care system, I think it's so very important that we have this hour and this time together.

Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress because I was so concerned with regard to the health care law. I thought that it was substantively flawed. I thought that it was procedurally flawed. It was passed in secrecy at all hours of the

night, and I thought that constitutionally it was flawed in that our government doesn't have the right to mandate our buying anything, let alone health care. So I ran on that. Now that time has unfolded—and we've been here a year now—what has come to light is how very flawed this health care law is. I speak to so many parts of it that are flawed, but I just want to focus on a couple of specific areas.

I am the daughter of a 90-year-old woman. My mother is alive and well and lives in a small town in Auburn. I know how much she cares about her Medicare coverage, and I know how important that is to her and for her. Then last April, when the Republicans put out a budget proposal, Mr. Speaker, we were demagogued; we were demagogued that we wanted to cut Medicare for seniors.

I am here tonight to reassure the American people, particularly our seniors, that this group—all the members of our caucus—and our conference understand and appreciate how important Medicare is to our seniors. We understand that. This budget proposal that was proposed last April and passed in the House is merely a proposal, a suggestion as to how we're going to save Medicare for those who are 54 years and younger. So I want to assure seniors that any changes we talk about with regard to Medicare have to do with only those who are 54 and younger. That's very important to emphasize.

What I do want to talk about briefly is that this health care law, which is the law of the land and which will go into effect in 2014, does cut Medicare. I've heard from many of the seniors in the country, and I've heard from the hospitals in my district, and I've heard from the physicians in my district. This health care law cuts Medicare by \$500 billion. Every senior is going to feel the impact of this health care law.

So I want to be here tonight with my colleagues and with members of the health care profession to assure our seniors that we are here to protect you. We want to keep Medicare intact, and we want to alert you that the law that was passed is flawed on so many levels. We voted to repeal it, but it's flawed primarily.

One of the biggest reasons is that it cuts Medicare, which will impact our seniors and the care they receive. We've heard about the IPAB, and you've heard about the CLASS Act; but this cut to seniors is something every senior should be concerned about, and they should be clamoring for the repeal of the law of this land because it will affect their care and their coverage.

I've heard from so many hospitals in my district, and I have a list here. I have five hospitals in my district. All of the Members have hospitals in their districts. There are cuts to our hospitals because of this health care law. Hospitals receive what's called a "disproportionate share" for services they give to folks who don't have insur-

ance—who are uninsured—or who maybe get Medicare or Medicaid. So hospitals get what's called a "disproportionate share."

□ 1950

Mr. Speaker, the health care law eliminates the disproportionate share. It's a problem for hospitals, and I've heard from my hospitals and I've had the privilege of representing my hospital for 13 years as a lawyer. I don't say that as much as I say that I'm a nurse.

The cuts to Medicare to our hospitals will really force them into a very bad situation. And I want to talk just briefly, and then I want to yield to my colleagues, how important our hospitals are to our districts. In my district alone it employs 18,000 people. So when we've enacted a law, this health care law in this country, it's going to impact our hospitals and how viable they are.

You can see the payroll and purchases from the hospitals. Just in my district, Mr. Speaker, over \$2.5 billion; and State and local tax and revenues, 105 million. So this health care law—and my hospitals have said to me, it's going to hurt us. One has said it will put us into bankruptcy because we can't afford to do business because of the health care law.

So a bill that was supposed to—a law that was supposed to increase access, decrease the cost of health care—as this bill and this law unfolds, we're seeing more and more that it's bad. It's bad for seniors, it's bad for hospitals, it's bad for our physicians. It's bad because it's the government telling the American people what they have to do.

I'm so proud to stand here with my colleagues who have voted to repeal this health care law, and we want to make sure that the American people understand. We do realize we need health care reform, but it needs to be market based, as my colleague mentioned, and it needs to be care that doesn't hurt our seniors, doesn't hurt our hospitals, doesn't hurt our physicians and really does increase access to health care.

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks, and thank you for taking the time to come up this evening.

We're nearing the end of our hour here, and I'd like to give the other Members that are here an opportunity to speak.

I yield to my friend from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who is a member of the dental profession. I'm looking forward to your comments.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Dr. BENISHEK. Thank you for having this opportunity through these Special Orders.

I've got a unique perspective of looking at health care through a dentist's eyes, something that has stayed market based and stayed very inflationary neutral.

But before I do that, what I wanted to do is touch on my colleague, Ms. BUERKLE, in regards to hospitals.

I come from rural Arizona and more important aspects of hospital care is our rural hospitals and the solvency that we're seeing with them. They've taken an undue burden because we destroyed the patient-doctor relationship, the integral aspects of all the doctors with specialties and with the hospital.

Many of the hospitals that I've been working with are finding that it's going to be insolvent very, very quickly; and, therefore, our safety net is going to be gone.

We need to look no further to see government-run health care, particularly the longest-standing health care, and that's Native American health care. We see how detrimental it actually is. We have actually seen a group of people that are so despondent about the way government has taken care of their health care that they've invoked a clause called the self-determination act, in which they are taking back their health care needs within their communities, patient based, community based, preventive based.

These are some of the things that we as health care professionals really support and really tried to build upon. We can look no further than our Native American friends to see how we can actually start that capacity of rebuilding.

Second of all, we've talked about it briefly, and that is the modality of increased competition. This is a place that the Federal Government can actually help us and intercede. We all, as professionals, can work as collusive bodies, in unison, price fixing. But insurance companies certainly do that, and this is where we can actual level the playing field by our Federalist papers to allow open competition and vertical competition against each other across State lines.

This gives us the opportunity to have many more opportunities for the marketplace. That gives us the opportunity, consumer based, so that my needs may be different. For example, I'm allergic to wheat. I need to take care of myself. I need to be able to have an opportunity if I want wellness checks, if I want to see. I have different riders for lymphomas, all those different things I need to have the opportunity for. And that gives me the playing field on which I can play, particularly when there's more options out there. We're competing against each other and State lines.

Like my good friend from Louisiana talked about, State laws that almost give a monopoly to certain insurers within a State. This is the opportunity to open those doors and start to bypass the ERISA laws, opening up the competition model so that we all have an opportunity. You know, there was a conversation that was taking place, but we've lost it. Instead of a single-payer, how about a single-pool?

Here's our opportunity to make sure that we've got great competition within the marketplace. Dentist, no, because we compete that way. You know,

once upon a time insurance wanted to take over dentistry. There is an insurer called Delta Dental, and it was dentistry that was actually building insurers basically for the patients.

That's how we became the marketplace, opportunity. This gave us the opportunity that everybody got to choose and pick, and those are the things we have to look at.

Last but not least, all parts of this, this government-run health care, we need to really point at a vibrant economy. No closer do we have to look at this discussion than the withholding tax. Part of this money goes into the Social Security fund but also into Medicare. When we don't have a vibrant economy, we don't have the money going into our health care portfolio.

This is why it's all integrated. This isn't one separate entity. It's all integrated into a Nation that has a vibrant economy; and that's where we have to poignantly look, establish a new playing field, open up the rules, even get tort reform.

And we can learn from our States. This is one where one size doesn't fit all, but we can work with a value: what happens in Texas, what would happen in California. How about mediation that all medical malpractice cases have to go to mediation before they can go to court.

Isn't that magical? That's exactly what happens in Oregon. These are opportunities to take the brightest pieces across this country and putting them together and working it on the basis for patient preference, allowing them to pick. There's nothing more dear to somebody than their health care.

I'd like to thank my good friend, Mr. BENISHEK, for putting this together.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. Gentlemen, I appreciate the very passionate discussion that you had about the way physicians interact with patients, and patients kind of expect that their care is going to be a personal decision between their health care provider and themselves and their family.

My understanding, and the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned this, Independent Payment Advisory Board, are 15 bureaucrats appointed by the President. Do either of the gentlemen know, correct me if I'm wrong, they are by law—cannot be a practicing physician.

You might want to check one of those 2,700 pages because I believe that the act by law says they cannot be a practicing physician.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan pointed out something that every senior in America ought to really care about, or those who take care of seniors or whose parent or grandparents are seniors. When your loved one is ill, do you really want the decision about whether they can receive care being

made in an office in Washington by somebody who's got to find a way to pay for that ObamaCare bill?

Because, Mr. Speaker, that's the whole purpose of that Independent Payment Advisory Board. They've got to find \$500 billion to take out of that Medicare program. Who among us doesn't believe that when that bureaucrat sits down, they're not going to be thinking about what's best for your loved one?

They're not going to be thinking about what that physician or that health care provider's decision is about what the best care is. They're going to be thinking how they're going to make that budget work.

To the gentleman from Michigan, I will tell you, I think that's the way America thinks that decision is going to be made. They're going to believe that when government runs health care, it's going to be run just like government runs a whole lot of other things it runs.

Ask a senior in your district, doctor from Louisiana, the doctor from Michigan, the doctor from Arizona, the doctor from Georgia, ask the next Medicare patient you take care of how long they have to wait on the phone when they call Medicare.

□ 2000

To the gentelady from New York, my mother is 88, God bless her. And I have to tell you, she has made the mistake a couple of times of calling Medicare on the phone. My poor 88-year-old mother spent 90 minutes one time on the phone to get an answer. That's the kind of care we're going to get from the Affordable Care Act. It's not affordable care. It's not accessible care. It's not good care.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and giving us the opportunity to remind the American public, we repealed ObamaCare in this Chamber. That repeal bill is sitting over in the Senate.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank my colleague from Maryland, and I appreciate your bringing up those great points.

The President's health care act was to allow people to get more access to medicine. And as we've seen from multiple discussions here this evening, with the closure of many small hospitals throughout America due to the decreased payments under the President's health care bill, many small hospitals are facing closure.

I know, like the gentelady from New York mentioned, I have many small hospitals that are on the razor's edge of being in the black or in the red. Recently, a small hospital in my district was just on the verge of bankruptcy. How is closing five hospitals in the 200-mile area increasing access to care? It isn't. It's making access to care more difficult, more impersonal.

Physicians, like ourselves, we're concerned about what's going to happen here because I'm concerned about my patients. And I'm concerned about my

colleagues who complain to me about their patients. I think it's folly to be able to regulate health care from above.

Health care needs reform. We have the best health care in the world. The problem is it costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of money because there's not enough market forces, as my friend from Louisiana mentioned. You know, once somebody pays their copay, they don't care what anything costs. I paid my copay, I don't care what it costs. It's all good. We need to have health insurance be more like car insurance. You can buy car insurance from multiple different companies, thousands of different companies. In Michigan, you can buy your car insurance from a company in Florida or Tennessee because there's a lot of open competition. And your car insurance doesn't pay for an oil change. It doesn't pay for new tires. It doesn't pay for the routine expenses. If your car insurance paid for your oil change and your new tires, it would be really expensive, just like our health insurance is today.

We need to have people understand that health care isn't free once they pay their deductible. I think the health savings account concept where people have to save money tax free in their health savings account, use that money for their routine medical care and have health insurance be what it should be, not complete coverage of everything medicine but insurance for catastrophic disease, for items that you choose to insure for, not to insure for things that the government makes you insure for, like, you know, abortions which you may not want, or pregnancy, which you may not—you know, if you've had a hysterectomy, why should you be paying insurance for a pregnancy? There should be choice in health insurance, to allow people to have a Cadillac plan if they want, if they can afford it, or a Chevrolet plan. Or a young person may have simply a catastrophic plan if they feel they will not have significant health issues.

That type of marketplace and that type of philosophy is what we need in the health insurance business in my view.

I want to ask my colleague from Louisiana if that view of medicine, a market-based insurance and then competition between physicians as well, is your view?

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman. I will just briefly respond to that.

The point I would like to make on that very question is that coverage is not the same thing as access. There are countries around the world that have 100 percent coverage, yet they have no access to care. And I'm not just talking about communist or socialist countries. Look at Canada today. It takes a year to get a CT scan; but yet everybody's covered. So that's the fine point that we need to understand and take away.

I will also add in response to the gentleman just a moment ago talking

about the Independent Payment Advisory Board is that it will have more power than Congress itself. It will take a two-thirds vote from both bodies to overturn their decisions, and I don't think that Americans are ready to put all of that power in the hands of 15 bureaucrats who may or may not be physicians.

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you. Let me ask my colleague from Georgia if he has any other comments he'd like to make?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment before we close tonight. The members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, along with the health care providers that caucus on the Senate side, in the other body, have just recently sent a letter to the American Association of Retired Persons, AARP, the executive director Mr. Barry Rand, asking them and the 35 million seniors that they represent in their advocacy, and of course the definition of a senior for them is anybody who has reached the age of 50, so certainly they can reach a whole lot more seniors, and I'm sure membership is important to them, so we have sent a letter to them reaching out to the organization and asking AARP to meet with the Doctor's Caucuses in the respective bodies in a very bipartisan way to try to save Medicare.

There are things that that organization, which I respect, indeed, I've been a member of, that we agree with, and there are things that we don't agree on. Now, AARP was opposed to what we had in the Republican budget last year, the so-called Paul Ryan budget in regard to how to strengthen, protect, preserve, the Medicare program, not just for our current seniors and recipients of that program, but for our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren, indeed. So we want to ask them to sit down with us and say what they do like. We know what they don't like. I guess they didn't like the mandate of premium support in our budget last year. But Chairman RYAN this year is working very closely in a bipartisan way with Senator WYDEN, the gentleman from Oregon, in regard to this same idea of premium support. But instead of mandating it—and of course it was only mandated for those younger than age 55; everyone else was held harmless—now the idea is to say, Look, let's let everyone choose and decide. It's their option. Do they want to stay on Medicare as we know it, the legacy program, or would they prefer to go to the doctor and the hospital of their choice with their own premium support?

So I just wanted to mention that, and I'm looking forward to having a dialogue with the AARP and the 35 million seniors that they represent.

Back in 2003, my colleagues weren't here then, but I was, and I had an opportunity to vote in favor, as a physician Member, of the Medicare part D, the Prescription Drug Act, and AARP

supported that. And yet our Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them symbolically came to the well and tore up their membership card of the AARP. So we're going to work with them. I think it's very important.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentlemen from Louisiana and Arizona, the gentlewoman from New York, and my colleague from Maryland as well for appearing with me tonight. We've been trying to explain to the Speaker and the American people some of the issues that we have with the President's health care bill that do not solve our problem with health care and why we want to repeal it.

□ 2010

I encourage you all to look further into this issue and become educated so that you can inform yourself and your friends how serious this problem is.

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

ASSAULT ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's wonderful to hear so many of not just colleagues but friends here on the floor discussing what is so important to this Nation—responsibility. And if you want to talk fiscal responsibility, it would certainly seem that the first place to start is with the repeal of ObamaCare. If you want to talk about freedom individually, once again, the best place to start is with repeal of ObamaCare.

There are so many ways the Federal Government has been encroaching into individual liberties and individual freedoms. It begins to get quite scary that we are encroaching on the very things that our original Founders were willing to fight and die for to ensure that we had the freedoms to do, that we would have the freedoms to avoid doing damage to our conscience.

It's so ironic that so many came to this Nation in its earliest days, and then through its history, seeking relief from persecution as Christians. So many groups came here believing that this could be a place, a promised land of sorts, where freedom could be experienced greater than anywhere else in the world. And that dream has been realized.

For far too long in our Nation's history, it was not extended to all men and women. Race and gender were problems. There were problems for some because there was racial and gender bias. But no one in those days ever anticipated we would get to the point in America where we are today, where people of faith who believe with all their heart that certain practices are just wrong in God's eyes would be

forced by their government to commit those acts of wrong.

We know that the President of Notre Dame University, back in 2009, endured a great deal of heat when he brought a man who had fought so hard in Illinois to allow late-term abortions, a man who had fought to prevent people of conscience from being allowed to be counseled on exactly what they would be doing. There were all kinds of efforts in Illinois to deal with the issue of abortion. And he's now President. So there were some that believed that bringing that individual to a Catholic university like Notre Dame and giving an honorary degree and bestowing this honor upon him was not a good idea. Yet the President took a great deal of chance.

Sarah Palin points this out in an open, little piece that she wrote Tuesday, when she said:

Consider Catholicism's most prominent academic leader, the Reverend John Jenkins, president of Notre Dame. Jenkins took a serious risk in sponsoring Obama's 2009 honorary degree and commencement address—which promised a "sensible" approach to the conscience clause. Jenkins now complains, "This is not the kind of 'sensible' approach the President had in mind when he spoke here."

As Sarah Palin notes, "Obama has made Jenkins—and other progressive Catholic allies—look easily duped," because this administration appears to want to wage war on Catholic Christian belief.

It's amazing that someone would take those kinds of positions that the administration currently is, basically a war on religious freedom for Christians.

There is an editorial posted by Mike Brownfield today, entitled, "Morning Bell: ObamaCare's Latest Victim is Religious Freedom." It says:

It has not even been 2 years since ObamaCare was enacted, and already the President's health care law has taken another victim—the religious freedoms Americans hold dear, as reflected by the First Amendment.

The Obama administration recently reaffirmed a rule under ObamaCare that requires many religious employers to provide health care coverage for all FDA-approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and related education and counseling. On the grounds that certain FDA-approved contraceptive methods can sometimes "cause the demise of embryos both after and before uterine implantation," many groups also believe that the rule forces them to cover abortion.

As the article points out, it's not just Catholics affected by the rule. Leaders from other faith traditions have expressed their concern. This is deeply troubling.

Another article here from The Washington Post, entitled, "Obama Plays His Catholic Allies for Fools," by Michael Gerson, published January 30. He says:

In politics, the timing is often the message. On January 20—3 days before the annual March for Life—the Obama administration announced its final decision that Catholic universities, hospitals, and charities will

be compelled to pay for health insurance that covers sterilization, contraceptives, and abortifacients.

It was bad enough that ObamaCare was going to take away individual freedoms regarding health care. We can take care of those who cannot take care of themselves. But we should not do, as a government, what has been done for far too long—provide incentives for people not to reach their potential, provide incentives for people, in effect, to take the life of an unborn, to make it easier to do that.

As so many have pointed out, if a government can order any individual, all individuals in the country, to purchase a particular product, including health care insurance, there really isn't anything the Federal Government cannot order them to do or to purchase.

□ 2020

And we're seeing that play out now, not merely in the area of just health insurance, but going deeper than that, more problematic, even theological, that the Federal Government can order you not to follow your religious beliefs.

So it's really quite shocking how far we've come. Now, those of us that study the teachings of Jesus know that He told Christians you will suffer for My sake. I didn't deserve to be born in America. I go to places like Afghanistan and Iraq and places where there's so much heartache, places around the world where you see people—in Africa, the places that I've seen so much heartache, so much suffering. We didn't deserve to be born here, but by the grace of God we were. And though we were told by Jesus you will suffer for My sake, for whatever reason we were allowed to grow up free, free from suffering on account of Christian beliefs.

This bubble in time and space that was allowed for generation after generation to be able to follow religious beliefs as Christians without persecution, that time has changed. Now it would seem that as people yell "haters" at Christians, throw things at Christians, fuss on the nightly news how Christians are haters and want everybody to go to hell if they don't believe just like them—what a terrible misinterpretation of Christian faith and beliefs.

An article from The Wall Street Journal talking about the contraception rule, talking about the discussions about it among the political candidates.

People need to understand the Christian faith is under assault, and this administration has stepped up the ante in that assault. And if people, whether they're Christians, Jews, Muslims, whatever faith—Hindu, Buddhists, Atheists—once you see a Federal Government telling Christians you cannot practice what you believe with your whole heart spiritually, you could be next. This ought to stir up not merely Christians. It ought to stir up people of all kinds of faith. Because, again, a

Federal Government that can tell you to buy one product can tell you to buy any others if it has that much power. A Federal Government that tells Christians they cannot actually practice their religious beliefs can tell other religions the same thing.

We've just about come 360. This gift we've been given, we've been blessed with more freedoms in this country than any country in the history of the world. It doesn't take all that much study of world history to see that. It doesn't take all that much traveling around the world to see that. As I've traveled the world, going back to my days as an exchange student in 1973 to the Soviet Union, you develop a love for people all over the world. It's ironic when people call you a xenophobe and have no idea how many people you love with all your heart—Africa, Asia, Europe, around the world, different places.

And as one West African told me when I was visiting there, You have to understand, we were so excited when you elected a black President, but now we've seen America growing weak. And you must let the people in Washington know that unless America stays strong, we will suffer. You're our protectors. Without you staying strong, we don't have hope of having the freedoms we have right now. America's strength and America's standing for freedom and liberty don't just affect the people in America.

I jotted some notes inspired by a pastor's comments decades ago. It says: Start thinking about what we have seen in this country. First they said you can't have prayer in school, but most people didn't speak out because they would just pray somewhere else. Then they said you couldn't publicly post the Ten Commandments because people might be tempted to read them; and if they read them, they might be tempted to follow them and live moral lives. But most people didn't speak out because they knew where to find the Ten Commandments if they decided they wanted to have that kind of moral code.

They said you couldn't use a cross for a headstone, even for soldiers who died in the Christian faith in Jesus Christ, believing what Jesus said that "greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." But not enough people have spoken out, because the soldiers are gone and they can't respond, so maybe it doesn't really matter.

I had a judge tell students, recent history, they could not have the freedom of speech to say what was in their hearts if it included horrible verboten words like prayer, invocation, benediction, but worst of all, God, prayer, amen, bow our heads, join in prayer. And most people didn't speak out because that was somewhere else, a judge somewhere else, not ours. Some judges said you couldn't say God in the pledge in a public place. It seems more judges have said that in more recent history.

Fortunately, it was struck down, but they're still saying it. And not enough people are speaking out because it's some other judge. Maybe an appellate court will strike it down. I hope so.

Now we're being told by some if you want to hire someone, unless you're hiring a minister, you can't hire someone with the same religious spiritual faith that you have. Not enough people speaking out because they think surely that won't apply to me, at least not for a while. We're being told if you know in your heart that killing the most innocent among us, the infant unborn, if you believe that's killing, it's murder, it's wrong, well, we're the Federal Government and you have to forget your religious beliefs. We're going to tell you what you can or can't believe and tell you what you can or can't do. You have to go ahead and pay, in tax money or in health insurance money, for someone else to kill an unborn child.

□ 2030

And we have hospitals, doctors, nurses, health care providers being told, you may know in your Christian heart that it's wrong personally to participate in the taking of an innocent life, like an infant unborn, but if you want to stay in the health care business you're probably going to have to do it anyway. We're the Federal Government, and we'll dictate not only what you may believe or not believe, but what you may put into practice and not put into practice.

And there are some in our government telling military chaplains, even priests, preachers, you may believe in your spirit, in your heart, in your soul that marriage is between a man and a woman, that Nature's God intended the perfect biological fit to produce a combination of a sperm and an egg. And some want to tell them you've got to set aside your religious beliefs and do what we, the Federal Government tell you, and marry whoever we tell you to marry.

You believe Romans 1? Forget it. Tear it out of your Bible because we're the Federal Government. We have a right to tell you what you can or can't believe.

Some say it's okay to force Catholics to violate their Christian consciences and their religious beliefs because our Federal Government has the power to tell them what to do. Not enough people are crying out. I guess they figure, well, I'm not really Catholic, or maybe I'm Catholic but surely they wouldn't try to tell me what to do in violation of my Christian spiritual beliefs.

But if the government can order, with the full power of Federal law enforcement, anyone to violate their Christian beliefs, we have come full circle. And the prayers of generations, the work of churches throughout our history—first, to even have a revolution based on freedom, based on the liberty that they knew God gave us, where over a third of the signers of the Declaration of Independence weren't

just Christians, they were ordained Christian ministers. But they believed in freedom so strongly that they were willing to fight and die for the spiritual freedom of all people in this country.

And a Constitution was put together and followed by a Bill of Rights, and it said what it meant, but it took a long time for it to be applied across racial bounds. It should have been clear. It's not a living, breathing document, but it says what it means, and it means that all people should have those rights under the Bill of Rights, that we were all created equal in God's eyes. The Founders believed that.

The churches were the heart and soul of the abolitionist movement to do away with that horrible evil called slavery. People like John Quincy Adams, 16, 17 years down the hall, Statuary Hall, after he was defeated for a second term as President, beseeching, preaching against the evils of slavery, inspired by what he knew from William Wilberforce as a Christian in the United Kingdom doing the same thing before him.

Abraham Lincoln, inspired by that overlapping time with John Quincy Adams, down the hall, because of his Christian beliefs and faith. If anybody doubts his belief, what motivated that man, go read the second inaugural address on the inside of the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial, as he tried to make sense, as a Christian, spiritually, about all the injustice and wrongs and death and suffering in America.

The movement for women's equality involved women of great faith. The civil rights movement, the greatest saint of the movement was a man who was an ordained Christian minister, who knew in his heart what Jesus had done for him, and he wanted all people to have liberty equally together, and be judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin.

And now, it appears, war is being waged like never before on people of biblical Christian beliefs. You wonder what some of the Founders had to say. Samuel Adams was one of the strongest Christians alive during the Revolution. He was inspirational.

"How strangely will the tools of a tyrant pervert the plain meaning of words!" Samuel Adams, that devout, strong Christian said, his wonderful quote inspired by his faith.

And he said:

If you love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude than the animating contest of freedom, go from us in peace. We seek not your counsel nor your arms. Crouch down and lick the hands that feed you. May your chains sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that you were our countrymen.

These are people of faith who believed in liberty that started this place. And to have courts saying you can't say the word "God" in invocation, benediction—we start every day with a prayer in this Chamber, and have for centuries.

But we go back and finish with this. The speech of Benjamin Franklin that we have from his own handwriting. So what he said, 1787, late June, 1787, when nearly 5 weeks had gone by and they'd accomplished virtually nothing, and he pointed out that they had accomplished virtually nothing, that they had more "nos" than "ayes" on virtually every vote.

And he went on to say:

In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room.

That was Independence Hall. This great, brilliant man, who most of us were taught was a Deist, went on to say:

Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered.

That's not a Deist.

All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor.

I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men.

Now, the judges in this country, there are those who would say, he shouldn't be able to give that speech. He just mentioned the "G" word. Yet, it was what inspired people, these kind of speeches.

He said:

And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings, that "except the Lord build the House, they labour in vain that build it." I also firmly believe, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the Builders of Babel: We shall be confounded by our local partial interests and we ourselves shall become a by-word down through the ages.

He went on to say he believed they should start every day with prayer.

He was followed by Randolph from Virginia, who basically pointed out that here we are at the end of June, we are about to celebrate our anniversary, let's all go to church together, hear a sermon together, which they did, the reformed Calvinist Lutheran Church. They all went to church and heard a sermon together. They came back in a new spirit, and gave us the Constitution, and gave us the Bill of Rights after that.

How in the world can a Federal Government that came from those roots begin to declare war on Christians, and Catholic Christians now? Beware, beware. The Federal Government that can declare war on Catholic Christian faith may be after your faith next.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 588. An act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 3, 2012, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4801. A letter from the Acting Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Classes of Poultry [Docket No.: FSIS-2007-0048] (RIN: 0583-AC83) received January 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4802. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lists of Regions Classified With Respect to Certain Animal Diseases and States Approved To Receive Certain Imported Horses [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0035] (RIN: 0579-AD05) received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4803. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus subtilis strain CX-9060; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0104; FRL-9330-9] received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4804. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4805. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Goals: Mortgage Reporting Amendments (RIN: 2590-AA48) received January 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4806. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Representation-Case Procedures (RIN: 3142-AA08) received January 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4807. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Automatic Commercial Ice Makers [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-TP-0036] (RIN: 1904-AC38) received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4808. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Applications for Food and Drug Administration Approval To Market a New Drug; Revision of Postmarketing Reporting Requirements-Discontinuance [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0898] received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Rome; Fine Particulate Matter 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0849-201153(a); FRL-9617-2] received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4810. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado: Smoke, Opacity and Sulfur Dioxide Rule Revisions; Regulation 1 [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0588; FRL-9614-8] received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4811. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New Mexico: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation-by-Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-RCRA-2011-0407; FRL-9613-6] received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0789; FRL-9615-5] received January 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4813. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 2 and 95 of the Commission's Rules to Provide Additional Spectrum for the Medical Device Radiocommunication Service in the 413-457 MHz band [ET Docket No.: 09-36] received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4814. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter of justification for the implementation of Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4815. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4816. A letter from the Honorary Secretary, Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, transmitting the 205th petition to the Prime Minister of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4817. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the Fellowship's Performance and Accountability Report and Financial Statements for the years 2011 and 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4818. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4819. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting seven reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4820. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-55; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2001-0076; Sequence 7] received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4821. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Preventing Abuse of Interagency Contracts [FAC 2005-55; FAR Case 2008-032; Item I; Docket 2010-0107, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL69) received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4822. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Transition to the System for Award Management (SAM) [FAC 2005-551 FAR Case 2011-021; Item II; Docket 2011-0021, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM14) received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4823. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Declassification of National Security Information [FDMS NARA-11-0001] (RIN: 3095-AB64) received January 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4824. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Statutory Period For Compensation For Certain Disabilities Due To Undiagnosed Illnesses and Medically Unexplained Chronic Multi-Symptom Illnesses (RIN: 2900-AO09) received January 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4825. A letter from the Senior Advisor for Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to Rules of Conduct and Standards of Responsibility for Representatives [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0016] (RIN: 0960-AH32) received January 3, 2012, 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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. H.R. 3521. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for a legislative line-item veto to expedite consideration of rescissions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-364 Pt. 2). 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3880. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions on foreign financial institutions that are members of an entity that provides services relating to secure communications, electronic funds transfers, or cable transfers to the Central Bank of Iran or sanctioned financial institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3881. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide authority for immigration judges to terminate proceedings or appoint counsel when necessary for aliens with mental disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HURT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 3882. A bill to require inclusion of Lease Sale 220 in the proposed Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program for the 2012-2017 period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 3883. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that the President submit a budget to the Congress each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to State emergency medical service departments to provide for the expedited training and licensing of veterans with prior medical training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 3885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to authorize agricultural producers to establish and contribute to tax-exempt farm risk management accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3886. A bill to expand the workforce of veterinarians specialized in the care and conservation of wild animals and their ecosystems, and to develop educational programs focused on wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 3887. A bill to provide increased funding for the reinsurance for early retirees program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3888. A bill to authorize microenterprise assistance for renewable energy projects in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 3890. A bill to provide for additional Federal district judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to speed American innovation in research and drug development for the leading causes of death that are the most costly chronic conditions for our Nation, to save American families and the Federal and State governments money, and to help family caregivers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. NUNES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BACA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. CHU, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPs, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 3892. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8771 Auburn Folsom Road in Roseville, California, as the "Private First Class Victor A. Dew Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 3893. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to subcontracting and insourcing, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. RIVERA):

H. Res. 536. A resolution condemning the murder of Wilman Villar Mendoza and honoring his sacrifice in the cause of freedom for the Cuban people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

179. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20 memorializing the Congress to enact legislation that classifies forestry management activities as nonpoint sources under the federal Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

180. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 21 urging the Congress and the United States Forest Service to take immediate and aggressive action to correct mismanagement of national forestlands; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3880. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3881. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: * Clause 4, Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 3882. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 3883. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. CAPPs:

H.R. 3884. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3885. 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, which include the power to "regulate commerce...among the several States..."

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3886. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 3887.

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

Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3888.

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

Article 1, section 8.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3889.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 3890.

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

The Emergency Judicial Relief Act of 2012 is authorized by Article 1 Section 8 to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 3891.

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

Article I, § 8, clause 3

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3892.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 3893.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 12: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 83: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 104: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 192: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 196: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 420: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 458: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 719: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 733: Ms. CHU, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 938: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 997: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1009: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1065: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1093: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1148: Mr. DICKS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SABLON, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1179: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1244: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1267: Mr. HUNTER, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1278: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1354: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1477: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1489: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1568: Mr. KEATING and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1672: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GONZÁLEZ.
 H.R. 1738: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1777: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 1792: Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1903: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2086: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 2166: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 2168: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 2182: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 2238: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 2284: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 2299: Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 2364: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 2487: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2595: Mr. LEVINE.
 H.R. 2639: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2741: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2758: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2809: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2966: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2978: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 2980: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2982: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 3001: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. REYES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WATT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 3053: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3066: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3200: Mr. POLIS and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 3216: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 3221: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3283: Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 3307: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 3322: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3323: Mr. THORBERRY.
 H.R. 3356: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 3359: Mr. CLAY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3410: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 3422: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 3440: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 3458: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3462: Mr. OLVER and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3480: Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3509: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3510: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3526: Mr. HIMES, Mr. BACA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3545: Mr. WATT.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 3570: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3573: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3594: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3596: Mr. HOLT, Mr. OLVER, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 3599: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 3606: Mr. WELCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 3612: Mr. OWENS and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3670: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H.R. 3676: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3695: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H.R. 3698: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3702: Mr. CLAY and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 3728: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3733: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 3770: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. BONNER.
 H.R. 3771: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3778: Mr. LATA and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 3794: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3795: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3803: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. YODER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. QUAYLE, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3805: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. SCHILLING.
 H.R. 3811: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BERG.
 H.R. 3821: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3826: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3828: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 3840: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GRUJALVA.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. FLORES, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3844: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 3848: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 3852: Mr. WELCH and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 3855: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3858: Mr. SHULER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COOPER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CHU, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NEAL, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3867: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 3868: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 3877: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. POMPEO.
 H. Res. 25: Mr. LUJÁN.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H. Res. 137: Mrs. NOEM.
 H. Res. 507: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H. Res. 526: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3764: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, New York, relative to Resolution 11.066 urging the repeal of section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

34. Also, a petition of City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 11R-11-252 supporting S. 1836; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

35. Also, a petition of City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 11R-11-253 supporting H.R. 2914; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, Agriculture, the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.