

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	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Hincheey	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. PASCRELL. 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	Oliver
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
 Foyx McIntyre
 Franks (AZ) McKeon
 Frelinghuysen McKinley
 Gallegly McMorris
 Gardner Rodgers
 Garrett Meehan
 Gerlach Mica
 Gibbs Miller (FL)
 Gibson Miller (MI)
 Gingrey (GA) Miller, Gary
 Gohmert Mulvaney
 Goodlatte Murphy (PA)
 Gosar Myrick
 Gowdy Neugebauer
 Granger Noem
 Graves (GA) Nugent
 Graves (MO) Nunes
 Griffin (AR) Nunnelee
 Griffith (VA) Olson
 Grimm Palazzo
 Guinta Paulsen
 Guthrie 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
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foyx
 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 (AR)
 Griffin (MO)
 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
 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
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scallise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 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)
 NOT VOTING—18
 Berg
 Canseco
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carson (IN)
 Cassidy
 Filner
 Filner
 Gutierrez
 Hinchey
 Kaptur
 LaTourette
 Mack
 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
Bralley (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
Bralley (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
Biggert	Hanna
Bilbray	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	McCauley
Farenthold	McClintock
Fincher	McCotter
Fitzpatrick	McHenry
Flake	McIntyre
Fleischmann	McKeon
Fleming	McKinley
Flores	McMorris
Forbes	Rodgers
Fortenberry	Meehan
Fox	Mica
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Gallely	Miller, Gary
Gardner	Mulvaney
Garrett	Murphy (PA)
Gerlach	Myrick
Gibbs	Neugebauer
Gibson	Noem
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent
Gohmert	Nunes

NOT VOTING—16

Berg	Hinchey	Rothman (NJ)
Broun (GA)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Canseco	Mack	Sires
Cardoza	Napolitano	Waters
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	Clarke (MI)	Sarbanes
Kildee	Clarke (NY)	Schakowsky
Kind	Clay	Schiff
Kissell	Cleaver	Schrader
Kucinich	Clyburn	Schwartz
Langevin	Cohen	Scott (VA)
Larsen (WA)	Connolly (VA)	Scott, David
Larson (CT)	Conyers	Serrano
Lee (CA)	Costello	Sewell
Levin	Courtney	Sherman
Lewis (GA)	Critz	Slaughter
Lipinski	Crowley	Smith (WA)
Loebsack	Cuellar	Speier
Lofgren, Zoe	Cummings	Stark
Lowe	Davis (CA)	Sutton
Lujan	Davis (AK)	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	Visclosky
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	Herger	Price (GA)
Berg	Hanna	Quayle
Biggert	Harper	Reed
Bilbray	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)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hurt	Rokita
Bucshon	Issa	Rooney
Buerkle	Jenkins	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Ros (FL)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Camp	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Campbell	Jordan	Scalise
Canseco	Kelly	Schilling
Cantor	King (IA)	Schmidt
Capito	King (NY)	Schock
Carter	Kingston	Schweikert
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott (SC)
Chabot	Kline	Scott, Austin
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)
Dreier	Marchant	Thornberry
Duffy	Marino	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Turner (NY)
Ellmers	McCauley	Turner (OH)
Emerson	McClintock	Upton
Farenthold	McCotter	Walberg
Fincher	McHenry	Walden
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Flake	McKinley	Webster
Fleischmann	McMorris	West
Fleming	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Flores	Meehan	Whitfield
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gallely	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gardner	Myrick	Young (AK)
Garrett	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Noem	Young (IN)
Gibbs	Nugent	

NOT VOTING—13

Cardoza	Mack	Rothman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Pascrell	Roybal-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)
Boren	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	Sánchez, Linda T.
Ciicilline	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kissell	Schrader
Clyburn	Kucinich	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Latham	Sherman
Costa	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Costello	Levin	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Critz	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Loebsock	Speier
Cuellar	Loftgren, Zoe	Stark
Cummings	Lowe	Sutton
Davis (CA)	Luján	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	Visclosky
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	Biggart	Buerkle
Akin	Bilbray	Burgess
Alexander	Bilirakis	Burton (IN)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Amodei	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	Hurt
Coffman (CO)	Issa
Cole	Jenkins
Conaway	Johnson (IL)
Cravaack	Johnson (OH)
Crawford	Johnson, Sam
Crenshaw	Jordan
Culberson	Kelly
Davis (KY)	King (IA)
Denham	King (NY)
Dent	Kingston
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)
Diaz-Balart	Kline
Dold	Labrador
Dreier	Lamborn
Duffy	Lance
Duncan (SC)	Landry
Duncan (TN)	Lankford
Ellmers	LaTourette
Emerson	Latta
Farenthold	Lewis (CA)
Fincher	LoBiondo
Fitzpatrick	Long
Flake	Lucas
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer
Fleming	Lummis
Flores	Lungren, Daniel E.
Forbes	Manzullo
Fortenberry	Marchant
Fox	Marino
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Gallegly	McClintock
Gardner	McCotter
Garrett	McHenry
Gerlach	McKinley
Gibbs	McMorris
Gibson	McNulty
Gingrey (GA)	McNulty
Gohmert	Rodgers
Goodlatte	Meehan
Gosar	Mica
Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Granger	Miller (MI)
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Griffith (VA)	Myrick
Grimm	Neugebauer
Guinta	Noem
Guthrie	Nugent
Hall	Nunes
Hanna	Nunnelee
Harper	Olson
Harris	Palazzo
Hartzler	Paulsen
Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Hayworth	Pence
Heck	Petri
Hensarling	Pitts
Herger	Platts
Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Huelskamp	Pompeo
Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Hultgren	Price (GA)
Hunter	Quayle

NOT VOTING—12

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

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. PASCHELL. 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—