

\$1 billion, and they're interested in a couple of things. They want to eliminate inheritance tax, they want to extend the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy, and they want to slash the highest tax brackets.

Let's talk about one of them.

Mr. Adelson has contributed \$25 million, \$10 million to Mr. Romney's Restore Our Future. What is \$10 million in his budget like? Well, his \$10 million is a contribution in \$24 billion of net worth. How does that compare? Well, that would be like a \$40 contribution to someone whose net worth was about \$100,000. So Mr. Adelson can give a lot more money with much less effort.

THE DISCLOSE ACT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. When six Wall Street megabanks control two-thirds of the wealth of our Nation, it's too much economic power in too few hands. And when undisclosed billionaires spend billions on political campaigns and they crush the voices of ordinary citizens, it's too much political power in too few hands.

America must put an end to the influence of secret money on our elections. The DISCLOSE Act of 2012 would shine the light on the secret money in political campaigns. But the Republican leadership won't bring it up, even though Americans, three-quarters of our voters, think that campaign finance reform is a key issue for the election, and 69 percent of the public believes that super PACs should be illegal. Yet House Republican leaders refuse to bring up the DISCLOSE Act.

It's long past due that we put power back in the hands of ordinary citizens. In fact, let's rechannel the billions being wasted on campaign overkill to help our seniors afford food and to balance the national budget.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-125)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within the 90-day period prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to con-

tinue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2012.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 18, 2012.

SEQUESTRATION TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2012

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5872) to require the President to provide a report detailing the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 on January 2, 2013, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5872

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 "Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. SEQUESTER PREVIEW.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed report on the sequestration required to be ordered by paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) for fiscal year 2013 on January 2, 2013.

(b) *CONTENTS OF REPORT.*—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) *for discretionary appropriations—*

(A) *an estimate for each category of the sequestration percentages and amounts necessary to achieve the required reduction; and*

(B) *(i) for accounts that are funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 2013, an identification of each account to be sequestered and estimates of the level of sequestrable budgetary resources and resulting reductions at the program, project, and activity*

level based upon the enacted level of appropriations; and

(ii) *for accounts that have not been funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 2013, an identification of each account to be sequestered and estimates pursuant to a continuing resolution at a rate of operations as provided in the applicable appropriation Act for fiscal year 2012 of the level of sequestrable budgetary resources and resulting reductions at the program, project, and activity level;*

(2) *for direct spending—*

(A) *an estimate for the defense and non-defense functions based on current law of the sequestration percentages and amount necessary to achieve the required reduction; and*

(B) *an identification of the reductions required for each nonexempt direct spending account at the program, project, and activity level;*

(3) *an identification of all exempt discretionary accounts and of all exempt direct spending accounts; and*

(4) *any other data and explanations that enhance public understanding of the sequester and actions to be taken under it.*

(c) *AGENCY ASSISTANCE.*—(1) *Upon the request of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (in assisting the President in the preparation of the report under subsection (a)), the head of each agency, after consultation with the chairs and ranking members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall promptly provide to the Director information at the program, project, and activity level necessary for the Director to prepare the report under subsection (a).*

(2) *As used in this subsection, the term "agency" means any executive agency as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1240

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5872, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, here's basically why we are here today with the Sequester Transparency Act. As a background, under the current law, because the supercommittee was unable to agree on a deficit-reduction package, the Office of Management and Budget will implement a \$110 billion across-the-board cut—which we have referred to as a sequester or a sequestration—on January 2, 2013. This comes half on defense, half on domestic discretionary—in other words, a \$55 billion cut, which is a 10 percent cut to defense immediately, and then an 8 percent cut to domestic discretionary—but we do not know the actual reductions that will result from this sequester.

As we debate this bill today, we will probably not be able to avoid the contentious issues on the sequester, but let's not lose sight of the fact that the bill before us simply directs the Office of Management and Budget to tell us how they will implement the sequester. So we're just asking for more transparency and more details. Within 30 days, they should give us the plan on how they will do this.

This bill is essentially about transparency. It's not re-litigating the budget fight; it's about making sure that we have as much information as we can to make the right decisions. It's about carrying out a constitutional duty to ensure that laws are faithfully executed and that we fully understand the Budget Control Act sequester, how it's going to be implemented.

It has strong bipartisan support. The House Budget Committee voted 30-0 to report this bill here to the floor, and the Senate has passed similar legislation on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation. As the chairman of the Budget Committee said, it passed unanimously out of the Budget Committee.

I believe that more information is better than less. I also believe, and from the comments I've heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we also agree that we have enough information to know right now today that an across-the-board, meat-ax approach to reducing the deficit—a sequester—is a reckless way to deal with our budget.

We've heard a lot about the impact of the cuts on defense. Secretary Panetta has talked about those. We've heard a lot less about the impact of the cuts on other important investments, such as those in biomedical research. A coalition recently reported that the cuts to the National Institutes of Health alone would cut 33,000 jobs. That means fewer people investigating cures and treatments to diseases that plague every American family. That's just one small example on the nondefense side.

But, Madam Speaker, I believe, given what we know, we should be focused today and every day on avoiding the sequester. In the Budget Committee proceedings, the Democrats offered an alternative approach. I've got it right here in my hand. It called for a balanced approach to replacing the sequester, the kind of balanced approach that every bipartisan commission that has looked at our deficit challenge has recommended. It included a combination of cuts, such as direct payments in excessive farm subsidies. It also included cuts to things like big oil companies, eliminating taxpayer subsidies. That plan would totally replace the sequester for 1 year; and it wouldn't have to have the deficit, the impact that we've heard about.

So great to get more information, may have a unanimous vote here today

in the House; but let's take a balanced approach to reducing our deficits, and let's take a balanced approach to replacing the sequester.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the author of this bill, the chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we know our Nation faces very serious threats overseas, but we also have a very serious domestic threat as well, and that is our national debt, a debt that has increased more in the last 3 years on a nominal basis than in the previous 200. Thus, the Budget Control Act. The Budget Control Act, because, as the chairman of the House Budget Committee pointed out, the supercommittee—on which I served, as did the ranking member—did not prove so super, we are staring into the face of a sequester.

So I would like to not only compliment the chairman of the House Budget Committee for his leadership in bringing an alternative to this very, I believe, destructive sequester that still maintains the deficit reduction levels of the Budget Control Act, but I also want to compliment the Democrat ranking member for also offering an alternative plan. It is one I disagree with, one that, by my reckoning, includes 73 percent tax increases. But he should be applauded, and House Democrats should be applauded at least for recognizing the draconian defense cuts that could do real damage to our national security. As Secretary Panetta has said, the sequester “will do real damage to our security, our troops and their families, and our military's ability to protect our Nation.”

But although I compliment the ranking member, I find it more challenging to compliment the Democrat Senate Majority Leader. Senator REID has said: I'm not going to back off sequestration. That's what he has said. Thus, we are looking at a 10 percent real cut in our national defense.

Madam Speaker, I also picked up Monday's edition of The Washington Post—not exactly known as a bastion of conservative thought—and I read the headline: “Democrats Threaten to Go Over Fiscal Cliff if GOP Fails to Raise Taxes.”

So on the one hand, again, this is a very simple piece of legislation that I have coauthored with the chairman of the House Budget Committee. It simply says: Mr. President, since under sequestration you get to call a lot of the shots—according to the Congressional Budget Office “the administration's OMB has sole authority to determine whether a sequestration is required, and if so the proportional allocations of any necessary cuts”—all this is saying: Mr. President, show us your hand, show us your plan. Let the American people know what the true impact is

going to be on our national defense, on our economy, on a number of vital services, because you have the discretion. That's all this bill does. But I fear, to some extent, it may mask another agenda on what the debate is really about.

Madam Speaker, I need not tell you we continue to face the weakest, slowest recovery in the post-war era, and there are some who seem to have an ideological passion for raising taxes on the American people. An earlier speaker got up in an earlier debate and said that the largest small business group in America, the National Federation of Independent Business, has just released a new study saying that the President's tax plan will cost 710,000 jobs—jobs of working families—and those same working families will see their wages fall by 1.8 percent.

So why would we want to raise taxes on anybody in this economy? Well, someone pointed out, well, we need to reduce the deficit—and we do. But, Madam Speaker, if you do the math and give the President the top increasing tax rates in the top two tax brackets, not only does it destroy jobs; it's about 2 to 3 percent of his 10-year spending budget. So it harms jobs, and it doesn't solve the problem. I fear it is diversion from the failed policies that we have seen from this administration that has created the worst unemployment crisis since the Great Depression.

But I would hope that we would at least have a growing consensus that we shouldn't decimate national defense, and there should at least be transparency. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Sequestration Transparency Act.

□ 1250

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments about the supercommittee. I think we all wished it had succeeded. It did not, but it was a privilege to serve with my colleague from Texas.

Let me just make a quick correction on the math. I think everybody knows, under the Budget Control Act, which was enacted last September, we cut \$1 trillion from the budget, 100 percent cuts.

The alternative that the Democrats have proposed to the sequester takes a balanced approach of additional cuts, but also revenue. In fact, the 1-year proposal that we put forward puts additional cuts in direct payments, excessive subsidies under the farm bill.

Yes, we also eliminate taxpayer subsidies to the big oil companies. Former President Bush testified that, when oil's over \$50 a barrel, you don't need taxpayers shelling out dollars to encourage big oil companies to invest. So we think we should eliminate those subsidies to help remove the sequester, including the sequester on defense.

Let's make no mistake. The reason we're here is that our Republican colleagues deliberately chose, as part of

the sequester, to put defense spending on the chopping block along with other spending. That was the choice above an offer to deal with revenue as part of a sequester. And when the choice boiled down to cutting tax subsidies for oil companies and other special tax breaks or cutting defense, Republicans chose to put in the sequester cutting defense.

Now, I know we have a hearing today in the Armed Services Committee. I see the distinguished chairman on the floor today. I have to commend him because he has said before that if he were faced with that choice he would take that mixed, more balanced approach. And that ultimately is what we're going to have to do. That's the approach that's been taken by every bipartisan commission that's looked at this challenge.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), a member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I appreciate the opportunity to speak for just a couple of minutes on the legislation before us.

I do support a transparent process that would better ensure that there's public information on the impact of sequestration which, of course, is the automatic spending cuts that are scheduled for next year.

Sequestration, which would trigger those automatic cuts, was put in place to force Congress to work to find a bipartisan, balanced approach to deficit reduction. Today's legislation does not move us any closer to achieving that goal.

Time and again, the Republicans in Congress have rejected a balanced approach that would include spending cuts and revenue and economic growth. They reject a balanced approach that would protect our Nation's short-term economic recovery and create the right environment for long-term growth.

They reject a balanced approach, as you heard before, that has been recommended by every bipartisan commission, that would move our country forward by making tough yet responsible choices on the deficit and would reflect America's priorities and build America's economic strength.

The American people deserve to know the impact of across-the-board cuts resulting from the failure of the Republican majority to find that common ground and avoid sequester. But they also deserve real solutions, something the Republican majority has yet to deliver.

Their so-called solution, their budget, the House Republican budget, takes a partisan, one-sided approach to deficit reduction. It relies solely on spending cuts and directs the \$100 billion cuts next year from sequestration to come only from one part of the budget: non-defense discretionary. All of the \$100 billion cuts next year would come from our domestic priorities: health care, education, scientific research, transportation, law enforcement, to name a few.

Their budget fails to require other even larger parts of the Federal budget to reduce costs and be more effective. Their budget fails to protect our fragile economic recovery. It fails on economic growth. They should work together with Democrats to make a real deficit reduction-economic growth package for the United States of America.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to say that when we hear the words "balanced approach," what that means to taxpayers in this country is, You give us your checkbook and we'll balance it the way we think it ought to be balanced here in government. Government first, taxpayers second. That's what the so-called "balanced approach" means. It means keep feeding higher spending with higher taxes.

The problem is, Madam Speaker, the arithmetic just doesn't add up. You literally cannot tax your way out of this mess. Spending is the cause. We need to address our spending. The sooner we do it, the sooner we can get back on to a path to prosperity.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield that 5 minutes as he chooses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time and is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and Chairman RYAN for bringing this bill to the floor. It is greatly needed.

Barring a new agreement between Congress and the White House on deficit reduction, over \$1 trillion in automatic cuts, known as sequestration, will take effect. Although the House has passed a measure that would achieve this necessary deficit reduction to avoid sequestration for a year and give us time to work on it outside of election-year pressure, the Senate has yet to consider any legislation.

Now, I hear a lot of good ideas from the other side and they talk about increased revenue. All I'm saying is put it down on paper.

We have a process by which we work. It's outlined in the Constitution of the United States. One body passes legislation, the other body passes legislation, a conference committee is formed, and the differences are resolved. It goes back to the bodies for final passing and then goes to the President for his signature.

We have taken action in the House. We're waiting for the other body to take some action.

The President weighed in on this. He submitted a budget. His budget sought \$1.2 trillion in alternate deficit reduction. He followed the process. That budget was defeated in a bipartisan, bi-

cameral manner. Now, we need another bill that we can work on.

This impasse and lack of a clear way forward has created a chaotic and uncertain budget environment for industry and defense planners. Compounding the issue is a lack of guidance from the administration on how to implement sequestration.

We just held a hearing in the Armed Services Committee where we had industry leaders come in to tell us the problems they're having on getting guidance.

You know, I come from a small business background, nothing like building planes or ships or boats or the other things that our warfighters need to carry out their mission.

And I might remind people that we are at war. We do have warfighters going outside the wire, as we speak, every day, putting their lives on the line, and they're watching this. They're watching what we're doing. They're wondering if they're going to have the things that they need to carry out this mission and to return home safely.

My business, as I said, was a small family business. We were in the western wear business. We sold boots and hats in a retail way. And we would go, my brothers and I, family business, would go to the market in January. We would buy for our needs for the next 6 months. We would buy shirts, hats, jeans, boots. And then our suppliers would go to their suppliers and buy the things they need to make those things, and then they would ship them to us in an orderly manner, and then we would be able to have the product on the shelves when our customers came in in February, March, April, May.

These industry leaders are asking for a little guidance. All they know is the law, as we have it now, kicks in January 2, says that there will be no thought, no planning, just we take out the budget and cut every line item by a margin, 8, 12, 20 percent, whatever it is, realizing we're already a quarter of the way into the year.

One of the leaders gave us this quote in this conference. This is Sean O'Keefe, president and CEO of EADS North America and chairman of the National Defense Industrial Association. And I quote:

Most immediately, the administration must communicate today its sequestration implementation to the public, our Armed Forces, and to industry.

The current uncertainty has effectively put sequestration and its consequences in motion. In the absence of any guidance, industry is already holding back investments, questioning the fairness of ongoing competitions, doubting the viability of existing contracts, and starting to trim capacity.

In the absence of definitive guidance from the DOD, the OMB, and the Defense Contract Management Agency, we feel compelled to act in the spirit of this law and, in all likelihood, will issue WARN notices to those employees engaged in ongoing Federal contract activities.

□ 1300

We are going to put thousands of people in jeopardy of their jobs between

now and when sequestration should kick in. This is already in motion.

Madam Speaker, I ask that we come together on this issue, that we solve this issue. I ask the President to put forth some leadership. As Commander in Chief, he has the obligation to help us solve this problem. I ask our colleagues to please support this legislation and to bring transparency.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said, and I didn't find much that I disagreed with. We agree that we should replace the sequester, and we agree that it's a mistake to create the kind of uncertainty that's out there. Obviously, it has an impact, not just in the defense sector, but also in all of the other areas in which our Federal Government has activities.

I would just say—and I want to make sure the chairman is on the floor now and has a chance to respond—that he demonstrated some leadership on this issue last fall because he was asked this question. He was asked if he had to put together a plan that included some revenue. He said, Yes, I understand that we've got to make cuts, but I'd rather include some revenue than deep cuts to defense. In fact, what he said was:

We're going to have to stop repeating ideological talking points and address our budget problems comprehensively through smarter spending and increased revenue.

When asked to choose between deeper cuts in defense and cutting some tax breaks, he said we should cut some tax breaks.

That was last fall. That's exactly the kind of balanced approach that the Democrats put forward in the Budget Committee. The chairman of the committee asked for a specific plan. We had a vote on it in the Budget Committee. We wish that our colleagues would have supported it. It would have prevented the sequester from taking place for another year, and it would have eliminated all of the uncertainty the chairman of the Armed Services Committee just talked about.

The reason that we haven't been able to move forward is that our Republican colleagues continue to insist on supporting these tax breaks for special interests and tax breaks for folks at the very top and that they refuse to eliminate those tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit or for the purpose of eliminating the sequester on defense and non-defense. That's why we are in the situation we are in right now. The keys to the lock are in the hands of our Republican colleagues.

We had the same proposal ready to bring to a vote before the whole House of Representatives as part of the reconciliation process. The Rules Committee didn't even allow our proposal to be made in order so that Members of this body could vote on it up or down. So, yes, let's get on with the main

issue. Let's focus on replacing the sequester. Let's do it in a balanced way.

I have to say, since the gentleman from Texas earlier referenced the comments of Senator REID's, the majority leader, I've looked at the Senator's comments. The Senator's point was the same one I'm making here, which is that, if we are going to remove the sequester, we need to take a balanced approach. We need to include cuts. Again, it's important to remember we did \$1 trillion in cuts—100 percent cuts—as part of the Budget Control Act, but we also need to include some revenue by eliminating some of these special interest tax breaks and by asking folks at the very top of the income ladder to pay a little bit more for our national defense and for reducing our deficit. That is the underlying issue here.

I now yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, for yielding.

I rise in support of the Sequestration Transparency Act.

We have all heard concerns back home about partisan gridlock in our Nation's Capitol. Our constituents continue to ask us: Is there any way to overcome this gridlock to solve the problems facing our country? They ask if it is getting better, if Congress can actually do something. Can we get things done?

With the end of the year approaching and with our country's inching ever closer to the so-called "fiscal cliff," the questions from our constituents take on a new urgency. They want to know what is going to happen if the budget sequestration is allowed to go into effect, and they want to know if Congress can function well enough to avoid the doomsday scenarios that many economists are predicting if sequestration does occur. Up until now, we have not been able to offer them much in the way of positive news, and we've had to tell our constituents that we're not quite sure what sequestration will mean for our communities.

Now, this bill doesn't solve the problems our constituents will face if sequestration actually goes into effect—the lost jobs or the damage to our still struggling economy—but it does give us valuable information about what might happen. It will allow us, the body that brought us here in the first place with the passage of the Budget Control Act, to at least better understand the consequences of our actions. Importantly, it signals a bipartisan action on the part of Congress to ask: How bad will this be?

If there is a silver lining to be found, it is that we have come together on what could have been a contentious piece of legislation, and I thank the Budget Committee chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

Now, the fact that we have to pass a bill to get information on legislation that we have already passed does not speak highly of the process. The se-

quester was supposed to motivate us to work together and pass a budget that lowers costs while maintaining critical services. It's unfortunate that we have to pass yet another bill to move us closer to accomplishing what should have been done months ago.

But for the sake of better representing our constituents, let's focus on the positive: Let's support a bill that gives us the information we as legislators need in order to make an educated decision.

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

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

Ms. BONAMICI. I hope today's bipartisan action is an indicator of a renewed commitment to tackling the sequester, and I hope it sends a message to our constituents that we can work together to get something done. That's why I supported this bill in the Budget Committee, and that's why I am asking my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the Sequestration Transparency Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the House Budget and Armed Services Committees, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there is broad bipartisan agreement in this House that the looming defense sequestration cuts are bad policy for the U.S. military and our national defense.

Our Defense Secretary has testified to me and to other members of the Armed Services Committee that such cuts would hollow out the military, and our constituents are rightly concerned about our ability to provide necessary equipment to troops in the field, troops who are often our sons, daughters, brothers, or sisters.

The original goal of this legislation that gave us the sequester was to find deficit reduction in the Federal budget in a careful, deliberative manner. Despite their best efforts, the small group that was charged with finding these cuts failed in the end. That's why we have passed legislation in the full House to replace the defense cuts with deficit reduction elsewhere, but the Senate has, once again, failed to act. As for the administration, it has failed to specify how these cuts will be distributed and what kind of impact they will inevitably have on our Nation's security.

Military spending decisions should not be made in a vacuum. We shouldn't merely try to manage down to some predetermined, arbitrary spending level. Ultimately, strategy should guide these sorts of decisions. Missions we are asking our men and women in uniform to perform to keep our country safe should be our measuring stick, and we should ensure that full funding exists to carry out each of these missions.

The bottom line is this: It is the responsibility of this administration to

inform Congress and the American public of its plans to implement the sequester and to provide clarification on its scope and severity.

With that, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this blessedly bipartisan legislation, the Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who serves on the Budget Committee and who also, I believe, serves on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for including me on his committee.

H.R. 5872 is a bipartisan bill. As has been mentioned several times, it did pass out of the Budget Committee unanimously, and that's a very good thing. I think, honestly, we have a very strong bipartisan agreement that sequester is a very bad policy, something that really shouldn't be allowed to happen.

□ 1310

Obviously, I also sit on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee. So I focused on that area. If we don't arrive at agreement before the end of the year, we'll have \$110 billion worth of cuts across the entire budget, but about a 10 percent cut on top of a half a billion dollars we've already taken out of defense that will begin that will have tremendous consequences in my State, potentially 16,000 jobs, \$620 million or \$630 million to the State economy. We all hope this doesn't occur, but we all know that the administration does have a responsibility to plan for it and to inform us of those plans. So far it has failed to do that.

Mr. Speaker, it's worth noting for the record that we have dealt with sequestration in this House. We passed a measure to avoid it. It's the Senate that has failed to act. We may not have acted in a manner in which our friends on the other side would like, but the responsibility now is with the United States Senate to at least pass something and put us in a position to go to conference.

It would be irresponsible to allow sequester to occur, and it would be responsible for the Senate to actually act. I hope today, by giving the Senate additional information, by encouraging the administration to plan for something we hope doesn't happen, that we will actually bring ourselves a little bit closer to a solution, and we'll come to a bipartisan compromise by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe they have the right to close, so let me inquire of the gentleman from Maryland whether or not they have another speaker.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. There was one other gentleman who said he was on his way. He's not here yet. If he is not

here by the time you finish, we will close.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. With that understanding, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. LANKFORD. At home, people have just a simple request of Congress: do our job. Just do it. They're tired of worrying about what dumb thing the Federal Government will do to them and their business and their family that will cause them even more pain. They just want us to identify the problem, fix it, and quit messing with the private business world.

When a private business sees a threat on the horizon, they prepare for it. If it's good, they ramp up hiring, they add more inventory, they increase training, they increase sales staff. They get ready for something good. They take the entrepreneurial risk. If they see a threat on the horizon that looks bad, they pull back staff, they slow down internal purchases, they freeze inventory and hiring.

I have two quick observations. One is this: right now the national threat on the economic horizon is the Federal Government's lack of imperative to resolve this manufactured crisis. We need to fix it now. The second is this: we've got to look up and see there is a financial crisis coming and prepare for it. If we wait until the last minute to act, it creates incredible uncertainty in our economy and businesses and families can't prepare for it. When we wait until the last minute to do something, we have already created economic uncertainty there.

Here's what this bill does: it requires that we actually plan for an economic crisis that we know is coming January 2, 2013. It pushes us to do what's essential right now. Federal spending has dramatically increased. As we approach \$16 trillion in national debt in our fourth straight year of trillion-dollar deficit spending, we should not guess or try to make up a financial plan at the last minute. Some have proposed that we debt our way into prosperity or that we take even more money from one family and give it to another to make life fair.

This bill simply asks the President to let us know the plan, let us know the consequences of sequestration. We know it's bad policy, but the administration has not given us the details of how they will implement the sequestration. Months ago, the House Budget Committee and then the full House worked with six committees to create a specific plan of how we were going to deal with this. We just want to know what OMB's plan is and how things are going to be done.

Get us the information now.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Let me start on the points of agreement.

We agree with this piece of legislation. As we said, it passed the Budget Committee unanimously. What it does is ask for some more detailed information on the impact of the across-the-board sequester scheduled to take place in January. The Senate also agrees with that. Let's make no mistake, there was an amendment on the Senate side, a bipartisan amendment by Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington State and Senator MCCAIN, asking for additional information.

There was also agreement that we don't need more information to understand that the across-the-board sequester cuts would have a very negative impact on the economy and on defense and on important nondefense investments that are important to the American people.

The issue really is what are we going to do about it. We have proposed an alternative in this House. We proposed an alternative in the Budget Committee, and it didn't pass. We asked for this whole House to have a chance to vote on an alternative that had a balanced approach that included cuts, but also additional revenues from closing tax breaks and loopholes, and we were denied that opportunity for a vote over here.

Let's be very clear about what Senator REID has said and what the President has said on a number of these issues, both the tax issue, as well as the sequestration issue that we're debating today. The President of the United States has been very clear that he would like today for the Congress to pass legislation to extend tax relief to 98 percent of the American people, all the middle class tax cuts. He wants us to get it done today. In fact, what some people don't realize is that those tax cuts would also benefit folks at the very top. In fact, it provides tax relief to 100 percent of Americans compared to current law. Let's get that done. If we agree on it, let's act now.

The same is true with the sequester. The keys to this lock are in the hands of our Republican colleagues. We've agreed that part of the solution is cuts. We did a trillion dollars in cuts last year, 100 percent cuts. We've also said we can do additional cuts, but we should also deal with the revenue side of the equation if we're serious about the deficit.

The chairman talked about our use of the word "balance." It's the same use that the Simpson-Bowles and Rivlin-Domenici bipartisan commissions have made. What they have said is any serious approach to reducing the debt, in this case replacing the sequester, requires cuts, yes, but also revenues.

The reality is, in this House of Representatives, 98 percent of our Republican colleagues have signed a pledge to this fellow by the name of Grover

Norquist. What that pledge says is you can't eliminate one penny of tax breaks, you can't eliminate one dollar of taxpayer subsidies for the oil companies, or ask folks who are making more than a million dollars a year to pay one more dollar for the purpose of deficit reduction. They won't do it. Nor does that pledge allow them to take a dollar tax subsidy away for the purpose of defense spending.

We hear a lot of talk about the importance of defense spending. We agree. Secretary Panetta has talked about it. We think we should pay for it. Rather than just talk about defense spending, why don't we also pay for it? We have put two wars on our national credit card: Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of us proposed that we help pay for those as we go so we wouldn't be leaving the bill to future generations, to the children of the troops that are fighting those wars. We should pay for them. But, no, those two wars went on the credit card.

Now we're talking about defense. The Armed Services Committee has a hearing today on the impact of defense. As we've said, we agree that we don't want to see that. But when faced with the simple choice of cutting more tax breaks for oil companies or asking folks at the very top to pay a little bit more for defense and to reduce the deficit, no, they won't touch that.

Let's understand the underlying issue here, both on the tax issues at the end of the year, which we can solve today if our Republican colleagues will stop holding 98 percent of the American taxpayers hostage until they get a continuation of the tax breaks for the folks at the very top, and we can deal with the sequester today if our colleagues are willing to take the balanced approach recommended by every bipartisan commission. That's what's at issue.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with this. We've heard a lot of talk about how asking the folks at the very top to pay a little more would hurt the economy. The reality is we've tried the trickle-down theory. It's in place right now. We tried it for 8 years under the previous administration. The last time we had a balanced budget was at the end of the Clinton administration in 2001. Then-President Bush came in with back-to-back tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the very wealthy. What happened at the end of the 8 years? We lost private sector jobs. So much for the theory that tax breaks for the folks at the very top trickle down and lift everybody up.

□ 1320

They lifted the yachts, but the boats ran aground, and that's the reality. That's what we are hearing from our Republican colleagues.

When it comes right down to it, we've been willing to make some tough cuts, and we're willing to make more. But because of this pledge or other reasons, our Republican colleagues refused to deal with the deficit in a balanced

way. They refused to ask folks at the very top to chip in a little bit more to reduce our deficits and to help pay for defense. Let's take action today to prevent the cuts, not just to defense, but to non-defense.

It's interesting. I hear our Republican colleagues talk about the jobs created by defense, that's true. You know, building aircraft carriers creates jobs. Somehow building aircraft carriers creates jobs that building roads and bridges doesn't. The President has a jobs bill that's been sitting in this House of Representatives since September, a major boost in infrastructure.

We have 14 percent unemployment in the construction industry. We have roads, bridges, and transit systems in need of repair. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our Nation a D, grade D.

It's a win/win. Let's spend more there, boost jobs and the economy, do a job that needs to be done. But no, you know, cutting defense spending and work on tanks, that will hurt jobs, but it's okay not to fund the President's infrastructure proposal to put people back to work building bridges and roads.

Let's have a rational conversation here, Mr. Speaker, about what works and what doesn't work, and how we can take this balanced approach to reducing our deficit and eliminating replacing the sequester so we can avoid the cuts to both defense and non-defense.

I look forward to getting the information called for by this piece of legislation. OMB is actually already crunching the numbers. There are lots of details, I hear, but our time here would be best spent putting in place a plan to replace the sequester rather than simply asking for more information.

More information is good. Solving the problem is better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, if all this borrowing, taxing, and spending was the secret to economic success and prosperity, we would be on the verge of entering a golden age, along with Greece.

The so-called balanced alternative plan by the other side is balanced in that it does have deficit reduction of \$30 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, but only because after the \$55 billion spending increase scored by CBO, it has an \$85 billion tax increase. If we keep going down this road, Mr. Speaker we're going to get the same results.

What did we start with in this Congress? We passed a budget that cuts spending, that reformed government, that reformed the taxes and gets back

to economic growth to puts us on a path to prosperity to pay off the debt.

The Senate hasn't passed a budget for 3 years. Then we engaged in negotiations on the debt limit to try to get a down payment on deficit reduction and the Budget Control Act resulted.

Therefore, the supercommittee failed, and the sequester is about to kick in. So again we took action in the House, and we passed the reconciliation package that replaces the sequester, which resulted in a net \$242.8 billion in additional deficit reduction. We put specifics on the table, passed them through the House again. The crickets are chirping in the other body in the Senate. No leadership from the President, no leadership from the Senate, no leadership.

What this is is simple. Since there is an absence of leadership on these critical fiscal issues from the President of the United States, from the Senate of the United States, at the very least show us how this is going to work. If you're not willing to replace the sequester, tell us how it's going to be implemented.

That is simply a matter of transparency. We're not judging the debates or the merits or the each other's ideas and how to replace it; we're simply saying to OMB tell us how it's going to go down, because this seems to be your only plan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to follow the bipartisan example that has been set in the Budget Committee and let's have a nice bipartisan vote on behalf of transparency from the legislative branch.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5872, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

YEAS—414

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (TX)
Adams	Benishke	Braley (IA)
Aderholt	Berg	Brooks
Alexander	Berkley	Brown (GA)
Altmire	Berman	Brown (FL)
Amash	Biggert	Buchanan
Amodei	Bilbray	Bucshon
Andrews	Bilirakis	Buerkle
Austria	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Bachus	Black	Calvert
Baldwin	Blackburn	Camp
Barber	Blumenauer	Campbell
Barletta	Bonamici	Canseco
Barrow	Bonner	Cantor
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Capito
Barton (TX)	Boswell	Capps
Bass (CA)	Boustany	Capuano
Bass (NH)	Brady (PA)	Cardoza

Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie

Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huiizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landy
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney

Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—15

Engel
Akin
Boren
Filner
Gonzalez
Gosar
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lewis (GA)
Polis
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Sewell
Stivers

□ 1354

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

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 471, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 471, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted “yea.”

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5856, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 717 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. 5856.

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

□ 1356

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. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year end-

ing September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. MARCHANT 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 Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the Defense appropriations bill for 2013. It has been done with the cooperation of the Republicans and the Democrats on the subcommittee, the Democrats led by NORM DICKS. I would say that NORM and I have worked together for so many years in making sure that these Defense appropriations bills were strictly nonpolitical—no politics in Defense appropriations. And there should not be.

Our investment in our national defense should be based on what is the real threat to the United States and what does it take to protect against that threat and what does it take to protect the men and women who provide for that national defense.

I want to compliment Mr. DICKS for having worked together with each other so well, regardless of who was in the majority, for 35 years, Mr. DICKS. And I just want to recognize that this will be the last Defense appropriations bill that Mr. DICKS will preside over on the floor because he is seeking retirement at the end of the term.

This committee will miss Mr. DICKS, the House will miss Mr. DICKS, the Congress will miss Mr. DICKS, and I will say the country will miss his service to the United States of America for so many years. So Mr. DICKS, I extend to you my very, very best and my appreciation and thanks for your friendship and your spirit of cooperation over the many years.

The subcommittee held many hearings and many briefings on so many subjects that it took most of the year leading up to this date in order to do that. I will compliment the members of the subcommittee because they were very attentive. The subcommittee hearings and meetings were all very, very well attended. The members were very loyal and faithful to their assignments and to their responsibilities.

During these hearings, we heard one word that bothered me a lot, that was the word “risk.” As we got into the issue of the budget requests, we were told that this might bring about a certain risk, or a prudent risk, or an acceptable risk. We pursued the issue of what is an acceptable risk when it comes to national defense or what is a prudent risk. Let me explain briefly some of the things that we heard.

One, we were told that the United States is going to show much more presence in the Pacific area. I certainly agree with that. That is a very, very