

funding and language regarding cybersecurity.

I strongly supported the inclusion of this anomaly, and see it as essential but also limited in scope to only the securing of our vulnerable Federal civilian networks. This provision does not intrude upon the authorizers' jurisdiction or enable a new executive order in any way.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to talk about the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS, as I said before, has served on this committee for 30-plus years. I'm not exactly sure how many. How many is it? It is 36 years. He has been a very, very dedicated member of the committee, including—and most especially—of the Defense Subcommittee on which he has served for, I think, 34 years. Before that, he was an aide to a Member of Congress, so he has wide, deep experience in this body.

Maybe just as importantly, perhaps even more so, is the dedication that he has given to the country through his service in the Congress. I, personally, have found him to be a close friend. He has also been a great partner in this appropriations process since I have become the chairman of the committee. He has been helpful in a thousand instances. His heart is in the right place. His mind is on the business of serving the public, especially the military part of that service.

We're going to miss NORM DICKS around here. He is going to leave a large hole in our hearts but also in the business of this body and this Congress, so we wish him well as he embarks upon a new career, perhaps, and a new way of life, perhaps. I've got an idea there are going to be a few fish involved in that future, but we are going to miss NORM DICKS for all that he has meant to us.

This may be the last bill that he has a part in. I hope, perhaps, there will be something in the lame duck; but in case there is not, I wanted to be sure that we said some words of deep, profound thanks to a patriot who has served his country as few others have. I wish NORM DICKS the very, very best as he embarks on the next phase of his life.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I want to thank the chairman for his very kind remarks. It has been a deep pleasure working with you and your very able staff. I think one of the reasons for the success of trying to restore regular order is that we've had good staff cooperation at all levels. I want to thank our staff, both the majority and minority, for their excellent work.

It has been a great pleasure working with you. Again, let's hope we can convince people that we should get our

work done so when we come back in the lame duck session we can finally put the omnibus bill together for 2013 and get this accomplished. I know that's what the chairman wants and that that's what I want, but I appreciate his kind remarks. I appreciate his courtesy and his leadership of our committee. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention staff. As the ranking member has said, none of this would be here but for this wonderful staff that we are blessed with.

Bill Inglee on the majority side, the clerk; Will Smith, his deputy; and all of the staff on the subcommittees and the full committee have worked day and night—weekends included—on this bill. For that we are deeply appreciative. Then David Pomerantz on the minority side and all of the staff on the minority side, both full committee and subcommittees, have equally worked as hard and, most of the time, together on the same thing. So we want to thank them for the deep service that they've given to us.

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, we know that in too many states and districts across the country, students with the greatest needs are being taught by teachers with little or no training, including those enrolled in alternative route teacher preparation programs. That's why I am so glad this legislation requires the Department of Education to provide Congress—and the nation—with comprehensive information on the extent to which our highest-need students, including students with disabilities, English learners, students from rural communities, and low-income students, are being taught by teachers-in-training who are enrolled in alternative route programs, disaggregated by state and district, as well as by student subgroups. The data that will be included in this report should be made public and disseminated to parents and other interested parties so that is understandable and actionable. Specifically, the provision requires:

The Secretary of Education must submit a report to Congress by 12/31/13 that provides a comprehensive picture, with state-level and LEA data, on the extent to which the following categories of students are taught by alternative route teachers-in-training who are deemed "highly qualified" pursuant to 34 CFR 200.56(a)(2)(ii): students with disabilities, English learners, students in rural areas, and students from low-income families. 34 CFR 200.56(a)(2)(ii) is the regulation that allows individuals participating in alternative route programs but who have not yet completed their full state certification to be labeled "highly qualified." This regulation was struck down by the Ninth Circuit in the *Renee v. Duncan* lawsuit, but written into statute in the December 2010 CR.

To produce the report required by this amendment, states and LEAs will be required to compile the data that they are already required to have under Section 1111(h)(6)(A) of NCLB regarding the professional qualifications of all their teachers, including: "Whether the teacher has met State qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction.

Whether the teacher is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which State qualification or licensing criteria have been waived.

The baccalaureate degree major of the teacher and any other graduate certification or degree held by the teacher, and the field of discipline of the certification or degree.

This data will provide essential information to parents, to educators and to policy makers so that informed decisions can be made so that we can strengthen one of our nation's most valuable assets, our public schools. We will be in a much better position to look at our neediest students and our neediest rural and urban school districts and determine the extent to which well prepared teachers are or are not equitably distributed. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to receiving this important report from the Secretary on December 31, 2013.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of an important provision that is included in this Continuing Resolution. This provision will enable the collection of essential information that we have long sought to make determinations about whether teachers are equitably distributed among our high needs schools. It will also help us understand which teachers are working with underserved students.

In many places, teachers-in-training are serving as teachers of record. While we know this, we do not know exactly where they are concentrated around the country or which subgroups of students they are primarily teaching. Data points are available for some locales, but not nationally. This provision will require the Department of Education to gather information about the extent to which students with high needs are being taught by teachers with the least amount of preparation, including students with disabilities, English language learners, low-income students and students in rural areas and report this information to Congress by December 31, 2013.

It is my hope that this report will require States and LEAs to compile the data that districts are already required to have under the Parents' Right to Know Section of NCLB regarding the professional qualifications of all their teachers.

I look forward to receiving this important report. The information presented will assist Congress, the public, parents and educators in making informed decisions about policy and practice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 117 is postponed.

□ 1540

NATIONAL SECURITY AND JOB PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 778, I call up

the bill (H.R. 6365) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, 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 778, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6365

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 “National Security and Job Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Current law requires that there be across-the-board cuts, known as a “sequester”, imposed on January 2, 2013. The sequester will result in a 10 percent reduction in non-military personnel programs of the Department of Defense and an 8 percent reduction in certain domestic programs, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and border security.

(2) Intended as a mechanism to force action, there is bipartisan agreement that the sequester going into place would undercut key responsibilities of the Federal Government.

(3) As the Administration stated in its fiscal year 2013 budget request, “[Sequestration] would lead to significant cuts to critical domestic programs such as education and research and cuts to defense programs that could undermine our national security. . . . [C]uts of this magnitude done in an across-the-board fashion would be devastating both to defense and non-defense programs.” (The Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013, p. 24, February 13, 2012).

(4) On March 29, 2012, The House of Representatives passed H. Con. Res. 112, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2013, which includes reconciliation instructions directing House Committees to craft legislation that would achieve the savings required to replace the sequestration called for in fiscal year 2013, as established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

(5) On May 10, 2012, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5652, the Sequestration Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012, which would replace the \$98 billion sequestration of discretionary spending called for in 2013, as established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, by making changes in law to reduce direct spending by \$310 billion through fiscal year 2022.

(6) An analysis of the impact of the sequestration prepared for the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee found that if left in place, sequestration would cut the military to its smallest size since before the Second World War, all while we are still a nation at war in Afghanistan, facing increased threats from Iran and North Korea, unrest in the Middle East, and a rising China.

(7) Major consequences identified by the House Armed Services Committee include the following:

(A) 200,000 soldiers and Marines separated from service, bringing our force well below our pre-9/11 levels.

(B) Ability to respond to contingencies in North Korea or Iran at jeopardy.

(C) The smallest ground force since 1940.

(D) A fleet of fewer than 230 ships, the smallest level since 1915.

(E) The smallest tactical fighter force in the history of the Air Force.

(F) Our nuclear triad that has kept the U.S. and 30 of our allies safe for decades will be in jeopardy.

(G) Reductions of 20 percent in defense civilian personnel.

(H) Two BRAC rounds of base closings. (House Armed Services Committee memo entitled “Assessment of Impacts of Budget Cuts”, September 22, 2011).

(8) Secretary Panetta and the professional military leadership have also looked at the impact of sequestration and reached similar conclusions.

(9) Secretary Panetta stated, “If the maximum sequestration is triggered, the total cut will rise to about \$1 trillion compared with the FY 2012 plan. The impacts of these cuts would be devastating for the Department. . . Facing such large reductions, we would have to reduce the size of the military sharply. Rough estimates suggest after ten years of these cuts, we would have the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest number of ships since 1915, and the smallest Air Force in its history.” (Secretary Panetta, Letter to Senator John McCain, November 14, 2011).

(10) General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated, “[S]equestration leaves me three places to go to find the additional money: operations, maintenance, and training. That’s the definition of a hollow force.”

(11) The individual branch service chiefs echoed General Dempsey:

(A) “Cuts of this magnitude would be catastrophic to the military. . . My assessment is that the nation would incur an unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk.”—General Ray T. Odierno, Chief Of Staff, United States Army.

(B) “A severe and irreversible impact on the Navy’s future” —Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations.

(C) “A Marine Corps below the end strength that’s necessary to support even one major contingency.”—General James F. Amos, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(D) “Even the most thoroughly deliberated strategy may not be able to overcome dire consequences.”—General Norton A. Schwartz, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force (Testimony of Service Chief before House Armed Services Committee, November 2, 2011).

(12) According to an analysis by the House Appropriations Committee, the sequester will also have a significant impact on non-defense discretionary programs, including the following:

(A) Automatically reducing Head Start by \$650 million, resulting in 75,000 fewer slots for children in the program.

(B) Automatically reducing the National Institutes of Health (NIH) by \$2.4 billion, an amount equal to nearly half of total NIH spending on cancer this year.

(C) A reduction of approximately 1,870 Border Patrol Agents (a reduction of nearly 9 percent of the total number of agents).

(13) Beyond the negative impacts sequestration will have on defense readiness, it will also undermine the industrial base needed to equip our armed forces with the weapons and technology they need to complete their mission. A study released by the National Association of Manufacturers suggests that 1.1 million workers in the supply chain could be adversely affected, including 3.4 percent of workers in the aerospace industry, 3.3 percent of the workforce in the shipbuilding industry and 10 percent of the workers in the search and navigation equipment industry.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT FOR FY 2013 SEQUESTER.

(a) CONTINGENT EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by it shall take effect upon the enactment of—

(1) the Act contemplated in section 201 of H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) that achieves at least the deficit reduction called for in such section for such periods; or

(2) similar legislation that achieves outlay reductions within five years after the date of enactment that equal or exceed the outlay reductions flowing from the budget authority reductions mandated by sections 251A(7)(A) and 251A(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as in force immediately before the date of enactment of this Act, as it applies to direct spending in the defense function for fiscal year 2013 combined with the outlay reductions flowing from the amendment to section 251A(7)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 made by subsection (c) of this section.

(b) REVISED 2013 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013, for the discretionary category, \$1,047,000,000,000 in new budget authority;”.

(c) DISCRETIONARY SAVINGS.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—

“(i) FISCAL YEAR 2013 ADJUSTMENT.—On January 2, 2013, the discretionary category set forth in section 251(c)(2) shall be decreased by \$19,104,000,000 in budget authority.

“(ii) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—OMB shall issue a supplemental report consistent with the requirements set forth in section 254(f)(2) for fiscal year 2013 using the procedures set forth in section 253(f) on April 15, 2013, to eliminate any discretionary spending breach of the spending limit set forth in section 251(c)(2) as adjusted by clause (i), and the President shall issue an order to eliminate the breach, if any, identified in such report.”.

(d) ELIMINATION AND CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) ELIMINATION.—Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for the defense function (050) for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

(2) CONDITIONAL REPLACEMENT.—To the extent that legislation enacted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) achieves outlay reductions that exceed the outlay reductions flowing from the budget authority reductions required in section 251A(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as in force immediately before the date of enactment of this Act, the direct spending reductions for the nonsecurity category for fiscal year 2013 otherwise required to be ordered pursuant to such section shall be reduced by that amount, and Congress so designates for such purpose.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL SUBMISSION.

Not later than October 15, 2012, the President shall transmit to Congress a legislative proposal that meets the requirements of section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6365.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, there will be a \$110 billion across-the-board cut known as sequester. It will be imposed in this country on January 2, 2013, resulting in a 10 percent reduction in the Department of Defense programs and an 8 percent reduction in certain domestic programs as well.

In May of this year, the House passed a bill to deal with this. That was H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act. What this legislation would do is it would replace that sequester of 2013 with commonsense spending cuts and reforms. Unfortunately, we have seen a lack of leadership both over in the Senate and in the White House. The Senate has failed to act on this legislation—the Senate, where all good bills go to die, so too with this, or any sequester replacement bill. Today the House will once again try to responsibly fix the sequester.

The National Security and Job Protection Act would ensure our national security, but at the same time we do that, we'll cut spending. The National Security and Job Protection Act would do two things quickly. First, it would turn off the sequester of Congress, enacting the House-passed reconciliation bill or similar legislation that achieves equal levels of deficit reduction. Secondly, the National Security and Job Protection Act would require the President of the United States to submit to Congress a legislative proposal to replace the sequester with an alternative no later than October 15 of this year.

Up until this point, we have seen absolutely no leadership, we have seen no plan from the President to fix this sequester problem, but yet there is strong bipartisan agreement that the sequester, as it is right now, is bad policy and should be re-prioritized. Once again, the President has failed to lead in this area, failed to put forward a credible response, failed to put forward a legislative proposal, and the Senate has failed as well. The result is that in less than 100 days we will see reductions that our own Secretary Panetta says will hollow out our Armed Forces and make totally arbitrary reductions in other spending programs.

Not only has the President failed to lead in this area, he has failed to put forward a plan. The President has also failed—and this is important—to submit to Congress a report, as law requires him to do so, detailing specifically how this administration would implement the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, after months, literally months, of stonewalling Congress on how this administration would implement the sequester, Congress now comes to the floor because we are forced to pass legislation requiring the President to submit a detailed sequester implementation program. When that legislation became law, as we said, the President's response has been no response. Rather than him doing his homework, the President has simply taken a pass on this matter and instead has provided Congress with nothing, and he is not even meeting the requirements of the law. It is an example, I think, to use the President's own word, of an "incomplete" by this President on his report card.

That the President lacks leadership is simply stunning to this Member and to the American people as well. As I say, the Senate is no better for failing to respond in this matter. The Senate refuses to take up any bill or to replace the sequester whatsoever.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we again come here passing legislation to try to solve this problem, to fix the sequester, to make sure that these draconian cuts do not go in place now. We're not saying that it has to be the House-passed bill that passed. We're also asking the President to put forward his own legislative proposal, for the Senate to act before the legislation takes effect.

Americans are looking for leadership, and they're getting it from the House of Representatives today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is really quite a charade we're engaged in here today on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let's just flash back a year ago to how we got to this spot.

At that time, our Republican colleagues threatened that the United States would default on its full faith and credit, that we wouldn't pay the bills that we already incurred, that this Congress had already voted for, and threatened to tank the economy unless we passed their version of the budget, the Ryan budget, the budget that came out of the House Budget Committee. In order to prevent the United States from defaulting, everybody got together—the House, the Senate, and the President—and they passed the Budget Control Act. To hear our Republican colleagues today, you'd think they had nothing to do with the Budget Control Act. We heard the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, on television the other day not wanting to associate himself with that.

□ 1550

The reality is he voted for it. The Speaker of the House said he got 98 percent of what he wanted. Here's the Speaker of the House after we passed the Budget Control Act:

I got 98 percent of what I wanted. I'm pretty happy.

Now we are faced with the consequences of the Budget Control Act. What did it do? Two things: It cut spending, discretionary spending over 10 years by a trillion dollars by putting in spending caps, and it created a sequester process.

There's agreement in this House that allowing the meat-ax sequester agreements to take place would really be a stupid thing to do. There's agreement on that.

The issue is: How do we replace that? How do we achieve a similar amount of deficit reduction to replace that sequester?

We hear our Republican colleagues say there is no leadership from the President; they haven't heard any alternatives. That's just not true.

There are lots of alternatives that have been put on the table. They just don't like the alternatives. And do you know why? Because the Democratic alternatives to the sequester, and the one put forward by the President, takes the same balanced approach that's been recommended by bipartisan commissions.

They say that in order to tackle our deficit we should make additional cuts. But we should also eliminate a lot of special interest tax breaks for Big Oil companies. We should ask the very wealthy to go back to paying a little bit more in taxes, about what they were paying when President Clinton was President, the last time we balanced our budget.

The President has submitted that. In fact, a year ago the President sent down a plan right here on how we could take a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Just yesterday in the Rules Committee, on behalf of my Democratic colleagues, we proposed a substitute that would totally have replaced the sequester, again through a mix of cuts, cutting some of the excessive agriculture subsidies, but also raising revenue by cutting some of the big breaks for Big Oil companies and asking the wealthiest to chip in a little bit more.

Our Republican colleagues who say they want a big open debate on the floor here, they denied us even a vote on that amendment. We're not going to get to vote today on that amendment. Instead, we're voting on this resolution that, even if we pass it and the Senate passes it and the President would sign it, it would do nothing about the sequester—nothing. That's why I said this is a charade.

We had an option to bring to the floor of this House a real substitute proposal that, if we passed it, it would have removed the sequester, made sure that there are no cuts to defense and nondefense under the sequester. We don't get to vote on that today. Instead, we're voting on something that is totally meaningless.

They say they're going to ask the President to submit a report to the

Congress. He's already done it. He did it a year ago. They just don't like it because it takes a balanced approach, because it does ask Big Oil companies to give up some of their big taxpayer subsidies.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's end the charade. The moment our Republican colleagues come to the conclusion that it's more important to protect defense spending than it is to protect special interest tax breaks for Big Oil companies, we can move on and deal with this in a balanced way, the same way bipartisan commissions have recommended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that it is inappropriate to traffic the well while a Member is speaking.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the legislation before us, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST), who recognizes that while the President may have presented a plan to this Congress, that bill went down 414-0, and to the Senate 97-0.

Mr. WEST. I want to thank my colleague for allowing me to come here.

This is not a charade. I served 22 years in the United States military, and I was part of a reduction in force coming out of Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and I know what these types of cuts will do to the military. Also, this is what these types of cuts will do to non-defense discretionary.

The sequestration will put at risk all that we have accomplished in education and weaken programs that help children, serve young families, send young people and adults to college and make the middle class American Dream possible.

Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan.

Secretary of Defense:

This mechanism of sequestration will force defense cuts that, in my view, would do catastrophic damage to our military and the ability to be able to protect our country.

I think right now, Mr. Speaker, it's very simple. George Santayana had a quote back in the 1920s and said:

Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

At the end of World War I, we cut our military, then came World War II. At the end of World War II, we cut our military, then came the Korean War. At the end of the Korean War, we, of course, did the exact same thing, and, of course, we had to chase communism all over the world, Vietnam.

As I spoke about earlier, I participated in the RIF after Desert Shield/Desert Storm. This sequestration does one simple thing: It takes the Army and Marine Corps down to 1940s levels.

It puts 200,000 of our men and women in uniform on the streets.

It makes our United States Navy go to 1915 levels. Currently, we have a naval force of 283 warships. It goes down to 230.

It takes our Air Force down to the smallest Air Force we have had in mod-

ern history, when we created the United States Air Force. It cuts non-tactical fighter squadrons.

If you talk to any of our service chiefs, if you listen to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who talks about hollowing out this force, we should not be doing this at a time when we all see what is happening in the world right now, when the United States of America has had a sovereign piece of its territory attacked. We have had an Ambassador that has lost his life. The message that we are going to send is that we are going to do nothing?

This legislation says, very simply, we have passed a plan out of the House. The Senate, if you don't like our plan, come up with your own plan. Mr. President, you are the Commander in Chief. Come up with a plan.

One of the things that you learn as a young officer, that if you ever get into a firefight, you are ever in an ambush, to do nothing means that people lose their lives. I will not stand here and do nothing at this time because those are my friends still in uniform; those are my relatives that are still in uniform.

Now, I did not have the ability to be selected to be on the supercommittee—maybe because I have only been here as a freshman—but that does not mean that I will not be an adult and present a solution that says, very simply, if you don't like what we passed in the House, then do something. Come up with a plan.

We just heard the debate about the continuing resolution, a continuing resolution we have been forced into because we have a Senate that has not passed a budget in close to 3 years. We have a Senate that has not taken up any appropriations bills.

Well, I will tell you—and I will reach out to my colleagues from the other side—at least here in the House we have done something. But we have been forced into a position with this sequestration to say we have got to come up with a solution. The supercommittee did not meet its enacted mandate.

Does that mean we're going to stop? Does that mean that we're going to look at the men and women in uniform and say we will allow this to happen? Did that mean that we're going to look at other people that are affected by these non-defense discretionary cuts?

All I'm saying is, with this piece of legislation, those who have come up with a plan, tell us what you want so that we do not have this occur. Think about the second- and third-order effects that will come to this.

We are talking about the people that will be lost in uniform.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. No, I will not yield, so please—thank you.

We're talking about the Department of Defense civilian positions that would be lost. We're talking about the defense industrial base, the technology that is going to develop the next generation of weapons systems for our men and

women that will be lost. We're talking about a critical decision for the way ahead for the United States of America.

And I understand what has been said about this balanced approach that the President sent over in his fiscal year 2013 budget. They had \$1.9 trillion of new taxes, but yet it never balances at any time. If it was such a good plan, such a good budget, no one here took it up. That's my concern.

This is a last chance for us to be the adults, to do something, to stave off this sequestration. The House voted. The House sent a piece of legislation out in May. The House voted on the Sequestration Transparency Act. We still have not gotten anything.

The Director of the OMB, Mr. Jeffrey Zients, testified before the Armed Services Committee he has no plan. All he did was sit there and say that, if you guys would stop with these tax cuts not being brought up on the rich, then this would not happen.

What is a fair share when the top 1 percent pays close to 37 percent of taxes? That's not the debate, Mr. Speaker. The debate is what we're going to do about this sequestration.

□ 1600

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

We've heard before that there was this vote on the President's plan and that it got no votes. We had a vote on a fake President's plan. When we actually had to vote on the Democratic alternative, which the White House made clear was closer to their plan than the one that was put up for a fake vote, it got a huge vote from our Democratic colleagues.

I would just ask Mr. WEST to read his own amendment. Because if you read the bill, it's pretty clear if we were to pass it and the Senate was to pass it and the President would sign it, it doesn't make the sequester go away. No, it doesn't make the sequester go away. It calls for action. In fact, it says the President should submit a plan within a certain period of time. It's right here in your bill: Presidential submission not later than October 15, 2012. The President shall transmit to the Congress a legislative proposal.

Mr. WEST. If the gentleman will yield, it says that it would be replaced. If you come up with a plan, it will be replaced.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Exactly. And reclaiming my time, that's exactly right. That's exactly what it says. But you tell the President what his plan has to do. You tell the President that his plan cannot include one penny of revenue for the purpose of reducing the deficit. In other words, you say the President's plan has got to look like your plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue here is not whether the President has a plan or not. He does have a plan. Our Republican colleagues don't like it because it says that it's more important to protect defense spending and protect domestic spending like NIH than it is to

protect special interest tax loopholes. And I see the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the floor, and I respect him greatly. That's the position he took last October. Here's what he said when he was asked:

"If it came that I had only two choices, one was a tax increase and one was a cut in defense over and above where we already are, I would go to strengthen defense."

That is the President's position. That's the President's position, Mr. WEST. He said we need to take a balanced approach to reducing the deficit. We need to combine cuts. But we also should end special interest tax breaks for the big oil companies. George Bush himself said when you've got oil above \$50 a barrel, you don't need these ridiculous incentives to keep them drilling. And we should ask very wealthy individuals, frankly, to pay the same tax rate that the people who work for them do; the same effective tax rate. And we should eliminate some of these ag subsidies.

Now you asked about other proposals. I have a proposal in my hand. I took it to the House Rules Committee yesterday. It would have totally replaced the sequester. If we actually voted on this, it would replace the sequester for defense and nondefense. You know how we do it? We do it through cuts to big ag subsidies, we do it by eliminating subsidies for the big oil companies, and yes, we ask people making more than a million dollars a year to pay a little bit more because we think it's more important to do that than allow these cuts to defense to take place and all the consequences you talk about, and we think it's important to protect investments in places like NIH, people who are fighting to try and find cures for diseases.

So, Madam Speaker, the issue is not whether we replace the sequester. The President's got a proposal. I've got a proposal. It's how we do it. And, again, our Republican colleagues have doubled down on this idea that you're going to protect every tax break that's out there before you protect spending on our national defense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Before we hear from our leader, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. We voted to cut defense spending by \$487 billion. We're talking about additional. And when you talk about raising these taxes, Ernst & Young had an independent report that talked about the adverse ramifications that will come from raising taxes.

Obviously, one thing we fail to understand, small business operators, subchapter S corps, LLCs, you're going to ruin this economy and more job losses by raising those taxes.

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

I just would ask the gentleman, and I would yield to him for an answer, whether he means Bain Capital is a small business.

Mr. WEST. I'm not talking about Bain Capital. You said raise taxes on individuals. I'm talking about personal income.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. Mr. WEST, when Mr. Romney and Mr. RYAN and all our Republican colleagues cite those figures about passthroughs, that includes companies like Bain Capital. It also includes some Fortune 100 companies. The President has put forward a proposal that says let's act right now to extend tax relief to 98 percent of the American people and 97 percent of all passthrough businesses.

It's true we don't think that Bain Capital needs a big additional tax break when we've got a big deficit that we should deal with in what we think should be a balanced way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to our leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and commend the gentleman from Florida on bringing this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us is not about tax rates. Because I think that that issue will be resolved one way or another here shortly in this election. We know that there's a difference between the two sides. Unfortunately, our counterparts on the other side of the aisle think it's very important in this tough economy to raise taxes. We don't believe that, Madam Speaker. The bill before us simply asks the President to give us his plan for replacing the first year of cuts in the sequester.

It has been 126 days since we passed our plan to responsibly replace the sequester with cuts that maintain our fiscal discipline. Our plan controls unchecked government spending and reduces wasteful and duplicative programs. But still there has been no action and no proposal coming from the other side of the Capitol, coming from the other side of the aisle.

It has been 126 days since the President said he would veto our plan. But he has failed to put forward an alternative. And the letter that some of us Republican leaders wrote on July 14 asking the President to engage with us to come and find a bipartisan solution to the sequestration, that letter has gone unanswered.

Madam Speaker, inaction carries a very high risk. Instability and unprecedented political transformation throughout the Middle East, a civil war in Syria, Iran's dogged pursuit of nuclear weapons in support for terrorism, as well as challenges posed by a rising China and geostrategic shifts in the Asia Pacific make maintaining American military preeminence as important as ever. And the deadly and tragic

attacks on Ambassador Chris Stevens, Foreign Service Information Management Office Sean Smith, and two other Americans at our consulate in Benghazi, Libya, make clear that Islamic extremist terrorism remains a tremendous threat to the Middle East, the United States, and the international community.

If the cuts in the sequester go forward, they will fundamentally weaken our current and long-term security and our ability to meet challenges we're facing. Implementing these cuts will mean reductions in shipbuilding, aircraft and missiles, shrinking our current force to levels not seen since before World War II. And that means fewer defense-related jobs. According to a study conducted by the Aerospace Industries Association, the job losses will reach 2 million. Let me put that in perspective. The economy added less than 100,000 jobs last month. Worse, more people dropped out of the labor force than were added to it. Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made. According to the same study, the jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians, my own State, are on the line. A small business in my district called Produce Source Partners, which provides fresh food to military bases, says the sequester threatens the jobs of their 200 employees. Another small company in Virginia, HI-TEST Laboratories, could be forced to reduce their staff by as much as 30 percent. Removing these jobs from the community will shrink the local economy and set back an already underutilized business zone. That same predicament faces hundreds of hardworking men and women in towns from here to California.

Madam Speaker, we are here today asking the President simply to come forward with a plan. We are here today because the minority has failed to work with us to find a solution to prevent these cuts that would hollow out our military and result in massive layoffs.

Madam Speaker, the House has acted. Now we need leadership, Mr. President.

□ 1610

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

It's hard to know where to begin because—I hope everyone was listening very carefully. If we allow these spending cuts to take place, we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs in Virginia alone. Thousands of jobs around the country.

You know, I've heard a lot of complaints from our Republican colleagues about the recovery bill and the fact that we had to do some emergency spending to prevent the loss of millions of jobs. You know what? That worked. And here our Republican colleagues here today are saying that we've got to make sure the spending cuts don't take

place because if we do, it will result in a lot of lost jobs.

Well, you know what? It takes jobs to build an aircraft carrier, absolutely. It also creates jobs when you invest in trying to repair and modernize our roads and our bridges, our infrastructure.

The President submitted a jobs bill more than a year ago to this House to do exactly that. Let's invest more in modernizing our infrastructure. We haven't had a single vote on the President's jobs bill.

So I'm really glad to hear our Republican colleagues say that if we make these kinds of cuts, it's going to result in lost jobs because you know what? You are right about that.

The debate today is not about whether we should prevent the sequester from taking place. As I said, we should. It's how we do that.

I heard again from the Republican leader the President doesn't have a plan. He has a plan. They just don't like his plan. They don't like his plan because it takes a balanced approach. It says, you know what? In addition to cuts, we should also ask people who make more than a million dollars a year to contribute a little more to reducing our national deficit and preventing the sequester. We should ask big oil companies to give up their taxpayer subsidies.

So, the question, Madam Speaker, is not whether we replace the sequester. There are lots of plans that I've already talked about. The one in my hand, I offered it yesterday. I can't get a vote on it today.

The issue is not whether; it's how. We should take a balanced approach.

I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to participate in this debate in some ways, although I do have to say that this is not really the kind of honest debate that we need to be having. We should be having a conversation. We should have been having a conversation well before now about how we would avoid sequester and do it in a bipartisan way and do it in a balanced way. That is not what is happening. Right now what we're seeing is a Republican plan without that kind of conversation, without that kind of willingness to find common ground or balanced approach.

The Federal budget is about choices. The choices we make matter. Do we choose to protect our seniors, to grow the middle class, to make smart investments in our economy, to be able to reach agreement on deficit reduction in a way that is fair to the American people or not?

Republicans have made their choices, their priorities, and their values very clear. Once again, they are wasting America's time playing politics instead of working to find that common ground.

Sequestration was put in place to push us, to force us in Congress to

work together on a bipartisan, balanced approach to deficit reduction. We knew it would be tough. We all knew we would not want to implement sequester, that that would be difficult. But we put on the table what needed to get done if we couldn't have that kind of conversation, and we have not yet seen the Republican leadership in the House be willing to engage in that kind of serious deficit reduction conversation that takes a balanced approach, respects our obligation to Americans and our future.

Today's legislation does not move us any closer to achieving the goal of deficit reduction done in a balanced way, in a fair way, in a real way. We know we must reduce the Nation's deficit in a balanced and fiscally responsible manner. We've seen every bipartisan independent commission tell us that.

It means, and they've told us and we know, that we have to take some hard hits in spending cuts, that we have to require greater efficiency and greater effectiveness from all sectors of government, that we must do this with a balance, with increased revenue. It cannot be done without it.

In order to build economic growth in our Nation, we need to do all of this. Deficit reduction means spending cuts, it means increased revenue, it means a balanced approach if we're going to grow the economy for now and the future.

The Republicans in Congress have rejected this balanced approach, and in doing so they have made it clear that they are not serious about deficit reduction. They are, in fact, willing to add \$800 billion to our deficit with tax breaks to the wealthiest. That's what this legislation does today. They are adding \$2 trillion more in defense spending, more than the Pentagon has said it needs to keep us safe and defend our Nation. They're willing to do this at the expense of our middle class, our seniors, and our economic recovery.

The Republican approach to replacing the sequester means that we will be less prepared to compete in the 21st century economy. Now is not the time to make drastic cuts in transportation and infrastructure, in innovation and clean energy, or in education and health care. And that's what this would do.

The Republican plan creates false and unfair choices for the American people.

Let's get serious. Let's have some real solutions. Let's move forward on deficit reduction and economic growth for the American people.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) who recognizes that it is really not a balanced plan to say that we want to raise \$3 on every American in taxes and only \$1 in spending reductions, and it is not a balanced plan to say that we want to pick and choose winners and losers when it comes to the Tax Code reform.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Security and Jobs Protection Act offered by Mr. WEST from Florida. I have the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee with him, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this important bill forward at this time.

It boggles my mind, Madam Speaker, that we are standing here ready to wipe out our national defense at a time when we turn on the TV in the morning and see the Middle East erupting, when we see Iran moving forward on their plans to achieve a nuclear weapon, when we see China increasing their defense spending while we're cutting ours.

People need to understand that we have cut \$487 billion starting October 1 over the next 10 years out of our defense. And on top of that, we have added this problem of sequestration, which adds another 500, \$600 billion over the next 10 years starting January 2.

The first \$487 billion, some thought was put into, and plans. Even though we had to adjust our strategy that we've had since World War II, we've had to cut back. We know that we won't be able to carry out the missions that we've been called on to do in the future, but we will be able to survive, according to our military leaders.

But the sequestration—we held five hearings last September with all of our former military leaders, our current military leaders, former chairmen and Secretaries of these committees, and to a man, every single one said that the sequestration would hollow out and wipe out our national defense.

We would take the Navy back to the size it was in World War I, the Armed Forces, the ground forces back to the size they were in 1940, and the Air Force back to the smallest it's been since it was created. How does anybody think that given these times that is not a stupid thing to be doing?

The way the sequestration would take effect is you just pull out the budget and take a percentage—the administration hasn't told us yet what percentage; it's probably going to be about 15, 20 percent—off of every single line item. So mowing the lawn at Fort Dix will have the same priority as ammunition for the troops in Afghanistan. How can anybody think that that is a smart idea?

You know, we have a Constitution of the United States, and it tells us how we should operate here in this Congress. It says one body passes a bill, the other body passes a bill, a conference is formed, you work out your differences, you take it back for final passage, and send it to the President to be signed into law.

The House has acted. We took tough votes. We accomplished our objective of paying for the first year of sequestration, not just the defense cuts, but all of the cuts across the board, to move it back, pay for the first year, move it back into a time where we're

less stressed with the election upon us, where we could do it in a less political environment, and the Senate hasn't acted. In 126 days, the Senate hasn't acted. Excuse me. The other body hasn't acted.

□ 1620

Madam Speaker, they don't like our bill; I understand that. All they have to do is pass another bill, get it to conference, and then we'll work out the differences. We accomplished ours through cuts, they can accomplish theirs through increasing taxes, and then we can work out a difference. All the gentleman on the other side says is, They've presented a plan and we don't like their plan.

Well, a plan is nothing. What they have to do is pass a bill. Show us. Get the votes, pass a bill, and then go to the conference. It's in the Constitution. That's how we operate. And it's important enough that we should all act like adults and follow the Constitution and get it done. Our Nation, our security depends on it, and we don't have much time left to do it.

Madam Speaker, I think it's very important that we pass this bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote for it. Let's act like adults. Let's earn our salaries here. Let's get this job done.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Security and Jobs Protection Act offered by Mr. WEST, whom I have the pleasure of serving with on the Armed Services Committee. We all know that in less than 4 months, the automatic across-the-board cuts known as sequestration will go into full effect, significantly reducing funding for our national defense and vital domestic programs.

Mr. WEST and members of our committee understand just how much these draconian cuts will undermine our constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense. They will result in the United States having the smallest Army since World War II, the smallest Navy since World War I and the smallest Air Force in U.S. history. That is why President Obama's own Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, has said the pending sequester is devastating and akin to shooting ourselves in the head.

So the natural question is—what is our government doing to stop sequestration? On May 10, 2012, the United States House of Representatives passed a measured and responsible proposal to deal with this impending threat, H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012. Yet, 126 days later the Senate has not acted. The President has not acted.

Madam Speaker, the House is prepared to work with the President and the Senate on alternatives to sequestration. We urge them to come to the table. That's what Mr. WEST's legislation does. Our colleagues in the Senate tell the press that they are negotiating a deal. Well they have been talking about that for a year now. It is time to put something down on paper and get it passed. We must not allow the well being of our troops and our national security to be used as a bargaining chip in this debate.

Just this week we were reminded at how unstable and dangerous our world is. The kill-

ing of Americans in Benghazi on the anniversary of Sep 11th is a reminder and a challenge to every member of this body that we must put our national security and our national interests first.

As one senior military official recently told me, America's inability to govern ourselves past sequestration plays directly into the hands of those who spread a narrative of American decline and will ultimately thrust us into a more dangerous world.

This legislation will require President Obama to live up to his obligation as Commander-in-Chief and submit his alternative plan to replace sequestration, while encouraging the United States Senate to do the same. Let us also not forget that it was the President who put defense "squarely on the table" last summer in the negotiations for the Budget Control Act.

Madam Speaker, we are running out of time before the draconian cuts in sequestration take effect. There are 111 days remaining. We need to work together to find a solution. I urge members to vote "yes" on this legislation.

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

I agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee; we should act like adults.

We agree that the sequester cuts are done in a stupid, meat-ax way. We also agree with what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said last October when, if it came to choosing between allowing all of the terrible consequences that he rightly spoke about and taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction which included some additional revenue, he would accept the balanced approach.

Mr. McKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will yield for a very quick question.

Mr. McKEON. You presented something that I said when I was asked after a speech what I would do, given two bad choices. But you don't have anything on the floor yet. You haven't passed a bill, so I don't even have the opportunity to vote for increased taxes because you haven't passed a bill yet.

Thank you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We wanted to give you that opportunity yesterday, which is why I went to the House Rules Committee with this substitute—which is in my hand, Mr. Chairman—that said you can replace the sequester right away if you're willing to cut some big ag subsidies, which I thought we were all agreed that we could do, but also get rid of some of the subsidies for the Big Oil companies, not some of the smaller producers, the big five, and you ask folks over \$1 million to pay the same effective rate that people who work for them pay.

I agree with what you said last October, which is that it's more important to prevent the kind of cuts that we're talking about here today to defense and non-defense than it is to protect tax breaks for Big Oil companies.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to vote. We wanted to vote. If the Rules Committee will allow us a vote, you can do it right now. In fact, the thing I have in my hand, the substitute, if we passed it, would actually replace the sequester. The resolution on the floor doesn't replace the sequester, even if it goes to the White House.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I have now been here 30 years, with 26 on the Ways and Means Committee. So why are we at this point of serious impasse? I think a major reason is that the radical right has taken over House Republicans. Balance is considered surrender; compromise is considered retreat.

Indeed, since the passage of the Budget Control Act in August of 2011, the Republicans have made sequestration even more likely. Before August of last year, the Republican position was no new revenues. The Bush tax cuts for the very wealthy were untouchable. But in their budget passed this March, the Republicans not only said that the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy must continue, but also they should be expanded. They are doubling down on a policy of tax cuts for the wealthiest while annual income stagnation continues for the middle class, and we have the worst income inequality in generations. So, in a word, they went from bad to worse, furthering the likelihood of sequestration.

Under the Ryan budget and the so-called tax reform fast-track bill they passed last month, a recent analysis concluded that the average millionaire would lock in an average tax cut of \$330,000, while the average person making less than \$200,000 would see their taxes rise by \$4,500.

I support tax reform, but so far Republicans have refused to say which policies they would eliminate to pay for it. It's been dodge and deception.

Half of the money in individual income tax expenditures is in the lower rates for capital gains and dividends, and they propose to cut those rates even further, Mr. RYAN down to zero on capital gains. Most of those benefits go to those making over \$1 million. Most of the other major tax expenditures—mortgage interest, health insurance, education benefits that would have to be decimated—are mainly middle class benefits.

This bill ignores the fact that the President put forward a balanced deficit reduction package over a year ago that would have cut the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

I close by emphasizing the word, "balanced." Essentially, the Republican Party that I've known over the years has become very deeply imbalanced in terms of the mainstream of America.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who understands that we are in fact presenting a balanced approach inasmuch as we present the options to either pass this legislation that the House already did or an alternative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I had made some notes I was going to say, but I'm now going to go off script as the gentleman from Maryland, who I genuinely like and respect, made some comments to which I feel I must respond.

The gentleman referred to, as the President does often, additional taxes on domestic energy, for which they use the pejorative "Big Oil," and taxes on job creators, for which they are creating a pejorative, "the rich," and that these two things will solve all ills.

Well, by my count, when we did the budget this year in the Budget Committee, the Democrats used those two taxes to pay for seven, by my count, different items of spending.

Now, let me explain what that's like. It's like this:

Here is a dollar. This is one dollar, a single dollar. If I go into a store and spend it and buy these breath mints, the dollar will be gone and I will have the breath mints. I cannot now take this dollar into six more stores and buy six more bits of breath mints because the dollar is gone. I spent it. So you cannot use the same tax increases to pay for everything that are multiple times what those tax increases will ever raise.

Now, I understand this is a political talking point. I get it. Look, we all do those. I get it. But this is not a game. We saw this week, with the reprehensible assassination of Ambassador Stevens, that our national defense is not a game—it is definitely not a game now—and our economy is not a game, as millions of people who are out of work can attest. This is a real proposal. We're asking the President for a real proposal and not a political talking point, and we need to solve this problem.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California for those comments, and I would just say this:

I have in my hand a proposal, a substitute amendment. If we passed it, it would prevent the sequester from taking place on defense and non-defense in a balanced way. You spend these things one time to get rid of the sequester.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee said he wished he had an opportunity to vote on something like this, and I say to him, I wish the Rules Committee had given him that opportunity.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I tell my friend from California whose dollar was at issue here, the gentleman from California, I will tell you with all due respect and affection, your party, over the last 10 years, took that dollar and they bought those mints; and they went to the six subsequent stores and they gave them a credit card for the next mints they bought. It's time to pay the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I have a very short time, but I wanted to make that point that you kept buying mints; you just didn't keep paying.

Madam Speaker, this bill is another instance of this Republican caucus walking away from its responsibility. The budget sequester was never intended to be a solution in and of itself. It was meant to be the blunt instrument to force compromise. Unfortunately, "compromise" is a dirty word around here in some quarters.

To lay out conditions, as this bill does, requiring one side to concede before negotiations even begin—and while solving only part of the problem—disregards sequestration's fundamental purpose: to be equally unacceptable to both sides that it forces compromise.

□ 1630

This bill, which I strongly oppose, essentially says, let's pretend. Let's pretend we don't have a deficit challenge. It says, let's pretend that we can solve our problems by cutting domestic spending alone.

No rational human being believes that's the case. No cuts to Republicans' favored programs, no elimination of tax loopholes for oil companies or anybody else, no increases in revenue by asking the wealthiest to contribute a little more to setting our country on a sound path.

We're collecting the lowest amount of revenues we've collected in 70 years in this country, and we haven't cut spending, and we increased spending in the last administration very substantially. By the way, a greater percentage than this administration has increased the deficits: 86 percent versus 41 percent. Check the figures.

What we need, Madam Speaker, is pragmatism, principle, and serious governing. We need to be honest with the American people. Both bipartisan commissions that explored that issue concluded that the best solution is a balanced approach that addresses revenues, entitlements, and targeted cuts to domestic and defense spending. To achieve such a balanced solution, we need something that is sorely lacking in this House: courage, and a willingness to compromise, to come together, to reason together, and to make tough decisions together.

Sequester is the direct result of Republican policies and is a part of the Republican strategy to cut spending.

You keep saying, well, it's the Democrats. This is not a Democratic policy.

It's an irrational policy, but it's in your bills and in your rules.

Now, instead of working with Democrats to turn off the sequester, Republicans are trying to paint the sequester as a Democratic initiative. That is false, untrue.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The Republican cut, cap and balance bill enforces its cuts and its caps. How? Through sequestration. That's what you voted for.

After the agreement was reached on the Budget Control Act that put the sequester in place, Speaker BOEHNER said, "I got 98 percent of what I wanted." Now our Republican colleagues are attempting to undo the sequester in a way that let's them off the hook politically but puts America at risk financially.

Democrats have an alternative—Mr. VAN HOLLEN just spoke of it—that would repeal the sequester for a year by asking that the wealthiest in our country, why, because they can help a little more, not because they're bad. God bless them. And by the way, we're most of those as well, folks.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle, who I know are as deeply concerned about our deficits and debt as I am, will join Democrats in defeating this bill and sending a message that only by working together can we find the solutions we need. America expects that of us.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Speaker, let's review. We have \$16 trillion in debt, and it's climbing every single day. We have no budget from the Senate for the last 3 years. The President's budget got exactly zero votes in the House and in the Senate. And the Federal Government has dramatically increased spending, which has led to this spending-driven crisis.

Let me show you what I mean by that. Five years ago, in 2007, the Federal Treasury received in \$2.5 trillion in revenue, the same amount that's estimated to come in this year in revenue, \$2.5 trillion 5 years ago, \$2.5 trillion now.

Five years ago, total spent by the Federal Government, \$2.7 trillion, now \$3.7 trillion. That almost looks like a \$1 trillion difference in spending, which equals the same amount as our deficit.

It's amazing to me. When we process through this, the problem is crystal clear. It's just the solution that seems to evade us in this process.

Now, some would say, tell you what we need to do. We've increased spending \$1 trillion, let's just increase taxes as well and that will solve the issue.

I would say, why are we spending money we don't have?

Last summer, we agreed that we would cut some spending and put a

group of people together in a room and let them work out a plan to find \$1 trillion in cuts. The back-up, the emergency back-up plan was that we would cut across the board if a solution wasn't found, 10 percent for security, 8 percent for everything else.

Now, no one wants across-the-board cuts that are that huge. A 1 percent cut in agencies would be no big deal. I can't imagine any agency couldn't handle 1 percent. Two percent, no big deal. Maybe even 3 percent. But you start to climb up, and it really begins to cut into some agencies that are actually very efficient. Other agencies, you could do a 50 percent cut and it would be fine.

The problem is an across-the-board cut becomes a very big issue for us. Treating every line item the same is a mistake. Every part is not the same in our budget.

Let me give you an example. At my house, on a Saturday afternoon, I'll open up a Dr. Pepper can at my house and my very cute, red-headed 12-year-old daughter will walk up and say, Daddy, can we split that? I will almost always smile at her and say, sure, I'll take the liquid, you take the can and we'll split it even. To which she says to me, that's not really fair.

But it again comes back to the same point: not all parts are the same. If we do across-the-board cuts in every area, that is not the best way to do it.

Now, I guarantee you, you allow this House to go item by item through this budget, we will find \$100 billion in cuts next year. I guarantee you. But doing across-the-board cuts into FBI, it cuts into our defense, it cuts into Border Patrol, it cuts into the basics and the heart of what we're doing; and we cannot do that.

The House passed a very specific plan for dealing with this last May. It is complete for us. Now it's time for the Senate to actually do their job, and it's time for the President to send that over to us.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, obviously, of H.R. 6365, the National Security and Job Protection Act.

Do we need any more evidence than recent events in Egypt and Libya to oppose these devastating cuts and what it would do to our Nation security? I don't think so.

If sequestration occurs, it would cut the military to its smallest size since before World War II. All the while, we're still a Nation at war in Afghanistan, facing unrest and aggression in the Middle East, increased threats from Iran, China, and North Korea.

In addition to the 10 percent cut to defense, our domestic programs would have, such as health, science, research, education, border security, an additional 8 percent cut.

In May, this House passed the only plan that's been presented thus far to prevent and replace sequestration, last May, by providing and making commonsense reforms to our fast-growing government that's on auto pilot spending programs and to avert the spending-driven economic crisis that's before us.

Well, we've seen no signs of leadership from the White House or the Senate. But the House will act again today with H.R. 6365, the National Security and Job Protection Act. The House will lead, where others have not.

This legislation sends a clear statement that the House is ready to carry out our budgetary responsibilities. We just need willing partners. The President, the Senate, House Republicans and Democrats, we all agree on a common goal: replace the sequester to protect important domestic programs, our fragile economy, our national security and our troops.

This bill is a path to that solution. Make no mistake, if sequestration goes into effect, America will compromise a legacy of superiority on the land, on the sea, and in the air and potentially send our economy spiraling back into a recession.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I would hope that we could pass this with a large number and get on with it.

□ 1640

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. As we come to the floor this afternoon to talk about this sequester issue, the clock is ticking. Every moment we delay in dealing with the budget issue is a moment of time that does not increase confidence in our economy, that does not bring more certainty to our economic situation, and that does not reduce the deficit.

I heard the previous speaker say that this legislation that is on the floor would end sequestration. It does not. That is one of the major differences between it and the Democratic proposal put forth by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Unfortunately, afraid of debate on the floor, the Republicans on the Rules Committee did not allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal to come to the floor today so that we could have a vote on it; but even with that, we can have a debate on it.

The debate is about fairness. It's about balance. It's about living up to our responsibilities. It's about saying, yes, we all have to compromise—there will be cuts; we need revenue; we want growth. That's what Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal does. It does, indeed, replace the sequestration. It is a better plan. It actually does end sequestration, as I mentioned, through a mix of cuts and revenues.

The reason we have a problem here is that our Republican colleagues have

refused to have one red cent from the wealthiest people in our country contribute to resolving this fiscal crisis, this budget crisis—not one red cent. If they cared as much about defense as they say, 1 year ago they would have agreed to a plan with fairness and balance, where we would have had growth on the table, making decisions about revenue and about cuts to produce growth and not getting into a situation that called for across-the-board cuts in defense and in our domestic budget.

This is really silly. It's really silly. It's not serious. It's a charade, this bill that they have on the floor today. It just keeps making matters worse as the clock keeps ticking. So I urge my colleagues to reject this mirage of a bill that poses as a suggestion and to support, instead, ideas that are being advanced by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't like everything about it. We've cut over \$1 trillion. That's how we got through last year—all cuts, no revenue.

You need only see how we differ by just looking at the Ryan-Romney Republican budget. Their blueprint says we're going to end Medicare; we're going to make seniors pay \$6,000 more as we end Medicare; and we're going to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country. That's not fair and that's not balanced, but that is what would happen if the Republican bill were to become law. It would enact the Ryan bill. So I urge my colleagues to think very seriously about this, because people sent us here to find solutions. We must resolve this.

When the Speaker of the House says, I'm not confident we can do this, we are confident we can do anything we set our minds to, and we certainly have to be confident that we can honor our responsibilities to the American people. We all have to go to the table and be willing to yield, willing to compromise. We had to do it with President Bush, Senior, and with President Bush on his recovery package for our country. Democrats cooperated with both of those Presidents when we were in the majority.

Why is it that the Republicans in the House see no reason to compromise even at the risk of the full faith and credit of the United States of America? even at the expense of the health of our economy? even at the expense of jobs for the American people?

Vote "no" on this mirage. Support what Mr. VAN HOLLEN is putting forth. Let's get moving because the clock is ticking.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I saw the gentleman from Maryland this morning on television. It was the first time I had heard, Madam Speaker, of his proposal. So I had a chance to take a look at it today, and I also had a chance to look at the CBO report that was performed on it. I saw some interesting things that I don't know if we've discussed fully here today.

It raises taxes by \$85 billion over the 10-year window. According to the CBO, it raises spending by almost \$80 billion. This is a refrain that I used to hear a lot when I was younger—taxes and spending, taxes and spending, raise taxes and increase spending. I thought it was gone from today's party across the aisle, but evidently, here it is—alive and well—in Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute offering, raising taxes by \$85 billion and raising spending by \$80 billion, which is a net reduction of the deficit of \$5 billion over 10 years. According to the CBO, it actually increases the deficit by \$55 billion in the first year.

It does that, by the way, in part and parcel by offering what they call the Buffett rule. The last time I came to this well, I believe the gentleman from Maryland and I had a nice exchange about whether or not my amendment was a gimmick. It was the amendment regarding the President's budget. I seem to remember someone else calling the Buffett rule a gimmick. In my research in coming over here today, I found out that it was, in fact, the President of the United States who called the Buffett rule a gimmick. So I'm wondering now if the President believes that part of the gentleman from Maryland's offering is, in fact, a gimmick because it encompasses the Buffett rule in its entirety.

I compare all of this, Madam Speaker, to the offering that we have before you with our bill. That bill reduces the deficit by at least \$237 billion over the same 10 years. Theirs reduces it by \$5 billion—raising taxes. According to the CBO, ours reduces the deficit by at least \$237 billion. That's the smallest number the CBO gives us. It also gives us four times as much in deficit reduction in the first year as does the BCA that it seeks to replace. Again, theirs increases the deficit by \$55 billion in the first year. Ours decreases it by more than the BCA it seeks to replace. Our offering does that without asking anybody to pay more money to the government. People pay enough money to the government. We spend their money improperly. It's not that we don't take enough from them. We take enough money from our citizens. We spend it improperly.

So, when I finished looking at this, I thought to myself, I think it would be great to have this come up for a vote. I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not give Mr. VAN HOLLEN the chance to bring it to the floor. It has happened to me before, and for that, I am sympathetic. At the same time, I know that he has a chance to do that still. We are going to finish this debate here in a few minutes; and before we vote, there is going to be a motion to recommit. The gentleman from Maryland could easily offer his amendment as the motion to recommit. In fact, I would welcome the opportunity to see that debate. I would welcome the opportunity here, 60 days before an election, to have my colleagues across

the aisle come over and say, We want to raise your taxes. Would you please reelect us. I want that on the floor. I'm disappointed the Rules Committee did not bring it. I would love to see if that's really what our colleagues across the aisle stand for.

I heard it described by the gentlelady from California a few minutes ago as a better plan. I think we are doing a disservice by not allowing a vote on this particular bill, because it is not a better plan, and I think the vote here would bear that out, not just on our side of the aisle. I would be curious to see if that's what our colleagues stand for—more taxes, more spending here 60 days before an election.

I encourage folks to support our bill. Our bill cuts spending, lets people keep their money, and still allows us to end the sequester.

□ 1650

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I wish Mr. MULVANEY were more persuasive with his colleagues because we agree. I wish we had a vote on this. We're happy to have that debate. In fact, that's what we've been having on the floor today.

We heard a lot from our colleagues about the devastating impact of these cuts on defense and other things, and we agree, which is why we think it's appropriate to ask people who earn more than a \$1 million a year to help contribute a little bit more to our deficit so that we don't have to see these consequences.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, addressing our debt is a critical long-term goal, but it's not our immediate problem. Right now, our immediate problem is high unemployment, and our economy needs efforts to spur job growth. The expiration of the Bush-era tax cuts, particularly those targeted toward the middle class, and the start of unparalleled across-the-board \$1.2 trillion spending cuts mandated by the Budget Control Act sequestration provision, threatened further job growth.

Looking just at sequestration, there is rare agreement. Not the President, not the Congress, not anyone ever wanted or expected the sequestration measures to take effect. Why? Because we have a jobs problem, and the spending cuts demanded by sequestration are a huge jobs killer.

Republicans argue that this steep cut would risk defense-related jobs, and they're right. According to the Economic Policy Institute, these cuts would kill 1.3 million defense jobs in the first 3 years. But the Republicans completely ignore that the domestic spending cuts will also kill an estimated 1.3 million jobs in the same timeframe. Put another way, sequestration will kill 2.6 million American jobs in just 3 years. We simply must stop the sequestration-mandated spending cuts disaster, but this bill won't do that.

This bill mandates draining tens of billions of dollars of Federal spending next year, reducing the already draconian domestic spending caps, and doing all of this without adding a single dollar of additional revenue. The outcome is virtually the same. This Republican bill will still kill a couple of million American jobs. Talk about driving off a cliff.

Basic economics tells us that during good times, with low unemployment, government should reduce the national debt, but that to support job growth, government must not reduce spending during recessions. Now when we suffer from high unemployment, the proposed spending cuts, particularly those of the magnitude Republicans are proposing, would be disastrous. When we get to 5 percent unemployment, then we should start worrying about spending cuts. Right now, jobs are the issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 6365.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6365.

While there is wide bipartisan agreement that getting control of our debt is a critical long-term goal, there is also agreement that unemployment is unacceptably high and that our economy remains in need of major efforts to spur job growth.

As we grapple with these issues, there are two significant events approaching at the end of the year that many have argued could send our economy careening off the so-called fiscal cliff: (1) expiration of the Bush-era tax cuts, particularly those targeted toward the middle class, and (2) the start of unparalleled, across-the-board \$1.2 trillion spending cuts mandated by last summer's Budget Control Act sequestration provision.

On the tax question, we are where we've remained for years now—the President and Democrats agree that we can't afford to foot the bill for tax breaks for the wealthiest among us, while the Republicans continue to be beholden to the don't-tax-even-millionaires-and-billionaires plan.

But on sequestration, there is rare agreement. The simple truth is that no one—not the president, not the Congress, not anyone—ever wanted or expected the sequestration to take affect. Why? Because we have a jobs problem, and the spending cuts demanded by mandatory sequestration are a huge jobs killer.

In 2013 alone, sequestration would require that defense and discretionary domestic programs each incur an across-the-board \$54.7 billion cut. Republicans have been spending a lot of time talking about the effects this steep cut would have on defense-related jobs. And they are right. According to the Economic Policy Institute, these cuts would result in the loss of 1.3 million defense jobs in just the first three years.

But, Madam Speaker, that is not the end of the story. The Republicans completely ignore the almost identical job loss from the mandated domestic spending cuts—also about 1.3 million jobs lost in three years, according to EPI.

Put another way, if we don't stop it, sequestration will be responsible for killing 2.6 million American jobs.

So we simply must stop the sequestration mandated spending cuts.

But this bill won't do that—at least, not really. H.R. 6365 still mandates (1) draining tens of billions of dollars of federal spending next year, (2) reducing the already draconian spending caps as outlined in the BCA, and (3) doing all this without adding one single dollar of additional revenue. So the outcome is the same—the Republicans would still kill a couple of million American jobs.

Talk about driving off a cliff.

But we won't hear about that from the Republicans, as they are too busy dancing as fast as they can to rewrite their role in setting up this self-made disaster in the first place.

During last summer's debt ceiling debate—another game of chicken where Republicans held our economy hostage—Republicans demanded a dollar-for-dollar spending cut in order to raise the debt limit so our nation wouldn't, for the first time ever, default on our debts. Sure, there was the charade of reaching compromise through the so-called super committee. But it should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that we are where we are today. Republicans wanted deep cuts that would kill millions of jobs, and we now stand on the brink of implementing them.

Basic economics tells us that, if you want to support jobs and build the economy, government must not reduce spending during recessions. In good times, when unemployment is low, government should build surpluses to pay down the debt. In bad times, when unemployment is high, government should run deficits to make up for slowed private sector spending and to spur job growth. That is why what President Clinton did in the 90s—balancing the budget and beginning to pay down the national debt during a good economic time—was so good, and why what President Bush did—enacting huge tax cuts and running large deficits during a time of low unemployment, when he should have been paying down the national debt—was so devastating. Now, when we suffer from high unemployment, proposed spending cuts—particularly those of the magnitude Republicans are proposing—would be disastrous. When unemployment is down to five percent, then we can think about spending cuts. Now we must spur employment, and not enact these job-killing spending cuts.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that we stop the misguided and self-made disaster that sequestration, or equivalent spending cuts, will bring. But H.R. 6365 won't do it. I urge a no vote.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I advise my colleague from Maryland that I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished lady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much to the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Madam Speaker, we rise today to try to bring some logic and sense, because as Americans debate sequestration, they throw their hands up and say, What is that? What is that in the

minds of children and the elderly? What does that mean in a real rational way of coming together and saying there are some cuts and there are some revenue increases to be able to invest in the American public?

In order to create jobs, you expend dollars, you invest in research and development, you help to create opportunities for small businesses, you help to promote manufacturing. That's how you create jobs.

But let me tell you what the underlying bill says. This bill will only take effect one year later. It has no opportunity, no desire, and no rationale to raise revenue. Every thinking economist says that we must raise revenue in order to reduce the deficit and continue to spend dollars to invest in the American public.

Do you want your military families to be on food stamps? Do you want 50 million Americans to suffer food insecurity? Do you want these Americans to suffer? That would include seniors on Meals on Wheels, home care, adult protective services. Millions of children, one-third of them, depend on these social service block grants, child protective services, foster care and child care. This also includes 1 million disabled, respite care or transportation. Do you want to, as I said, continue the food insecurity for 60 million children?

All I can say is that this bill not only kicks the can down the road; it kicks the mountain down the road. Let's vote against this bill. Let's sit down at the table, boost revenue, and invest in the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, we have a very serious debt problem in this country. We have a very serious jobs problem in this country. Both of those serious problems are solvable. The impediment is political.

This is exhibit A of a dysfunctional Congress. The supercommittee failed this Congress when the leadership on the Republican side implemented these sequester cuts. We all know they make no sense from an economic standpoint, but it puts the burden back on us to come up with the balanced approach that every American knows is the only way forward, a balance of revenues, a balance with entitlement reform, and the Pentagon making a contribution to solve our problems. That is what is going to create jobs, and that is what is going to create fiscal stability.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Speaker, the issue all afternoon has not been whether we should replace the sequester. Yes, we should. The issue has been how we do that.

We've heard our Republican colleagues talk about the devastating impact of the sequester on defense and nondefense. We agree. That's why we put forward a plan to replace the se-

quester in the balanced way that has been recommended by bipartisan groups through a combination of cuts, but also revenues generated by things like closing the tax loopholes for big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues have just doubled down on the position that it's more important to protect tax breaks for big oil companies and very wealthy individuals than it is to protect our investment in spending in defense or other important national priorities. That's what this debate is all about.

I hope we will reject this proposal and adopt a more balanced one.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I began this day being interviewed by a group of southern college students, and the primary question that they asked was why can't Congress seem to work in a more bipartisan manner, work across the aisle, work with the other Chamber. I had to explain to them what was about to occur here on the floor; that one of the most seminal issues that we have to deal with in this country is fiscal matters and also our defense matters that this House, led by Republicans, have done everything we possibly could to make sure that this country stands strong fiscally and stands strong in a defense posture, as well. We've reached across the aisle, and we've reached across to the Senate in a bipartisan manner to effectuate that.

We have passed a budget out of this House only to find that bill go to the Senate where as they say "all good bills go to die," and not have anything come back. We've communicated to the President of the United States that we want to work with him on a budget, only to see his own budget come to the Senate and fail 97-0, and come to this House and fail 414-0, not getting any Democrat or Republican support for that bill, as well.

We have reached across the aisle. We have tried to work on the fiscal matters and the defense matters when it comes to the sequester. We recognize the devastating impact that this will have on our defense posture in this country. As other Members have already come to the floor, in light of all the past circumstances that have come across this country in the last decade, in light of the memorial services that we just held, all of us, in a bipartisan manner out on those steps just days ago on September 11, in light of what has just been in the newspaper in the last several days of our embassies being attacked and Americans killed on American soil, we realize the important significance of making sure that we have a strong defense at this point in time.

I ask anyone who considers this legislation to vote "yes" in favor of this legislation, and anyone who would stand and vote "no" against trying to make sure that we're strong fiscally

and trying to make sure that we are strong in the defense posture as well, anyone who would vote “no,” I would ask them how do they when they go through the airport leaving here or coming to Washington, look anyone in uniform in the eye and say that they voted against a bill to make sure that there would not be the defense cuts here.

□ 1700

The other side of the aisle has no answer for that. Their only answer today, and as it's been ever since I've been here in Congress, is to say the solution to all problems is what? Raising taxes. As I said before, they want to raise \$3 in taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts.

We do not have a revenue problem in this country; we have a spending problem in this country. You know, there is an old saying that goes, if there is a dime left on the table in Washington, someone, primarily from the other side of the aisle I would suggest, will find a dollar's worth of use for spending it, and I think that's the case here. If they raise the taxes 3 to 1, they will find \$30 worth of spending to increase.

As the gentleman from California pointed out, that was the example every single time in the Budget Committee. Every single time it was suggested for spending cuts, they were opposed. They would always use the same spending cuts to further increase spending elsewhere.

The gentleman from California makes the reference to spending a dollar every time for—what was it?—for breath mints, I think it was. Well, quite candidly, after listening to this debate, and after listening to the debate continuously in Budget Committee over years, I always leave there, as I will leave here tonight, with a sour taste in my mouth if the other side of the aisle does not agree to begin to work with us in a bipartisan manner to make sure that this country is strong fiscally, to make sure that this country is strong in a defense posture as well.

I would urge all of my colleagues from both sides of this aisle to vote “yea” on this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the previous question is ordered.

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. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6365 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike sections 3 and 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. BALANCED DEFICIT REDUCTION THAT PROTECTS MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS AND REQUIRES EVERYONE TO PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE.

(a) **CONDITIONAL ELIMINATION OF SEQUESTERATION.**—Sections 251A(7) through 251A(11) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall have no force or effect upon enactment of subsequent deficit reduction legislation containing savings over 10 years that meet or exceed the outlay changes that would have resulted from those provisions.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS OF DEFICIT REDUCTION LEGISLATION.**—Deficit reduction legislation enacted pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) require upper income taxpayers to pay their fair share by instituting a “Buffett rule”;

(2) extend middle class tax cuts while allowing components of the tax extensions that benefit upper income beneficiaries to expire as scheduled under current law; and

(3) include targeted spending cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, let's just flash back to a year ago when we were working on the Budget Control Act, and it's, I think, worth reminding everybody what the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, said at that time:

I got 98 percent of what I wanted. I'm pretty happy.

That's what the Speaker of the House said about the Budget Control Act.

We now find ourselves here trying to find a way to prevent these across-the-board meat-ax cuts from taking place in the defense budget and the non-defense budget. There is agreement that that would be a stupid way to deal with our deficit, so there's no dispute there.

The issue is: What do we do to replace the sequester, to achieve deficit reduction, but do it in a reasonable and credible way?

That's where the rub is.

What Democrats have said is we need to do it in the way that bipartisan groups have proposed that we do it, through a combination of additional cuts in a targeted way, not in a meat-ax, across-the-board way.

But, yes, we also have to ask the very wealthiest Americans to contribute more to reducing the deficit, because the math is pretty simple. If you don't ask very wealthy people to contribute one more penny to reducing the deficit, then you have to hit everybody else much harder. You have to hit seniors on Medicare harder. You have to reduce dramatically our investment in our kids' education. You have to cut investments in infrastructure, our roads and bridges. Those are the consequences of not taking a balanced approach.

So we say, when it comes to the sequester, we should avoid all the ter-

rible things our colleagues have said and which we agree with. Let's take a balanced approach to do doing it.

You know what? The President submitted a plan to do just that, more than a year ago. It's not that he doesn't have a plan; it's our Republican colleagues don't like the plan. Why? Because he says we don't need to provide these big taxpayer giveaways to the Big Oil companies anymore. We don't need to cut dramatically into things like Medicaid and Medicare when we should be asking seniors to pay a little bit more. Let's ask them to pay what they were paying when President Clinton was President. That's the last time we balanced our budget.

The question is: How do we do it?

The President submitted a proposal. As I said earlier, I took a proposal yesterday to the Rules Committee that would have done this in a balanced approach. Our colleagues say they want an open, democratic process. We haven't had a vote on that.

Instead, we're going to have a vote on something that actually, even if it passes the House and the Senate and is signed by the President, doesn't do anything to eliminate the sequester, doesn't do a thing. It just says that the President has to come up with a plan. But they tell him what it has to do. They say it cannot be balanced. It cannot include any revenue. It has to be across the board in cuts.

Now let's talk a minute about taxes.

The President has called upon this Congress to immediately enact tax relief to 98 percent of the American people, let's do it now before they expire at the end of this year, and our Republican colleagues say, No, no. Nobody gets tax relief unless very wealthy people get a bonus tax break, because everybody on the President's proposal gets tax relief on the first \$250,000 of their income. Our Republican colleagues say, No; unless people like Mitt Romney get an extra tax break, nobody gets tax relief.

You know what? The President's proposal provides tax relief to 97 percent of all pass-through businesses. The Republican colleagues say, No; unless you're going to give businesses like Bain Capital a bonus tax break, we can't ask them to contribute one more penny to reducing the deficit.

Let's talk about jobs. It was really interesting to hear our Republican colleagues talk today about the fact that, if you allow these budget cuts to take place, it will have devastating impacts on the jobs in this country.

You know what? A year ago this month, the President submitted a proposal to this Congress, a jobs initiative. It called for investing more in our infrastructure, in our roads and in our bridges, to help put more persons back to work. We have 14 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

So here are our Republican colleagues saying, Well, we can't allow any of these cuts to take place because people who were building tanks will

lose their jobs. And we agree; spending that money on defense has consequences. But how is it that spending money on roads and bridges and infrastructure doesn't also put people back to work? That's what the President proposed a year ago. Not a single vote on the President's jobs bill. There were 37 votes to repeal ObamaCare, but not one vote on the President's jobs bill.

So, Madam Speaker, whether it's acting on the jobs bill, which has been sitting here for more than a year, or acting on the President's proposal to immediately extend tax relief to 97 percent of the American people, or whether it's taking a responsible balanced approach to replacing the sequester, let's do what bipartisan groups have recommended and take that balanced way to build our economy and reduce our deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. The seminal question, I think, to those who are watching deliberations here on the floor tonight, they are asking themselves the question: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?

When you look at the economy, you have to answer that question with a resounding, "No." Poverty is continuously up year after year after year, at the highest levels in this country we have seen since back in 1995, when one out of seven people in this country now find themselves, unfortunately, on food stamps.

□ 1710

Forty-seven million of our friends and neighbors find themselves in that situation. One out of six Americans will be on Medicaid. Are you better off today than you were in the past? Absolutely not. And that's why it's astonishing as I stand here to listen to the other side of the aisle and the proposals that they presented so far and that they have over the years.

For the last hour of the debate, the gentleman from Maryland has been saying one or two basic things, but one primary thing is that he went to Rules last night, that he had a plan. He pulled out his plan and he said, This is what the solution is. This is how we solve the problem. But the problem was that that mean old Rules Committee just wouldn't allow him to have it come down to the floor tonight.

Well, my friend and colleague from South Carolina made the recommendation to him: Take that proposal. If that is truly the answer in your heart, it's the right answer, that is truly the way to go, and lay it out. If you really do believe that the solution to the problem is by raising taxes to the tune of \$85 billion and cutting spending to the extent that there's only a net reduction of \$5 billion; if you truly do believe, as you said for the last hour,

that the way to resolve the issue of sequester is by raising taxes by \$3 for every \$1 in cuts; if you truly believe, and for the last hour, as he has said, that is the solution to the problem, then he could have come here and presented an alternative in this format. But he has not done so.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

That's just not true. We asked the Parliamentarian, and they said we couldn't bring it in that format because of the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. Reclaiming my time, what we have here before us is a lack of direction, a lack of leadership that America is so looking for out of Washington. The American public is looking for leadership from Washington. They're not seeing it from the President, who has failed to present a budget that would get any single vote in either the House or the Senate—97-0, 414-0. They're looking for the Senate to demonstrate some degree of vision, some degree of leadership by taking any of the bills that we send over to them, whether it's the budget or the sequester legislation, and showing that they can pass that legislation. They're looking for some degree of vision from the other side of the aisle in the House as well on these matters to make sure that we can stand up fiscally and a strong defense, and they're seeing a lack of vision here by the other side of the House as well.

We know what writings tell us: A Nation without vision leads to a people that will perish. Well, Madam Speaker, I can tell you this: that the route these last 2 years, this Republican-controlled Congress has shown vision with our strong budget, with our sequester bill, and now with this bill as well to present the option to the other side, to the Senate, and to the President to make sure that we can defend this Nation strong militarily and fiscally as well.

I would encourage all my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 247, not voting 12, as follows:

Ackerman	Fudge	Oliver
Andrews	Gonzalez	Owens
Baca	Green, Al	Pallone
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Barber	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Becerra	Hahn	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hanabusa	Polis
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Rahall
Bonamici	Himes	Rangel
Boswell	Hinchey	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Holden	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Holt	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Honda	Rush
Carnahan	Hoyer	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Israel	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	T.
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Ciциlline	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schrader
Clay	Kind	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costello	Loebach	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Crowley	Lowey	Stark
Cuellar	LujanAEln	Sutton
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tierney
DeFazio	Matsui	Tonko
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
DeLauro	McCollum	Van Hollen
Deutch	McDermott	Velázquez
Dicks	McGovern	Visclosky
Dingell	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Meeks	Wasserman
Doyle	Michaud	Schultz
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Waters
Ellison	Miller, George	Watt
Engel	Moore	Waxman
Eshoo	Moran	Welch
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Nadler	Woolsey
Filner	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Frank (MA)	Neal	
Adams	Cantor	Foxx
Aderholt	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Altmire	Cassidy	Galleghy
Amash	Chabot	Gardner
Amodei	Chaffetz	Garrett
Austria	Chandler	Gerlach
Bachmann	Coble	Gibbs
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Gibson
Barrow	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Bartlett	Conaway	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Gosar
Benishek	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Berg	Culberson	Granger
Biggert	Denham	Graves (GA)
Bilbray	Dent	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Griffith (VA)
Black	Dold	Grimm
Blackburn	Donnelly (IN)	Guinta
Bonner	Dreier	Guthrie
Bono Mack	Duffy	Hall
Boren	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Harris
Brooks	Emerson	Hartzler
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Bucshon	Fincher	Hayworth
Buerkle	Fitzpatrick	Heck
Burgess	Flake	Hensarling
Burton (IN)	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fleming	Huelskamp
Camp	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Forbes	Hultgren
Canseco	Fortenberry	Hunter

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—170

NAYS—247

Hurt	Miller (FL)	Runyan	Cassidy	Hultgren	Reed	Kissell	Nadler	Schwartz
Issa	Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Chabot	Hunter	Rehberg	Kucinich	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Scalise	Chaffetz	Hurt	Reichert	Labrador	Neal	Scott, David
Johnson (IL)	Mulvaney	Schilling	Coble	Issa	Renacci	Langevin	Olver	Serrano
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Coffman (CO)	Jenkins	Ribble	Larsen (WA)	Owens	Sewell
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Schock	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Larson (CT)	Pallone	Sherman
Jones	Neugebauer	Schweikert	Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Rivera	LaTourette	Pascarell	Shuler
Jordan	Noem	Scott (SC)	Cravaack	Jordan	Roby	Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Sires
Kelly	Nugent	Scott, Austin	Crawford	Kelly	Roe (TN)	Levin	Paul	Slaughter
King (IA)	Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Nunnelee	Sessions	Culberson	Kingston	Rogers (KY)	Lipinski	Perlmutter	Speier
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Shimkus	Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)	Loeback	Peters	Stark
Kissell	Palazzo	Shuler	Dent	Kline	Rohrabacher	Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson	Sutton
Kline	Paul	Shuster	DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rokita	Lowey	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)
Labrador	Paulsen	Simpson	Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rooney	Lujan	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Lamborn	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Dold	Landry	Ros-Lehtinen	Lynch	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lance	Pence	Smith (NJ)	Donnelly (IN)	Lankford	Roskam	Maloney	Quigley	Tonko
Landry	Peters	Smith (TX)	Dreier	Latham	Ross (FL)	Markey	Rahall	Tsongas
Lankford	Peterson	Southerland	Duffy	Latta	Royce	Matheson	Rangel	Van Hollen
Latham	Petri	Stearns	Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Runyan	Matsui	Reyes	Velázquez
LaTourette	Pingree (ME)	Stivers	Ellmers	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)	McCarthy (NY)	Richardson	Visclosky
Latta	Pitts	Stutzman	Emerson	Long	Scalise	McClintock	Richmond	Walz (MN)
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Sullivan	Farenthold	Lucas	Schilling	McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Wasserman
Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Terry	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Schmidt	McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)	Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Schock	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Waters
Long	Posey	Thornberry	Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Schweikert	McIntyre	Rush	Watt
Lucas	Price (GA)	Tiberi	Fleischmann	E.	Scott (SC)	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Luetkemeyer	Quayle	Tipton	Fleming	Mack	Scott, Austin	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Lummis	Reed	Turner (NY)	Flores	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner	Michaud	T.	Wilson (FL)
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg	Turner (OH)	Forbes	Marchant	Sessions	Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
E.	Reichert	Upton	Fortenberry	Marino	Shimkus	Miller, George	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Mack	Renacci	Walberg	Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster	Moore	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Manzullo	Ribble	Walden	Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Simpson	Moran	Schiff	
Marchant	Rigell	Walsh (IL)	Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Murphy (CT)	Schrader	
Marino	Rivera	Webster	Galleghy	McKeon	Smith (NJ)			
Matheson	Roby	West	Gardner	McKinley	Smith (TX)			
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland	Garrett	McMorris	Southerland			
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield	Gerlach	Rodgers	Stearns	Akin	Garamendi	Ross (AR)
McClintock	Pitts	Wilson (SC)	Gibbs	Meehan	Stivers	Blumenauer	Herger	Towns
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Wittman	Gibson	Mica	Stutzman	Broun (GA)	Jackson (IL)	
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Wolf	Greigay (GA)	Miller (FL)	Sullivan	Burton (IN)	King (NY)	
McKeon	Rokita	Womack	Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Terry			
McKinley	Rooney	Woodall	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Thompson (PA)			
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder	Gosar	Mulvaney	Thornberry			
Rodgers	Roskam	Young (AK)	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi			
Meehan	Ross (FL)	Young (FL)	Granger	Myrick	Tipton			
Mica	Royce	Young (IN)	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Turner (NY)			
			Graves (MO)	Noem	Turner (OH)			
			Griffin (AR)	Upton				
			Griffith (VA)	Walberg				
			Grimm	Walden				
			Guinta	Walsh (IL)				
			Guthrie	Webster				
			Hall	West				
			Hanna	Westmoreland				
			Harper	Whitfield				
			Harris	Wilson (SC)				
			Hartzler	Wittman				
			Hastings (WA)	Womack				
			Hayworth	Woodall				
			Heck	Yoder				
			Hensarling	Young (AK)				
			Huelskamp	Young (FL)				
			Huizenga (MI)	Quayle				

NOT VOTING—12

Akin	Critz	Johnson (GA)
Bachus	Garamendi	King (NY)
Blumenauer	Herger	Ross (AR)
Broun (GA)	Jackson (IL)	Towns

□ 1733

Messrs. KISSELL, FORTENBERRY and LIPINSKI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BERMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam 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 223, noes 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—223

Adams	Biggart	Buchanan
Aderholt	Bilbray	Bucshon
Alexander	Bilirakis	Buerkle
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Austria	Black	Calvert
Bachmann	Blackburn	Camp
Bachus	Bonner	Campbell
Barletta	Bono Mack	Canseco
Bartlett	Boustany	Cantor
Benishak	Brady (TX)	Capito
Berg	Brooks	Carter

Ackerman	Clarke (NY)	Frank (MA)
Altmire	Clay	Fudge
Amash	Cleaver	Gonzalez
Andrews	Clyburn	Green, Al
Baca	Cohen	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Grijalva
Barber	Conyers	Gutierrez
Barrow	Cooper	Hahn
Barton (TX)	Costa	Hanabusa
Bass (CA)	Costello	Hastings (FL)
Bass (NH)	Courtney	Heinrich
Becerra	Critz	Herrera Beutler
Berkley	Crowley	Higgins
Berman	Cuellar	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hinchey
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bonamici	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Boren	DeFazio	Hochul
Boswell	DeGette	Holden
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Holt
Braley (IA)	Deutch	Honda
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Hoyer
Butterfield	Dingell	Israel
Capps	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Doyle	(TX)
Carman	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jones
Chandler	Eshoo	Kaptur
Chu	Farr	Keating
Cicilline	Fattah	Kildee
Clarke (MI)	Filner	Kind

NOES—196

Frank (MA)	Fudge	Gonzalez
Green, Al	Green, Gene	Grijalva
Gutierrez	Hahn	Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)	Heinrich	Herrera Beutler
Higgins	Himes	Hinchey
Hinojosa	Hirono	Hochul
Holden	Holt	Honda
Hoyer	Israel	Jackson Lee
(TX)	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.	Jones	Kaptur
Keating	Kildee	Kind

NOT VOTING—10

Akin	Garamendi	Ross (AR)
Blumenauer	Herger	Towns
Broun (GA)	Jackson (IL)	
Burton (IN)	King (NY)	

□ 1742

Mrs. SCHMIDT and Mr. GOWDY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS
RESOLUTION, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. BARBER. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 117 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 156. (a) FULL YEAR FUNDING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL ACCOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 106, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution (including section 101(c)) for the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall remain available until September 30, 2013: