

□ 1545

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MARCH 14, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I designate the following Members to be available to serve on Investigative Subcommittees of the Committee on Ethics during the 113th Congress:

John C. Carney of Delaware, Gerald E. Connolly of Virginia, Janice Hahn of California, Brian Higgins of New York, Hakeem S. Jeffries of New York, William R. Keating of Massachusetts, Ed Perlmutter of Colorado, Terri A. Sewell of Alabama, Jackie Speier of California, Dina Titus of Nevada.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 803, SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE  
EDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFE-  
LONG SKILLS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-4. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee

on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

□ 1550

Ms. FOXX. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 113 provides for a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 803, the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act, also known simply as the SKILLS Act.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider the SKILLS Act, which reauthorizes the Workforce Investment Act, WIA, of 1998. While these programs have continued to receive funding through the appropriations process, the WIA authorization expired in 2003.

WIA seeks to coordinate local employment services through a unified workforce development service and a one-stop career center delivery system. Reforming the Nation's workforce development system is critical, and in these difficult economic times, when roughly 20 million Americans are struggling to find adequate work, we cannot afford to delay action any longer. Delay is costly for those seeking to find work. Today, many unemployed and underemployed Americans have turned to Federal workforce education programs to develop the skills they need to be competitive for jobs, but instead of an easy-to-navigate, responsive system, many have found a complex bureaucracy unresponsive to their needs and concerns.

In January 2011, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, identified 47 separate and distinct workforce development programs across nine different Federal agencies that cost taxpayers approximately \$18 billion annually. The GAO report found that almost all of these programs were duplicative and overlapping, that only five of these programs had had any type of evaluation, and that those evaluations had not been very effective ones.

Through the Education and the Workforce Committee's oversight of the WIA system, even more programs have been identified, and the true number of Federal workforce development programs is greater than 50. We know this is a problem, and we all agree this needs to change. President Obama recognized the challenge of the current bureaucratic system in his 2012 State of the Union address. Let me quote the President directly:

I want to cut through the maze of confusing training programs so that, from now on, people have one program, one place to go, for all the information and help that they need.

These are among the many reasons I introduced the SKILLS Act earlier this year. This legislation streamlines 35 duplicative Federal workforce development programs, and it creates a single workforce investment fund to serve employers, workers, and job seekers.

The SKILLS Act establishes a dynamic, employer-driven workforce development system by ensuring that two-thirds of the State and local Workforce Investment Boards' members are employers, and it repeals 19 federally mandated board positions. This legislation expands decisionmaking at State and local levels so that these individuals can make the best decisions to meet the needs of their communities.

The bill also addresses the administrative bloat in Washington by requiring the Office of Management and Budget to identify and reduce the number of Federal staff working on employment workforce development programs that will be consolidated under this bill. The SKILLS Act holds these programs accountable for taxpayer dollars spent by requiring annual performance evaluations and by establishing common performance metrics.

The bill also allows States to determine eligible training providers, simplifying the bureaucratic process that has forced many community colleges and other providers out of the system, and it gives local boards the flexibility to work directly with community colleges to educate large groups of participants. Additionally, the SKILLS Act encourages these programs to focus on in-demand jobs and industries so that participants will be able to succeed in the workplace upon completion, and it ensures that funds are spent directly on services rather than on administration and bureaucrats. This bill improves transparency by requiring States and local areas to report annually on administrative costs.

Each day we delay is another day employers are not hiring the workers they need, another day unemployed workers are not receiving the best technical education and another day taxpayer dollars are wasted on red tape and well-intentioned but broken programs. We have a responsibility to move this process forward. The time to act is now.

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

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills, or SKILLS Act.

For the last 40 years, the reauthorization of the Federal job training legislation has had the support of Democrats and Republicans. Members on both sides of the aisle know that the passage of this bill is critical to our Nation's recovery and future competitiveness.

I served on the State Board of Education in Colorado from 2000 to 2006, and I recall the prior authorization of the Workforce Investment Act that we're still operating under. It dates to 1998. It came up after 5 years, which was in 2003, and I remember being on the State board. In our State, like in many States, jurisdiction goes between both the Department of Labor and the State Department of Education. Under the State Department of Education, we have some of the adult literacy components and adult education components of workforce investment, and under the Department of Labor, we have other areas of responsibility.

We said, well, hopefully, Congress will act. That was in 2003–2004, but that Congress didn't act. We said, well, hopefully, Congress will act in 2005–2006. We still need a reauthorization, so let's hope Congress will act. Then I ran for Congress. I was in the next Congress from 2009–2010 with a Democratic majority. It didn't pass. In 2011–2012, with a Republican majority, there was no WIA reauthorization.

So here we are now in the 113th Congress, and, unfortunately, we have a bill that lacks bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the Republicans have departed from the long history of bipartisanship in common areas of agreement, some of which were talked about by Dr. FOXX in her opening remarks: streamlining programs; reducing the number of programs that have been shown to be ineffective by the GAO; having a workforce investment system that's more nimble and able to react to changes in the economy, to changes in the employment sector, to changes in the types of skills that people need to succeed in the 21st century workforce. Unfortunately, we have a bill today which falls short in that regard.

Even though this bill gives great authority to Governors, I have word from my own home State's Department of

Labor and Unemployment of its opposition to this bill. We have statements from many other disability advocates, youth groups, civil rights groups that are opposed to this bill. Workers with disabilities, disadvantaged youth, returning veterans, low-income adults, migrant workers, and minorities are all underserved populations that a workforce investment system is designed to serve, yet these are the very populations that stand to lose the most under the current bill.

Instead of encouraging collaboration between these programs and streamlining these programs and rewarding what works and stopping what doesn't work, this bill forces effective programs to compete with one another for State funding, putting an additional burden on State and local budgets in the process. Instead of prioritizing incentives for business, which could potentially leverage our Federal investment for colleges and local governments and workforce organizations to collaborate, this bill requires that only employers be represented on Workforce Investment Boards, leaving many other stakeholders on the sidelines.

Of course, meeting the needs of employers is the goal of the Workforce Investment Act, but when you look at the stakeholders that will deliver on that and match the people to the skills, you need to include businesses, colleges, local governments, and others who work in partnership with needs assessment, driven by the employment needs of the private sector, to help determine the outputs that are important for workforce training systems so that our economy can continue to grow and succeed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill hands a blank check to Governors with a message that says to go ahead and use Federal tax dollars however you like, you can eliminate services for the underserved, and yet we, the American taxpayers, are continuing to pay for it.

Look, we are custodians of taxpayer trust here in this body. Frequently, this body doesn't do a very good job of that with the deficits that we have, with the lack of any comprehensive way of reining in Federal spending and even with regard to the sequester, which, while it makes progress on reining in Federal spending, it does so in a non-discriminate way rather than with a thoughtful approach that would be in the interest of our country. Here we are just passing out dollar bills, throwing dollar bills to the States. Here comes Uncle Sam, ready to bail out Governors. They're playing the walnut game—moving it over to this account and moving it to this account.

□ 1600

This is essentially a slush fund for State Governors, as it's currently constructed, at the expense of groups that traditionally have high unemployment, including veterans who so capably served our country, particularly during our two most recent wars—the Iraq

War, which has wound down, and the Afghanistan war, which we hope winds down over the next couple of years—as well as the many veterans of prior conflicts, including the first Gulf War and the Vietnam conflict, who continue to suffer from unemployment at above average levels to this day.

In addition, this bill decreases the WIA State set-aside funding that facilitates targeted innovation and encourages interstate partnerships. My home State of Colorado has used this funding for a State energy sector partnership, provided scholarships to train over 20 Coloradans. It led to full-time employment, even leading to the creation of a new company.

This funding also allowed Colorado to form 10 strategy sector partnerships, which have leveraged more than three-quarters of a million in private financing and public financing towards incentives that will train over 1,200 Colorado job seekers in high-demand occupations. This vital funding would be slashed from 15 percent to 5 percent. I would add that, under the Democratic substitute, which we are grateful that this rule allows for, WIA State set-aside would be restored at the full 15 percent.

In addition, this bill would freeze authorized funding levels for WIA over the next 7 years. This freeze comes on top of the fact that WIA funding has already been cut in half since 2001. Let me say that again. WIA funding has been cut in half since 2001, at the very time when the changing needs of the global economy need to be matched so that Americans can keep up with the skills they need to compete in the 21st century economy. And while making a cut there could save a few dollars now, if we fail to invest in the future of bringing Americans along to ensure that they can have good jobs that our Nation depends on, this would have a profound negative impact on our budget and economy over time.

There are many ideas that a number of us have had to make this bill better. Many of them are included in the Democratic substitute, which is allowed under this rule and will be debated with extended debate time and discussed. However, many of us would have preferred an open rule. We proposed an open rule yesterday in the Rules Committee. Had an open rule been offered, I would have loved to bring forth a number of amendments, including one that is a bill I cosponsor with Representative ROSA DELAURO of Connecticut that would make it easier for women to get training in jobs that they are capable of doing in fields that they are traditionally underrepresented in. There are many fields, while women have made great progress across the economy, where women only have a 2 or 3 or 4 percent presence that are high-paying jobs. We need to match women to the skills so they can fulfill those opportunities.

I also would like to see, if there had been an open process here on the floor

of the House of Representatives, a requirement that State and local workforce organizations both give some of their time and effort on promoting training to empower people to start their own companies through entrepreneurship and innovation. In addition to creating access to entrepreneurship training, we can focus on reducing the skills gap in computer science and information technology, fast-growing occupations, by providing education and training for the jobs of their future.

Democrats have introduced their own workforce reauthorization bill, the Workforce Investment Act of 2013, which would streamline programs, maintain strong protections for veterans and other vulnerable populations, and create stronger accountability for employment outcomes while recognizing and expanding the central role community colleges play in job training.

Again, I'm pleased that this rule makes the Democratic substitute in order. I wish that it was an open rule that allowed for a full discussion of the many ideas that come from the entire body of membership.

It will take both sides working together on this bill, with Dr. FOXX's effort, Ranking Member MILLER's effort, Chairman KLINE's effort, Ranking Member HINOJOSA's effort, to create a reauthorization that will stand the test of time, replacing the 1998 law that we all continue to operate under in a world that has changed significantly since then.

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

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

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Colorado, as he's on the Education Committee. And I certainly wish that he and his colleagues had stayed in the Education Committee markup on this bill and offered the many ideas he said that they had to make it better; but, unfortunately, they walked out and did not take the opportunity to offer those amendments in the committee.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to show my support in favor of the workforce initiative bill presented by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

This bill is not restrictive to any group, be it gender or race, but is for all Americans. This bill will allow people to find gainful employment in the marketplace. This is what America is in dire need of right now, and that is jobs.

By helping people acquire the skills needed to find employment, we also give them the ability to help themselves in their ability to change their lifestyle as they pursue their American Dream.

The SKILLS Act will help the economy in several ways:

One, by creating a more qualified workforce to fill the needs of today's industries. Thus, it will bring more certainty to the marketplace. Therefore, employers, knowing that there is a more readily available trained workforce, will be more likely to expand their business.

Another way is it will create higher paying jobs.

A third way is it reduces the number of administrative agencies that oversee and run these programs by more than half, thereby causing government to be more streamlined, operate more efficiently, and save the taxpayers money.

The end result, we help people get back to work sooner; and by doing so, we make a stronger America. So many of our policies of the past, although well-intentioned, have held people back and kept them out of the workforce by not promoting the learning or the advanced job skills needed in today's work environment. I believe we all would prefer to see people independent and self-sufficient versus dependent upon government.

America is known as a generous country, and let's work to keep her that way; but America is also known as the land of opportunity for those that choose to seize that opportunity. This SKILLS Act will help ensure people acquire the skills, and if they desire to take advantage of the opportunity, to succeed in America. Again, everyone wins and America is stronger.

For these reasons, we should move forward with this legislation; and I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to vote in favor of the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing problem with this Republican majority is their insistence on partisan political ploys at the expense of sound policy. It's their way or the highway, and this is a good example. This bill should be a bipartisan bill. This bill should have brought both sides together for the common goal of putting people back to work.

The bill we are considering today, the so-called SKILLS Act, doesn't in any way, shape, or form reflect bipartisanship. Instead of bringing a bill to the floor that will help our economy prosper and grow jobs, instead of bringing a bill to the floor where there's bipartisanship, this majority has given us a bill that, quite frankly, will gut job training programs.

This is not a good bill. In fact, it does real harm to job training programs that will help put Americans back to work. And I'm particularly alarmed by the bill's egregious cuts to the SNAP Education and Training program.

The SKILLS Act would destroy the SNAP Education and Training program as we know it. It would kill a program that provides low-income individuals

with the training they need to get jobs, jobs that pay enough to get them off of public assistance. And here is the deal: the SNAP Education and Training program works; it actually works.

The author of this bill, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Dr. FOXX, does not take a meat-ax to this program but, instead, cleverly reworks it in a way so that, while it will exist in name, it will not be able to carry out its mission. Rather than going directly at the program and reducing or zeroing out the program funding, the bill instead eliminates the role of the SNAP agency in determining what kinds of services are provided to SNAP participants.

Under its SKILLS Act, the WIA board is authorized to serve "eligible SNAP participants." The way this would appear to work is that the State SNAP agency would still assign some group of participants to SNAP Education and Training programs, but only to those programs as provided through WIA.

□ 1610

And here's the concern: the concern is that a good number of States, including my home State of Massachusetts, have found the WIA services to be inappropriate for SNAP recipients.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, childless, unemployed adults generally cannot participate in SNAP for more than 3 months out of every 3 years unless they are enrolled in certain types of training programs for 20 hours per week.

In this legislation, workforce investment boards are not required to provide work slots that meet these conditions, and State SNAP agencies are no longer able to provide additional services. As a result, if jobs are not available, some poor individuals who are willing to work could lose their SNAP benefits. They could lose their food benefits.

According to the Government Accountability Office:

Many SNAP participants are not ready for many program services such as training classes offered by programs at the WIA one-stops because they lack basic skills, such as reading and computer literacy, that would allow them to use their services successfully.

At best, Mr. Speaker, low-income individuals on SNAP who are lacking job skills that will help them get off public assistance will be denied access to job-training programs. But here's the kicker: at worst, low-income individuals who rely on SNAP to put food on their table will either see part or all of their benefit cut.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just when you think things couldn't get worse for poor people in this country, this new legislation could actually make hunger worse.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill that does nothing to help the American economy or the unemployed or the untrained in this country. We should be focusing on jobs, not partisan legislation.

This is an area where we should be able to come together, as my colleague, Mr. POLIS, said. This is yet another attack on poor people. We should be working to end hunger now and not passing bills that make hunger worse.

I'll conclude as I began, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this is one of those opportunities that I think the American people believe that we could come together. Unfortunately, this has become a partisan ploy, another partisan press release.

This bill is going nowhere, and I regret that very much because unemployed people need help.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am used to hyperbole on this floor. I'm used to hyperbole from my colleague from Massachusetts, but I really think this one was a little over the top.

This bill does not kill the employment program with SNAP, and only 6.8 percent of the recipients of food stamps even participate in that program. So to say that this bill is going to create additional hunger in this country is really over the top a little bit.

The best way we can help people who are hungry in this country is to help them get a good-paying job, and that's what we need to be doing.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding, as well as her sponsorship of this important bill.

You know, job creation and getting Americans back to work is the number one priority facing this country. And in talking to people from my district, talking to people who are unemployed, people who are underemployed, they tell me that they need skills to get back to work.

We need workforce development programs that work. We need to train people for jobs that are here today and jobs that are going to be here tomorrow.

One step we can take is to reform our workforce development program. Our system currently isn't flexible. It has too much red tape, and we need to make sure it works for people who are looking for jobs and connects people who are looking for jobs with employers that have open positions.

We need a nimble system that can respond to our changing economy, and we have to streamline our current system. Today we have at least 47 duplicative or ineffective programs. We need a simpler, more comprehensive system, a system that employers and job seekers can navigate and successfully complete.

The SKILLS Act will address these issues and set up a workforce development program that will train people looking for jobs to get them back to work. That's why I look forward to voting in favor of the SKILLS Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado, and I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill of the so-called SKILLS Act.

Fifteen years ago, before I was in Congress, I watched with great interest as Congress, House and Senate, Democrat and Republican, worked on worker training and produced the Workforce Investment Act. I was impressed. This was the kind of thing that Congress should be doing. It was the kind of thing that made me look forward to the prospect of maybe going to Congress some day.

I remember David Broder, then the dean of Washington journalists, wrote a column saying this is exactly the kind of thing that Congress should be doing—and they were doing it in a bipartisan way.

And here we are today, 15 years later, with an ideological, partisan dead end.

Now, let me make it clear: workforce investment is what Congress needs to do. The government plays an important role in training and fostering a strong and capable workforce.

The so-called SKILLS Act does not invest in the workforce. Rather, it seeks to combine and reduce vital programs that workers need.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I, along with others, sought to help to develop and update an efficient, fair program that would help eager workers get the right training and get the right jobs. We had some good ideas to contribute. Some of them had been tested in my home State of New Jersey.

We had some strong evidence that some of the programs that Representative FOXX's version had canceled, or sought to cancel, should be improved and retained. We had good legislative language for the majority party to consider, and we were rebuffed. Our efforts were in vain.

American workers are now caught in the middle of this partisan, ideological effort. Individuals with disabilities, the disadvantaged, high-risk youth, veterans cannot afford to be abandoned by the majority party's proposal.

It was interesting that the author of this bill said, well, only 6.8 percent of the SNAP participants use the workforce training. Oh, so 3 million people we can forget about. Is that the implication of that?

No, I think the implication should be we should expand it to even more. We need to work together to provide our Nation's job seekers with the resources and the training they need to obtain and maintain quality employment. The underlying partisan "consolidate it and then cut it bill" will keep people out of work, not put them back to work.

I urge the defeat of the rule so that we can have something more bipartisan, and I urge defeat of the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a line from "The Canterbury Tales": The gentleman doth protest too much.

We're told that this is a partisan bill, that the efforts of the other side were in vain.

Well, let me remind my colleague, he's one of the members of the committee that walked out of the committee meeting. When there was the opportunity for the Democrats to offer amendments, they did not do it. However, some amendments were offered before the Rules Committee, and we have all of the amendments that were submitted by the Democrats and not withdrawn that are going to be considered today.

The Democrat substitute amendment was made in order, and I appreciate Mr. POLIS acknowledging that. And we've given them extended debate time. So it's not exactly as though we are shutting them out of this process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, whose passion and longstanding experience in this area have brought this great piece of legislation for us to be able to vote on today.

And I would just like to rise and say that I am in support of the rule and the underlying bill to the SKILLS Act.

□ 1620

Here in Congress we frequently hear from our constituents back home that we need to work with the President on many issues, and this is a perfect example of a piece of legislation that we are working on with President Barack Obama. The SKILLS Act directly addresses what the President recently called "a maze of confusing training programs."

This is our chance to come together and create meaningful, commonsense reform that will help struggling Americans pull themselves up out of unemployment and empower them to better provide for their families. It would also create a single Workforce Investment Fund. It basically streamlines numerous ineffective, redundant programs, and it allows for every American to better themselves.

I can only think of whom this bill actually helps. I can think of the single mother who is working every day and wants to better help her family and have the flexibility to go back to school to our good community colleges in this country, to our technical schools. This bill cuts the red tape that our community colleges and our technical schools now face. And now we can help them. There are so many out there that need this help.

Mr. Speaker, this idea is not Republican and it is not Democrat. It is common sense. In fact, this bill is largely the same bill that came out of the Education and Workforce Committee last Congress, and most of the Democratic provisions have been retained.

I am also hearing from constituents back home. For instance, Dr. Larry Keen, president of Fayetteville Technical Community College, recently told my office:

I am in favor of the SKILLS Act and the purposes for which it was created. Anything that contributes to the simplification of a very complex system is of value.

Again, I rise today in support of this. I agree with Dr. Keen. I am here to say that I am calling on my colleagues to step away from this partisan attack and help us pass this bill. Additionally, I hope the Senate will do the same.

Mr. POLIS. I have to take a moment to correct the gentlelady from North Carolina, my colleague, Dr. FOXX, who quoted, "The lady doth protest too much," saying it was from Canterbury Tales. It is actually from Shakespeare's Hamlet. I'm sure the gentlelady, upon further reflection, will concur.

I will add this bill, like Hamlet, is indeed a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time to be investing in workforce development programs, not slashing them. I especially want to point out that unemployment in Rhode Island remains unacceptably high, yet the skills gap is an employment obstacle we can overcome with the right resources. Workers need proper training to succeed in a global economy, and the Workforce Investment Act programs have helped to do just that.

So it saddens me that the bill before us today cuts so many vital programs just when we need them the most. It freezes investments in job training. It cuts or consolidates 35 critical programs and limits access to services for youth, minorities, older workers, people with disabilities, and veterans—the vulnerable populations that this law was designed to serve.

This bill could also imperil the efforts of organizations making positive strides also in my home State. A prime example of this is the Genesis Adult Education Center in Providence, which receives 20 percent of its total budget from WIA sources and helps some of the most disadvantaged people in our State through job training, child care, and support services. Under the SKILLS Act, the Genesis Center could face a reduction of funding and would be forced to serve fewer Rhode Islanders.

At the Job Corps centers nationwide, enrollment of new students has been suspended, and this bill does nothing to address this problem. For almost 3 years, the Job Corps center in Rhode Island has been unable to enroll new students in job training classes. We should be considering legislation that addresses this challenge and invests in job creation, and this bill falls far short on both counts.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and reject this bill so that we can come together in a bipartisan manner that properly addresses our workforce issues.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this very, very important issue.

As I travel across Virginia's Fifth District, it is clear that years of failed policies—like the President's health care law, higher taxes, and stimulus spending—have impacted the people that I represent. Main Streets all across our rural district have seen our small businesses struggle. Families across our district have felt the pain as neighbors, friends, and family members have lost their jobs and tried to find work.

As our economy struggles, ensuring our unemployed and underemployed have access to the skills training that they need to improve their careers is as important as ever. However, the Federal Government workforce training programs, while well intended, are cluttered with bureaucracy, waste, and inefficiency. They're not helping those they were intended to help. Americans will not benefit from these programs until we ensure that they are both efficient and effective.

At a time when the national debt is skyrocketing, a 2011 study from the GAO found that taxpayers are spending \$18 billion on 47 duplicative job training programs across nine Federal agencies. Our top priority in the House of Representatives over the last 2 years has been getting Americans out of the unemployment lines and into good-paying jobs. And today we are standing up to make those critical reforms.

By adopting the SKILLS Act, Congress will put words into action and take a critical step toward getting our communities back to work. This legislation will eliminate red tape that prevents workers from accessing job training, and it will ensure that support is tailored to the specific needs of individual workers.

A strong workforce is critical to this Nation. I remain committed to getting Virginia's Fifth District back to work. I urge my colleagues to support me in supporting the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. At a time when more and more people are starting their own businesses, we should be doing everything we can to encourage entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, current rules make it difficult for Workforce Investment Boards, or WIBs as we call them, to provide entrepreneurial training services or to count the suc-

cesses of those programs in their outcome measures, the very thing that we ought to be doing through these Workforce Investment Boards. As a result, very few WIBs even offer these programs, depriving aspiring entrepreneurs of valuable resources to help them thrive.

That's why in the last Congress I introduced legislation to fix the guidelines for self-employment training. Our goal would make it easier for Workforce Investment Boards to offer these programs in the local community and expand access to training for aspiring entrepreneurs.

I would like to thank Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. MILLER for including my legislation in their amendment that will be considered tomorrow. Job training and reemployment issues always have been, and always should be, bipartisan. So it's very sad that this rule and the underlying bill have come to the floor under a strictly partisan process and that they will actually harm the very programs that they're designed to support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. FOXX. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana, a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mrs. BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I would first like to thank the leadership of Congresswoman FOXX.

I stand here today not just as a Member of Congress but as a former community college administrator. As senior vice president and general counsel for Indiana's largest public college system, I led statewide workforce education and training efforts aimed at putting thousands of Hoosiers back to work. I also served on Indiana's State Workforce Board, which administers the funds set forth in the SKILLS Act.

My experience in the workforce development arena taught me a very important lesson: Americans of all ages and backgrounds have the ability to be anything they want to be, but they need a flexible support system that prioritizes people and not bureaucracy.

This is bureaucracy and this is what our current system looks like. That's why Congress must pass the SKILLS Act. We have a chance to empower millions of individuals to lead more fulfilling lives by finding meaningful work, and we must take that chance now. This is the time to choose people over paperwork and workers over waste.

□ 1630

My own district is home to several global manufacturing and life science leaders. I recently sat down with employees from Dow AgroSciences, headquartered in Zionsville, Indiana. One by one, its employees told me we have to make better, smarter investment decisions in workforce development and education for our Nation to succeed and for our companies to succeed.

How can we be a Nation that spends over \$18 billion a year on job training

programs—over 47 job training programs—and yet have almost 3.6 million jobs going unfilled? So we have jobs that are unfilled because we have a system that doesn't work. This isn't good enough for America. We can do better, and the SKILLS Act can take us on that path.

The SKILLS Act can and will put people back to work. It is leaner. It provides a roadmap for success that can fuel a 21st century workforce. It removes roadblocks that prevent workers from receiving in-demand training, and it gives local leaders the flexibility to provide more funding to high-performing programs. Every step of the way, it ensures more of every dollar we spend goes to training people rather than to the government bureaucracy administering all of the 47 different programs today.

House Republicans are ready to show we can put skilled American workers over government bureaucracy by passing the SKILLS Act. I support passage of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady from North Carolina if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we do have additional speakers.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to now yield 3 minutes to another distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina. Thank you for your hard work on this very important bill.

I rise today in support of the rule to H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act. This critically important legislation, introduced by Dr. Foxx, will reform and strengthen our Nation's workforce investment system.

Back where I come from in Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, the number one issue is jobs. Though there are 12 million Americans looking for work, most folks would be surprised to know that 3.6 million jobs are unfilled simply because prospective employees lack the necessary knowledge and training needed for that job. The SKILLS Act works to address this problem.

Folks in my district are tired of the failed Obama economy. Too many times parents have had to come home and tell their children that they've lost their job and they don't know how they're going to pay their bills, or send them to college, or get their car fixed. Too many times in recent years young people have been unable to find a job—or at least find a good-paying job that lets them start their journey of life.

Unfortunately, our Nation's job-training system has been failing these hardworking taxpayers. The more than 50 separate programs offered under the current system costs taxpayers \$18 billion annually. Most of these programs are duplicative and not as effective as they should be. This has led to taxpayer dollars being wasted, employers

being unable to hire adequately trained workers, and workers not getting the skills they need to succeed.

We must do better. The SKILLS Act will eliminate and streamline 35 ineffective and redundant programs to ensure workers are getting the skills they need to fill available jobs. The SKILLS Act will eliminate wasteful duplication and empower State leaders, local elected officials, and job creators to make the necessary decisions to ensure workers receive training for jobs in high demand. This bill will guarantee job creators a stronger role in workforce development decisions and ensure taxpayer dollars aren't wasted on broken bureaucracies. Most importantly, these changes will help workers find good-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the SKILLS Act strengthens our workforce investment system, provides smart stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and gives us the opportunity to do better right now. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady from North Carolina if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Yes, we do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continued to malign what they call a "political process." Regular order, Mr. Speaker, is not political process.

The SKILLS Act has been posted online for nearly a month. The Higher Education and Workforce Training Subcommittee held a legislative hearing on this bill on February 26, and a full committee markup last Thursday. Unfortunately, the Democrats opposed the open transparent process of markup and instead requested that members of the committee hold closed-door negotiations. During the markup, the Democrats ultimately walked out and refused even to offer amendments. This is not what the American people asked for in the 2012 elections. They asked us to work together in a transparent, bipartisan way to address our country's challenges, and we gave our colleagues that opportunity. They refused it.

Last year, the committee accepted four Democrat amendments during consideration of the Workforce Investment Improvement Act, the predecessor of the SKILLS Act. These four amendments are retained in the base text of the SKILLS Act, hardly a partisan approach.

My Republican colleagues and I on the Education Committee have shown we're willing and ready to work with our Democrat colleagues, and it's unfortunate that they instead chose a partisan walkout.

In contrast, under Democrat control in the 110th and 111th Congresses, the House considered 66 bills that were referred to the Education and Workforce Committee, but received no committee consideration before being brought to the House floor.

The SKILLS Act has gone through an open and transparent process, and it is unfortunate that Democrats have been unwilling to participate in regular committee process.

Additionally, the rule before us today provides consideration of six amendments, including all amendments submitted to the Rules Committee by Democrats that were not withdrawn before the Rules Committee hearing. As I stated before, the Democrat substitute amendment was made in order with extended debate time. This exceedingly fair rule is a culmination of a transparent, regular order which allows my colleagues across the aisle multiple opportunities to argue for their approach.

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

Mr. POLIS. Again, I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it appears now that we do not have any additional speakers, and if the gentleman from Colorado is prepared to close, I will also be prepared.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, particularly at a time of economic stagnation, recovery from a recession, skills are a more important piece than ever to ensure that Americans can compete in the 21st century workforce.

We all know that many of the jobs that helped Americans earn a solid place in the middle class in the 20th century are not necessarily going to be the same jobs that will allow Americans to live in upwardly mobile middle class lifestyle in the 21st century. There are new growth sectors, new opportunities, and yes, new challenges as well.

One of the keys to both our prosperity as a Nation as well as the prosperity and growth of the middle class is to make sure that Americans have the skills they need to compete in the 21st century economy. When we match those skills to the people who need to have them to support their families, we're talking about all American families. We're talking about veterans. We're talking about the disabled. We're talking about those who don't have a high school diploma. We're talking about immigrants.

□ 1640

We need to make sure that each of these groups that traditionally has had and does have a higher unemployment rate than Americans as a whole can receive the type of training, education, and skills that they need to support their families and give back to the rest of us—a hand up, rather than a hand out. That is what workforce investment is all about.

Both Democrats and Republicans agree it's long overdue for us to update and strengthen the Workforce Investment Act. It was written in 1998. The world was different in 1998. I don't

think any of us saw the degree with which the economy would change. We've, since 1998, had many new technology jobs, the Internet has grown to a mainstream phenomenon, we've had a banking crisis, we've had two wars, and we're on our third President since 1998. Things have changed a lot. Things have changed a lot.

I'm amazed, Mr. Speaker, when I meet people now that were born in the 1990s and they're in the workforce. It's absolutely incredible to think about. And, yet, we're still operating under a law that doesn't reflect the changing needs of the American workforce. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to work together—to work together—to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

The President has stated that he doesn't support this bill, he wouldn't sign this bill. We need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to come up with a framework that works. Yes, we all know that a committee markup process is part of that process; but so, too, is establishing the base bill, a process from which Democrats were excluded.

Former Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BUCK MCKEON said that he "would like to see us work in that same mode where we really try to work together. I don't think it is the Republican bill or the Democratic bill, but it should be all of our bill."

Unfortunately, with regards to where this bill is today, Republicans did not choose to regard this wise advice of the former chairman in how this bill was formed and brought to the floor. Now, again, while neither House Democrats or committee Democrats or the President support the underlying bill, I'm hopeful that the Republican leadership's desire to move this bill to the floor indicates the start of a process to finally reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

It's not an issue of left or right. It's an issue of updating the Workforce Investment Act to reflect the changing needs of our economy and the changing set of skills that Americans need to support themselves.

I'm hopeful that with the continued work of Dr. FOXX, Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member HINOJOSA, and other esteemed Members of this body that Republicans and Democrats will work together both making concessions to improve the Nation's workforce investment system and improve the route to the middle class for working families across our country.

Workforce investment and training to address the skills gap are critical to this economy as a whole. We have a long way to go to strengthen and, yes, streamline our workforce training and investment programs. There are some good ideas with regards to streamlining workforce investment that are contained in this bill that can form a basis for bipartisan support, but we still have a long way to go. We need to

work across the aisle to invest in our future and take care of fellow citizens to make sure that they have the ability to support themselves.

I look forward to continuing this process with Members on both sides of the aisle, with members of the committee and Members of the House at large. Yet the process and bill before us currently is flawed.

Therefore, I urge a "no" vote on this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The world has changed greatly since 1998 when this legislation was first authorized and even since 2003 when this legislation was last reauthorized.

I'm very concerned that my colleague has said that this legislation is flawed and that we did not participate or provide a bipartisan process. This is an example of Democrats blaming Republicans for what they themselves do. We gave our colleagues every opportunity to come help fix the flaws in this legislation through regular order. They chose not to do it.

The President said in his 2012 State of the Union Address:

It is time to turn our employment system into a reemployment system that puts people to work.

With 12 million Americans looking for work, the SKILLS Act makes commonsense reforms to a broken workforce development system to remove inefficiencies and ensure that individuals are able to get the education skills they need to find a job.

Now the President is saying that he will veto this legislation, and yet it does exactly what he asked us to do. This is another example of the President saying one thing and doing another.

The SKILLS Act takes a crucial step forward in the fight to eliminate red tape and create a more effective system to better serve and prepare Americans to compete in the 21st-century workforce. I hope the legislation will see swift approval in the House and Senate and the SKILLS Act will be on the President's desk in the coming weeks to see if he, indeed, will veto the bill that he asked for.

Mr. Speaker, the SKILLS Act will build a more dynamic and responsive workforce development system, give priority to well-paying, in-demand industries, expand opportunities at community colleges, and—most importantly—treat all job seekers as individuals. These changes are critical at a time when the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that more than 3.6 million open jobs are going unfilled because there aren't enough skilled candidates. Let's reform these programs to serve employers and individuals in an effective and efficient manner.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]  
YEAS—225

Aderholt	Gosar	Nugent
Alexander	Gowdy	Nunes
Amash	Granger	Nunnelee
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Barr	Grimm	Perry
Barton	Guthrie	Petri
Benishek	Hall	Pittenger
Bentivolio	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Black	Hartzler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bonner	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Boustany	Hensarling	Radel
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bridenstine	Holding	Reichert
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Renacci
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hultgren	Rigell
Burgess	Hunter	Roby
Calvert	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Camp	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Campbell	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Carter	Jones	Rokita
Cassidy	Jordan	Rooney
Chabot	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Chaffetz	Kelly	Roskam
Coble	King (IA)	Ross
Coffman	King (NY)	Rothfus
Cole	Kingston	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Collins (NY)	Klaine	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Labrador	Salmon
Cook	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cotton	Lamborn	Schock
Cramer	Lance	Schweikert
Crawford	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Denham	Long	Shuster
Dent	Lucas	Simpson
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Marino	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Stivers
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
Farenthold	McCauley	Stutzman
Fincher	McClintock	Terry
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thornberry
Fleming	McMorris	Tiberi
Flores	Rodgers	Tipton
Forbes	Meadows	Turner
Fortenberry	Meehan	Upton
Fox	Messer	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Wagner
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Gibbs	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Noem	Williams

Wilson (SC) Woodall Young (FL)  
Wittman Yoder Young (IN)  
Wolf Yoho  
Womack Young (AK)

**NAYS—191**

Andrews Green, Gene  
Barber Grijalva  
Barrow (GA) Gutierrez  
Bass Hahn  
Beatty Hanabusa  
Becerra Hastings (FL)  
Bera (CA) Heck (WA)  
Bishop (GA) Higgins  
Bishop (NY) Hinojosa  
Blumenauer Holt  
Bonamici Honda  
Brady (PA) Horsford  
Braley (IA) Hoyer  
Brown (FL) Huffman  
Brownley (CA) Israel  
Bustos Jackson Lee  
Butterfield Jeffries  
Capps Johnson (GA)  
Capuano Johnson, E. B.  
Cárdenas Kaptur  
Carney Keating  
Carson (IN) Kennedy  
Cartwright Kildee  
Castro (TX) Kilmer  
Chu Kind  
Cicilline Kirkpatrick  
Clarke Kuster  
Clay Langevin  
Cleaver Larsen (WA)  
Clyburn Larson (CT)  
Cohen Lee (CA)  
Connolly Levin  
Cooper Lewis  
Courtney Lipinski  
Crowley Loeb sack  
Cuellar Lofgren  
Cummings Lowenthal  
Davis (CA) Lowey  
Davis, Danny Lujan Grisham  
DeFazio (NM)  
DeGette Luján, Ben Ray  
Delaney (NM)  
DeLauro Maffei  
DelBene Maloney,  
Deutch Carolyn  
Dingell Maloney, Sean  
Doggett Matsui  
Doyle McCarthy (NY)  
Duckworth McCollum  
Edwards McDermott  
Ellison McGovern  
Engel McIntyre  
Enyart Mc Nerney  
Eshoo Meeks  
Esty Meng  
Farr Michaud  
Fattah Miller, George  
Foster Moore  
Frankel (FL) Moran  
Fudge Murphy (FL)  
Gabbard Nadler  
Gallego Neal  
Garamendi Negrete McLeod  
Garcia Nolan  
Grayson O'Rourke  
Green, Al Owens

**NOT VOTING—15**

Bilirakis Culberson  
Broun (GA) Gardner  
Castor (FL) Hanna  
Conyers Himes  
Costa Lynch

□ 1712

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

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, 2013, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 70 due to being sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 113—“Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

**AYES—226**

Aderholt Graves (GA)  
Alexander Graves (MO)  
Amash Griffith (AR)  
Amodei Griffith (VA)  
Bachmann Grimm  
Bachus Guthrie  
Barletta Hall  
Barr Harper  
Barton Harris  
Benishek Hartzler  
Bentivolio Hastings (WA)  
Bilirakis Heck (NV)  
Bishop (UT) Hensarling  
Black Herrera Beutler  
Blackburn Holding  
Bonner Hudson  
Boustany Huelskamp  
Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI)  
Bridenstine Hultgren  
Brooks (AL) Hunter  
Brooks (IN) Hurt  
Buchanan Issa  
Buchson Jenkins  
Burgess Johnson (OH)  
Calvert Johnson, Sam  
Camp Jones  
Cantor Jordan  
Capito Joyce  
Carter Kelly  
Cassidy King (IA)  
Chabot King (NY)  
Chaffetz Kingston  
Coble Kinzinger (IL)  
Coffman Kline  
Cole Labrador  
Collins (GA) LaMalfa  
Collins (NY) Lamborn  
Conaway Lance  
Cook Lankford  
Cotton Latham  
Cramer Latta  
Crawford LoBiondo  
Crenshaw Long  
Daines Lucas  
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer  
Denham Lummis  
Dent Marchant  
DeSantis Marino  
DesJarlais Massie  
Diaz-Balart Matheson  
Duffy McCarthy (CA)  
Duncan (SC) McCaul  
Duncan (TN) McClintock  
Ellmers McKeon  
Farenthold McKinley  
Fincher McMorris  
Fitzpatrick Rodgers  
Fleischmann Meadows  
Fleming Meehan  
Flores Messer  
Forbes Mica  
Fortenberry Miller (FL)  
Foxy Miller (MI)  
Franks (AZ) Mullin  
Frelinghuysen Mulvaney  
Garrett Murphy (PA)  
Gerlach Neugebauer  
Gibbs Noem  
Gibson Nugent  
Gingrey (GA) Nunes  
Gohmert Nunnelee  
Goodlatte Olson  
Gosar Palazzo  
Gowdy Paulsen  
Granger Pearce

Andrews Grijalva Pallone  
Barber Gutierrez Pascarell  
Barrow (GA) Hahn Pastor (AZ)  
Bass Hanabusa Payne  
Beatty Hastings (FL) Pelosi  
Becerra Heck (WA) Perlmutter  
Bera (CA) Higgins Peters (CA)  
Bishop (GA) Hinojosa Peters (MI)  
Bishop (NY) Holt Peterson  
Blumenauer Honda Pingree (ME)  
Bonamici Horsford Pocan  
Brady (PA) Hoyer Polis  
Braley (IA) Huffman Price (NC)  
Brown (FL) Israel Quigley  
Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee Rahall  
Bustos Jeffries Rangel  
Butterfield Johnson (GA) Richmond  
Capps Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard  
Cárdenas Kaptur Ruiz  
Carney Keating Ruppertsberger  
Carson (IN) Kennedy Rush  
Cartwright Kildee  
Castro (TX) Kind Ryan (OH)  
Chu Kirkpatrick Sánchez, Linda  
Cicilline Kuster T.  
Clarke Kuster Sanchez, Loretta  
Clay Langevin Sarbanes  
Cleaver Larsen (WA) Schakowsky  
Clyburn Larson (CT) Schiff  
Cohen Lee (CA) Schneider  
Connolly Levin Schwartz  
Cooper Lewis Scott, David  
Courtney Lipinski Serrano  
Crowley Loeb sack Sewell (AL)  
Cuellar Lofgren Shear-Porter  
Cummings Lowenthal Sherman  
Davis (CA) Lowey Sinema  
Davis, Danny Lujan Grisham Sires  
DeFazio (NM) Slaughter  
DeGette Luján, Ben Ray Speier  
Delaney (NM) Swalwell (CA)  
DeLauro Maffei Takano  
DelBene Maloney, Carolyn Thompson (CA)  
Deutch Carolyn Takano  
Dingell Maloney, Sean Thompson (MS)  
Doggett Matsui Tierney  
Doyle McCarthy (NY) Titus  
Duckworth McCollum Tonko  
Edwards McDermott Tsongas  
Ellison McGovern Van Hollen  
Engel McIntyre Vargas  
Enyart Mc Nerney Veasey  
Eshoo Meeks Vela  
Esty Meng Velázquez  
Farr Michaud Miller, George  
Fattah Miller, George Miller, George  
Foster Moore Moore  
Frankel (FL) Moran Moore  
Fudge Murphy (FL) Nadler  
Gabbard Nadler Neal  
Gallego Neal Negrete McLeod  
Garamendi Negrete McLeod Nolan  
Garcia Nolan O'Rourke  
Grayson O'Rourke Owens  
Green, Al Owens

**NOES—191**

Andrews Grijalva Pallone  
Barber Gutierrez Pascarell  
Barrow (GA) Hahn Pastor (AZ)  
Bass Hanabusa Payne  
Beatty Hastings (FL) Pelosi  
Becerra Heck (WA) Perlmutter  
Bera (CA) Higgins Peters (CA)  
Bishop (GA) Hinojosa Peters (MI)  
Bishop (NY) Holt Peterson  
Blumenauer Honda Pingree (ME)  
Bonamici Horsford Pocan  
Brady (PA) Hoyer Polis  
Braley (IA) Huffman Price (NC)  
Brown (FL) Israel Quigley  
Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee Rahall  
Bustos Jeffries Rangel  
Butterfield Johnson (GA) Richmond  
Capps Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard  
Cárdenas Kaptur Ruiz  
Carney Keating Ruppertsberger  
Carson (IN) Kennedy Rush  
Cartwright Kildee  
Castro (TX) Kind Ryan (OH)  
Chu Kirkpatrick Sánchez, Linda  
Cicilline Kuster T.  
Clarke Kuster Sanchez, Loretta  
Clay Langevin Sarbanes  
Cleaver Larsen (WA) Schakowsky  
Clyburn Larson (CT) Schiff  
Cohen Lee (CA) Schneider  
Connolly Levin Schwartz  
Cooper Lewis Scott, David  
Courtney Lipinski Serrano  
Crowley Loeb sack Sewell (AL)  
Cuellar Lofgren Shear-Porter  
Cummings Lowenthal Sherman  
Davis (CA) Lowey Sinema  
Davis, Danny Lujan Grisham Sires  
DeFazio (NM) Slaughter  
DeGette Luján, Ben Ray Speier  
Delaney (NM) Swalwell (CA)  
DeLauro Maffei Takano  
DelBene Maloney, Carolyn Thompson (CA)  
Deutch Carolyn Takano  
Dingell Maloney, Sean Thompson (MS)  
Doggett Matsui Tierney  
Doyle McCarthy (NY) Titus  
Duckworth McCollum Tonko  
Edwards McDermott Tsongas  
Ellison McGovern Van Hollen  
Engel McIntyre Vargas  
Enyart Mc Nerney Veasey  
Eshoo Meeks Vela  
Esty Meng Velázquez  
Farr Michaud Miller, George  
Fattah Miller, George Miller, George  
Foster Moore Moore  
Frankel (FL) Moran Moore  
Fudge Murphy (FL) Nadler  
Gabbard Nadler Neal  
Gallego Neal Negrete McLeod  
Garamendi Negrete McLeod Nolan  
Garcia Nolan O'Rourke  
Grayson O'Rourke Owens  
Green, Al Owens

**NOT VOTING—14**

Broun (GA) Culberson McHenry  
Castor (FL) Gardner Napolitano  
Cohen Hanna Smith (WA)  
Conyers Himes Westmoreland  
Costa Lynch

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

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

□ 1719

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, 2013, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 71 due to being sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on H. Res. 113—“Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put

Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 125, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—289

Aderholt DeGette Jones  
 Alexander Delaney Jordan  
 Amodei DeLauro Joyce  
 Bachmann DelBene Kaptur  
 Bachus DeSantis Kelly  
 Barber DesJarlais Kennedy  
 Barletta Deutch Kildee  
 Barrow (GA) Diaz-Balart King (IA)  
 Barton Doggett King (NY)  
 Beatty Doyle Kingston  
 Becerra Duckworth Kline  
 Bentivolio Duncan (SC) Kuster  
 Bera (CA) Duncan (TN) Labrador  
 Bilirakis Ellmers LaMalfa  
 Bishop (GA) Engel Lamborn  
 Bishop (UT) Enyart Lankford  
 Black Eshoo Larsen (WA)  
 Blackburn Farenthold Larson (CT)  
 Blumenaucr Fattah Latta  
 Bonamici Fincher Levin  
 Bonner Fleischmann Lipinski  
 Boustany Fleming Loeb sack  
 Brady (TX) Fortenberry Lofgren  
 Braley (IA) Foster Long  
 Bridenstine Frankel (FL) Lowenthal  
 Brooks (AL) Franks (AZ) Lucas  
 Brown (FL) Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer  
 Brownley (CA) Gabbard Lujan Grisham  
 Buchanan Gallego (NM)  
 Bucshon Garamendi Lujan, Ben Ray  
 Bustos Garrett (NM)  
 Calvert Gibbs Lummis  
 Camp Gingrey (GA) Maffei  
 Campbell Goodlatte Maloney, Sean  
 Cantor Gosar Marino  
 Capito Gowdy Markey  
 Capps Granger Massie  
 Cárdenas Grayson Matsui  
 Carney Griffith (VA) McCarthy (CA)  
 Carson (IN) Grimm McCarthy (NY)  
 Carter Guthrie McCaul  
 Cartwright Hahn McClintock  
 Cassidy Hall McCollum  
 Castro (TX) Hanabusa McIntyre  
 Chabot Harper McKeon  
 Cicilline Harris McMorris  
 Clay Hartzler Rodgers  
 Cleaver Hastings (FL) McNerney  
 Coble Hastings (WA) Meadows  
 Cole Heck (WA) Meeks  
 Collins (NY) Hensarling Messer  
 Conaway Higgins Mica  
 Connolly Hinojosa Michaud  
 Cook Holt Miller (FL)  
 Cooper Horsford Miller (MI)  
 Cramer Huffman Miller, Gary  
 Crawford Huizenga (MI) Moran  
 Crenshaw Hultgren Mullin  
 Cuellar Hunter Mulvaney  
 Cummings Hurt Murphy (FL)  
 Daines Issa Murphy (PA)  
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA) Nadler  
 Davis, Danny Johnson, Sam Neal

Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 O'Rourke  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Perry  
 Petri  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Reichert  
 Rice (SC)  
 Richmond  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross

Rothfus  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruiz  
 Runyan  
 Rumpersberger  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salmon  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Scalise  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Speier  
 Stewart  
 Stockman

Stutzman  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tierney  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Tsongas  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Wagner  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Welch  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoho  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 70 on H.R. 803. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 71 on H.R. 803. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 72 on Approving the Journal. I would have voted “yea.”

BUDGET GAMES IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Georgians and folks all over our Nation who are sick and tired of the budget games in Washington.

Ask almost any American what happens if someone spends substantially more money than they take in, and they’ll tell you that that individual will be plagued with debt and face limited economic opportunity.

But this commonsense reality seems to evade many of my friends in the other body. As evidenced by the recently proposed budget, this so-called plan increases taxes by \$1 trillion, proposes \$100 billion in new stimulus spending, and will never balance.

This mentality is exactly what got our Nation into this fiscal mess in the first place. However, I must commend my friends for at least finally putting down a budget on paper. It took them 4 years, and their plan certainly doesn’t propose any new ideas, but at least they’ve articulated where they stand.

However, this administration remains delinquent in their duty to send a budget to Congress. The administration’s budget is more than a month overdue, and news reports indicate it may come in April, if at all. They have complained that the delay is the result of Congressional debate surrounding the fiscal cliff and sequester.

Someone should tell this administration that using uncertainty created by their own policies to buck their responsibility to craft a budget is unconscionable. Attacking this body’s balanced budget approach, when they haven’t produced their own plan, unfortunately reveals their willingness to put partisan politics ahead of our Nation’s fiscal future.

If this administration is truly concerned about the uncertainty, they should send to Congress a responsible balanced budget. This will put our Nation on the path to true fiscal responsibility.

MEDICARE AND THE RYAN BUDGET

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, the latest Ryan budget is déjà vu all

NOES—125

Amash  
 Andrews  
 Barr  
 Bass  
 Benishek  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Burgess  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Chaffetz  
 Chu  
 Clarke  
 Clyburn  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Collins (GA)  
 Conyers  
 Cotton  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DeFazio  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 Dingell  
 Duffy  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Foxx  
 Fudge  
 Garcia  
 Gerlach  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene

Griffin (AR)  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Heck (NV)  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Holding  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Israel  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Keating  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Latham  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lewis  
 LoBiondo  
 Lowey  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Marchant  
 Matheson  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McKinley  
 Meehan  
 Meng  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Negrete McLeod  
 Nolan  
 Nugent  
 Pallone

Pastor (AZ)  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Peters (CA)  
 Peters (MI)  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Price (GA)  
 Radel  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Reed  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Slaughter  
 Stivers  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Valadao  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Wenstrup  
 Wittman  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Broun (GA)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Costa  
 Culberson  
 Gardner  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Hanna  
 Himes  
 Lynch  
 McHenry  
 Napolitano  
 Sires  
 Smith (WA)  
 Walberg  
 Westmoreland

□ 1724

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.