

After we have spent billions on border walls, seen record-high deportations and record-low immigrant apprehensions, endured endless lines at our international ports of entry that threaten to destroy our economy and our way of life, it is time to focus on immigration reform and the secure, legal flow of people and trade.

The people of El Paso, Texas, a city of immigrants that was recently ranked as the safest in the United States, can tell you this: pass comprehensive immigration reform, and you will have true border security.

#### THE DANGERS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to caution again about the dangers of sequestration.

In a few short weeks, automatic across-the-board spending cuts will take place. If allowed, they could forestall our economic recovery. Not only will these cuts cripple many effective programs, but across-the-board cuts on top of already large budget reductions will impact the Department of Defense.

Yes, we need to make strategic budget reductions, eliminate or reduce ineffective programs, and begin to bring our budget under control. But we need to do this in a responsible way, and automatic sequestration cuts are irresponsible.

In my community, we will feel an immediate impact. If sequestration hits, programs that are essential to keeping our community safe and secure would face an automatic 8.2 percent cut. The COPS program in Sacramento would lose over \$1.5 million in funding, which would hurt local law enforcement and impact our community safety.

Yes, we need to get our budget under control. We need to reduce our deficit and begin paying down our debt. But irresponsible across-the-board sequestration cuts are not the way to do it.

#### MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, America's manufacturing sector has played an invaluable role over the last century in propelling our economy and creating a strong and vibrant middle class.

Manufacturing continues to be a bright spot in our economic recovery. Since 2010, the U.S. has added over half a million manufacturing jobs. That's progress. But in a time where millions of Americans continue to struggle, we can and must do more.

Congress should be working every day to rebuild our economy and create good paying jobs right here in America, not overseas. That's why I support the Make it in America agenda, which will strengthen manufacturing and rebuild

our infrastructure. It will also maintain our Nation's leadership in innovation and educate a 21st century workforce.

The Make it in America agenda is a real jobs plan for this country. Democrats stand ready to act.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and all Americans cannot wait any longer.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 5, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 5, 2013 at 10:58 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 227.

Appointments:

Commission on Long-Term Care.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 444, REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 48

*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. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General

debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today, as you heard from the Clerk, on House Resolution 48, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 444, which is the Require a PLAN Act. This is a resolution that will require that the President, if he doesn't submit a budget that ultimately comes to balance, submit then a supplementary budget that shows how he would bring the budget to balance.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we've been grappling with serious budget challenges throughout this President's administration. We go back to FY 2009, the very first year of the administration; the deficit tripled the previous record-high deficit in this country to \$1.4 trillion. It was \$1.3 trillion in FY 2010, \$1.3 trillion in FY 2011, \$1.2 trillion in FY 2012. And, Mr. Speaker, there's no plan that the administration has produced to get us from where we are—fiscal irresponsibility—to a point in the future of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we've been doing our part here in the House. We've been proud to work together across the aisle in order to pass budgets that tackle

those hard challenges that are ahead of us. If you read the President's comments, Mr. Speaker, you will see that he recognizes the challenges are hard. The question is: Are we going to deal with those or not?

I hold here, Mr. Speaker, a speech that the President made to the Democratic National Convention on September 6, 2012, where he said this:

I will use the money that we're no longer spending on war to pay down our debt and put more people back to work.

And my notes here said that it was followed by extended cheers and applause. I expect my friend from Massachusetts supports that spirit wholeheartedly, that, "I will use the money we're no longer spending on war to pay down our debt and put more people back to work."

But, Mr. Speaker, I also hold in my hand a transcript from the Budget Committee, on which I have the pleasure of sitting, when we had the President's Treasury Secretary come before the Budget Committee to explain the budget, and I said this:

Can you tell me just in simple terms—in true or false terms, this budget never, ever, ever reduces the debt, is that right?

Treasury Secretary Geithner:

Uh, that is correct. It does not go far enough to bring down the debt, not just as a share of the economy, but overall. You're right.

I then said this:

It doesn't bring down the debt at all.

Mr. Speaker, that's the conflict that we face here as a people, as a country. Not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as a people. On the one hand, what our politicians are saying is we're going to use the money to pay down our debt. But what the reality is is that proposals are coming out today that never, ever, ever pay down a penny of debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to see that for yourself, you can look. The President's budgets each year are posted online on the OMB Web site. In fact, the very first one he submitted—I hold the cover page here—it was called "A New Era of Responsibility." "A New Era of Responsibility" is the first budget that the President ever submitted. But as I go through that budget, Mr. Speaker, what I see is projections for 2020, for 2030, for 2040, for 2060, and for 2080.

Mr. Speaker, hear that. You have got young children—2020, 2030, 2040, 2060, and 2080—and in each one of those years, according to the President's budget, not only does the budget never balance under his plan, but it continues to get worse. 2020, 2030, 2040, 2050, 2060, 2080—the President's budget. And I think that comes as news to so many of us, Mr. Speaker, I confess, because I've listened to the speeches, just as my friend from Massachusetts has, where we talk about getting the deficit under control, where we talk about paying down the debt. Only when you get into the plan, do you see that we never pay down one penny.

So this rule today, Mr. Speaker, would allow us to take up a bill that would require the President for the very first time to submit a balanced budget. It doesn't have to balance the way I would balance it. It doesn't have to balance the way you would balance it. But to submit a balanced budget. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, the statute actually required the President submit his budget yesterday. He's going to miss that deadline, but I'm expecting it soon and I'm looking forward to reading it soon. It's so that we actually give the American people a plan.

□ 1310

I want to say—because we heard it in the Rules Committee last night, and I believe my friend from Massachusetts brought it up and he was absolutely right—the history of debt and deficits in this country, Mr. Speaker, is not a mark of shame on the Democratic Party and it is not a mark of shame on the Republican Party; it is a mark of shame on all of us collectively.

Candidly, you and I here, Mr. Speaker, in the big freshman class of 2010, I'm less interested in finding out who to blame and I'm more interested in finding out who has a solution to solve the problem. This House passed a solution to solve the problem. I'd like to see the Senate create a solution. I'd like to see the President create a solution. I'd like to see us discuss that solution as the American people, Mr. Speaker.

There were 14 amendments submitted to this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. We heard testimony on that in the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, six of those 14 amendments were nongermane; we were not able to make those in order. But we did make in order three Republican amendments, one Democratic amendment, and one bipartisan amendment. In fact, all the Members who came to the Rules Committee yesterday to testify on behalf of their amendments, we were able to make those amendments in order.

Mr. Speaker, all this bill does, should it become law, is require that if the President doesn't submit a balanced budget—it's certainly my great hope that he will, but if he doesn't, he share with the American people—again, not in 5 years, not in 10 years—whatever number he believes is the right way to set priorities, tell the American people what steps he will take to get us back on track.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, it's unconscionable that we can look at projections going out to 2080 and have folks never, ever, ever pay down one penny of debt. Contrast that with what we did here in the House of Representatives, where with a budget that passed this House, the bipartisan vote that passed that budget, passed the only budget that passed anywhere in this town, not only would we have balanced the budget in that time frame, Mr. Speaker, we would have paid back every penny of our \$16.4 trillion Federal debt.

That's no small conversation. It's a conversation that's long overdue on this House floor. It's a conversation that has been too long ignored by both Democrats and Republicans, and I'm pleased to be here today to take that up with my friend from Massachusetts, and then later on, the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this restrictive rule and to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

The process here is awful. The bill before us was not even considered by the Budget Committee. They didn't hold a single hearing, no markup, and on a party-line vote last night the Rules Committee denied Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the opportunity to offer a meaningful substitute. The Rules Committee also, on a party line, voted against an open rule. To all of the Republican freshmen and sophomores who campaigned on the need for openness and transparency, by voting for this rule, you are officially part of the problem.

This bill before us isn't a meaningful attempt to address the budget; it's a gimmick wrapped in talking points inside a press release.

Two weeks ago, this House passed the so-called "No Budget, No Pay Act," then they went on another recess. There wasn't a holiday, mind you. I guess it was the Super Bowl recess. Now they're back with today's bill. It calls on the President to tell Congress when his budget will come into balance. If his budget doesn't say when it will come into balance, then he must submit a supplemental statement telling Congress when it will come into balance.

Why are we doing this? Because the President is late submitting his budget for the next fiscal year. Okay, fine. The President should submit a budget on time, and I support that. But lost in all of this Republican budget Kabuki theater is the truth: the reason the administration is late with their budget is because they just spent months trying to avert the disaster that was the fiscal cliff.

As the Speaker was trying in vain to corral House Republicans into doing the right thing, we had Plan B and Plan C and Plan—who knows what. Finally, we reached a deal on January 1, technically after we went over the cliff. In the meantime, back in the real world, we are less than 24 calendar days away from the disastrous sequester taking effect—less than 24 calendar days from massive, arbitrary, and devastating cuts to defense and nondefense

discretionary programs, cuts to jobs programs and medical research and education, cuts to military personnel and law enforcement, cuts that will cost jobs and do real harm to the American economy as it struggles to recover.

And the reality is that we don't even have that much time. We only have 9 legislative days left in February to address the issue, 9 days to negotiate a trillion-dollar deal with the Senate and the President. And instead of a meaningful plan to address the crisis that we need to avert, we have this nonsense before us today. This is no way to govern.

The disturbing truth is that many Republicans seem downright giddy when it comes to the sequester cuts. There is news story after news story about how the Republicans are going to allow the sequester to take effect. In the Rules Committee last night, the author of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, couldn't support these cuts fast enough. I was shocked.

Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that the economic numbers for the fourth quarter of 2012 were released. Unexpectedly, we saw a contraction in those numbers, a contraction fueled by a massive reduction in defense spending. What do you know: huge cuts in government spending during a fragile economic recovery damage economic growth. The Republican response is to double down on this stupid.

These Republican games of Russian roulette with the American economy must come to an end. It is time to replace short-term partisan political interests with the greater good.

The President today is asking us to consider a thoughtful, balanced plan to stop the sequester. I urge the Republican leadership to bring that plan to the floor of the House for a vote as soon as possible. That's what the American people want and that's what they deserve: a real plan. The bill before us today isn't it, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Massachusetts because he's highlighting exactly what our challenges are and exactly why it's so important that we pass both the rule and H.R. 444 today. He went through item after item after item that have absolutely tied our economy up in knots. Short-term problems and short-term solutions are trumping the discussion of long-term problems and long-term solutions.

The sequester that he mentioned, Mr. Speaker, do you know that it was the month of May last year that this House first passed a replacement to the sequester? Now, as you know and as history has recorded, the Senate never acted on any replacement of a sequester, and now we talk about what happened on January 1 as if it was something that was created by this House, as if that fiscal cliff was something that this House invented. In fact, we

have a very proud history, bipartisan history, of looking further down the road to try to find the best answers and the best solutions to very serious problems. But we can't do it alone, Mr. Speaker.

One of the great successes we've had just early in this year—and by “we,” I mean this entire House, the people's House—is that we appear to have persuaded the Senate to pass a budget for the first time in 4 years. All indication is that this year, unlike last year and the year before that and the year before that, this year they're going to pass a budget to lay out their plan.

But what does it say, Mr. Speaker, about this House, about this process, about the future of this country that it's controversial whether or not the President of the United States should introduce a budget that balances ever? That's the debate today, Mr. Speaker. That's how out of touch Washington has become. That's how confused the speeches have been written. We're debating whether or not the President should introduce a budget that ever balances. I'm advocating, yes, he should. Others are advocating, no, that shouldn't be a requirement; when you take the oath to fully execute the laws of the land, when you take the oath to faithfully protect and defend the United States of America, it shouldn't be a requirement that you balance budgets. In fact, you should be free, not just for 10 years, not just for 20 years, not just for 40 years, not just for 80 years, but forever to deficit spend, to borrow from a generation of children and a generation of grandchildren to pay for our wants today, taking away from their needs tomorrow.

□ 1320

This rule debate is going to come to a close in 40 minutes and we're going to vote. Then if the rule passes, we're going to go into a vote on the underlying bill. There are going to be “no” votes on the board that say, no, the President should never have to explain to the American people how we're going to make our fiscal tomorrow better than our fiscal today.

I would like to change his mind, Mr. Speaker, but for now I'm going to focus on changing the minds right here in this Chamber. Because if there is anything that unites us in this body, rather than divides us, it is a true love of this country. And I challenge anyone, Mr. Speaker, to define their love of our freedoms and of our country in a way that allows us to continue borrowing from the next generation forever.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter sent to the Honorable PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, from the Executive Office of the President in the Office of Management and Budget which explains why the President's budget for this year is delayed—because of the

theatrics that my friends on the other side forced us to go through to avoid going over a fiscal cliff. So I think it's understandable why the budget may be a little late.

And I would say to the gentleman, submitting a budget is not controversial. What is controversial to me is the fact that so many of my friends on the other side want to go over this sequester cliff in which millions of jobs will be lost. That to me is controversial. We should be about protecting jobs and creating jobs.

My friends have budgetary plans that would throw people out of work, and I find that unconscionable. I find that unconscionable. We should be about lifting this country up, not trying to put people down.

And the plans that have been proposed by my friends on the other side, including this kind of giddiness about the prospect of going over the sequestration cliff, would cost millions of people in this country jobs. It would hurt our economy.

That's not the way we want to govern. That's what is controversial on our side. We don't want people to lose their jobs. We want people to keep their jobs, and we want to create an economy that creates more jobs.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT  
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, January 11, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter dated January 9, 2013, requesting information on when the Administration will submit the President's fiscal year (FY) 2014 Budget.

For over a year and a half, the Administration has been working with Congress to forge agreement on a plan that would both grow our economy and significantly reduce the deficit. The Administration continues to seek a balanced approach to further deficit reduction that cuts spending in a responsible way while also raising revenues.

As you know, the protracted “fiscal cliff” negotiations that led to enactment of H.R. 8, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, created considerable uncertainty about revenue and spending for 2013 and beyond. The Act resolved a significant portion of this uncertainty by making permanent the temporary rates on taxable income at or below \$400,000 for individual filers and \$450,000 for married individuals filing jointly; permanently indexing the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption to the Consumer Price Index; extending emergency unemployment benefits and Federal finding for extended benefits for unemployed workers for one year; continuing current Medicare payment rates for physicians' services through December 31, 2013; extending farm bill policies and programs through September 30, 2013; and providing a postponement of the Budget Control Act's sequestration for two months. However, because these issues were not resolved until the American Taxpayer Relief Act was enacted on January 2, 2013, the Administration was forced to delay some of its FY 2014 Budget preparations, which in turn will delay the Budget's submission to Congress.

The Administration is working diligently on our budget request. We will submit it to Congress as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. ZIENTS,  
Deputy Director for Management.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do love my country, and my country is begging me, as I'm sure it is all other Members of Congress, to for heaven's sake get some of this taken care of and have some certainty.

Talking with constituents just this morning, they were saying they simply don't know what to do. And what we're doing here again is just theater, as my colleague pointed out. This isn't a plan. It's a gimmick, and it has wasted valuable time.

CBS News reported last year that it cost \$24 million a week to operate the House of Representatives. On behalf of the taxpayers who pay those bills, we should be debating some serious legislation and come up with serious answers to our Nation's problems.

And everybody has known from their grammar school days that the way we pass a bill is that the House proposes a bill, the Senate proposes a bill, they go through the committee processes, they are passed on through the committee, the subcommittees, then the major committee, then to the Rules Committee, in our case, and then we have a conference and we send it to the President. We don't do that anymore.

The last two bills we dealt with on this floor just came directly to the Rules Committee. There was no committee action whatsoever, there was no discussion, there was no input.

And yesterday, what really I think grieves me most is that there was a wonderful substitute put forward with great sincerity by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think he's respected by all sides, and most of this country, for his wisdom and for his acuity. But could they put his substitute in order? No. They said they had to have a waiver. Well, that's what the Rules Committee is for. That's what the Rules Committee does.

The Budget Committee itself has had at least 18 waivers in the last term. It just defies imagination. But this is \$24 million again this week, where we're brought in from all of the corners of the United States at an expense to stand here and do absolutely nothing.

If they want to know what the President wants to do, they should call him up and ask him. We don't have to do a resolution or a bill on the floor of the House to find that out if that's so important. What a crazy thing that we could do in this time of communication to say this is the way we're going to try to find out something—and find out what?

The drastic across-the-board spending cuts are going to take effect on

March 1. Now, the week after next we're taking another week off. We work about two and a half days here. It's really unfortunate. I think I can use that word without being called down, but I have much stronger words in my head. But instead of solving that looming crisis, again, they propose legislation that tries to change the subject. Try as they might, they can't hide from the fact that they are failing to provide help when American people need it most.

Mr. Speaker, we are days away from a serious self-inflicted wound.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you.

If the pending sequester were to take effect, there will be such drastic cuts to important programs, not only domestically, but as you heard Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense, say, it would "hollow out" the military and leave our military fighting with one hand tied behind its back. Why would we do that? For no earthly reason why in the world would we put the United States through that? Taken together, these cuts, as was said before, would destroy jobs, reverse our economic recovery, just reverse it, and destroy the middle class.

To get a glimpse of what drastic spending cuts would do to our economy, just look back to the end of 2012. As leading economists of the White House Council of Economic Advisers and President Obama have all pointed out, the drastic spending cuts at the end of last year are the leading causes—the leading causes—of our recent economic stagnation. Should the sequester take effect, our economy would suffer even more, and jobs would be lost as deeper and deeper spending cuts take effect.

Is that the path the majority wants to walk down? Because if they keep spending our time debating stupid legislation like this, we're going to find ourselves on that path before too long.

I agree with Mr. MCGOVERN that many of our colleagues seem to want to go off that cliff for some kind of foolish exercise, knowing full well what is going to happen, and that is really shameful.

Yesterday, our Democratic colleagues and I proposed legislation that would stop the sequester with Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute, but, no, they would not do that. It was simply tossed aside.

The majority chose to move forward with this restrictive and partisan process, closed rule again, that ignores the problems before us and moves forward with a political gimmick.

As the clock continues to tick, I urge my colleagues to stop those gimmicks and get back to work. Again, the people I spoke with just today are saying over and over again some certainty has to be in this government. People have to know what the economic situation

is going to be. We do not want to play Russian roulette in here with the American economy day after day and week after week.

I urge my colleagues to stop wasting valuable time and let's provide that certainty.

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

I just want to say to my friend from New York, for whom I do have tremendous respect and value her counsel, to call this a stupid piece of legislation I think really misses the point about what we're doing here.

I would encourage you to ask your constituents in New York, and, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage you to ask your constituents back home, do folks realize, because I didn't, that in the four years that the President has been President of the United States, the budgets that he has introduced come to balance never?

My friends on the other side are making a persuasive case, Mr. Speaker, for why it is they would support doing things with different priorities than I would support doing things. And that's absolutely going to be true. When we debate the budget resolution, we're going to have different approaches for getting to balance. But the President's budgets never get there. If we give him every spending cut he asks for, if we give him every tax increase he asks for, if we do absolutely everything that the budget that he is required by law to submit requests, we will begin to pay down the first penny of debt never.

□ 1330

In fact, if we do absolutely everything that the budget he is required by law to submit to us asks, the debt will continue to grow forever.

I agree with so much of what my friends on the other side are saying about the sequester, about the fiscal cliff. That's why we acted in May in this body. That's why we acted in August in this body on this tax bill. That's why we passed another sequester replacement in August. That's why we passed another one in December. I agree. But can't we also agree that if you're going to be Commander in Chief of America, if you're going to be the President of the United States, if you're going to uphold and defend the Constitution—and we have our former Joint Chief of Staff Chairman telling us that our greatest national security threat is our growing debt—shouldn't it be fair to ask the President to tell us when, if ever, he plans to begin paying back the first penny?

Mr. Speaker, it's not a stupid piece of legislation that we're dealing with today. What's almost laughably ridiculous is that it's controversial.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I believe the gentleman has much more time. I will be happy to reserve the balance of my time, though, and allow my friend to control.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I see a number of my colleagues have come to speak, so I'm going to be as brief as I can.

I know that the chair of the Budget Committee has said that he can balance the budget in 10 years, which most economists and people say would certainly throw us into the worst depression, worse than 1929.

I believe that what we are doing here—I can't prove it—but my suspicions are that this is something intended to cover that. They're trying to get the President into that trick box or something to try to do the same thing.

Don't go, Mr. President. We can do better than that.

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

The issue is not whether the President should submit a budget. He should. And he would have submitted a budget by now, but because of the theatrics that my friends on the other side put us through dealing with the fiscal cliff, which was just solved on January 1, things are a little bit delayed. The issue is why is the House wasting time on this while the sword of the sequester hangs over the American people?

The President can submit any budget he wants. That's what the President has the right to do, just like George Bush submitted whatever budget he wanted to do.

We have a job here in this House, and that is to address this looming fiscal crisis called the sequester. What we're doing here today is doing nothing at all to move that ball forward.

In less than a month, arbitrary cuts are going to go into effect, people are going to lose their jobs, and this economy is going to go into a deeper slump. For the life of me, I can't understand why there's not more urgency. We shouldn't be taking vacations. We actually should be working here and trying to resolve this. This is stupid legislation because it is not addressing the crisis. It is doing nothing to advance the cause of trying to get to a solution. This is just a press release. This is yet another gimmick.

I think the reason why Congress and especially the House of Representatives is held in such low regard is because we spend so much time on trivial matters debating passionately, and we skip over debating the important things. We ought to be doing something important here today. We ought to be trying to avert this sequestration. We ought to be trying to keep people in their jobs. And we ought to be trying to create an economy that will create more jobs, not this theater.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there's a reason that we're spending so much time talking about things other than the underlying bill, other than the rule. The reason is because the rule is a good rule, and the bill is a good bill. We can use this time for the political

theater that my friend from Massachusetts appears to disdain, but I would say he's got a talent for it and he should not disdain it so rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, we handled the sequester in May. I hope whenever my friend from Massachusetts refers to his friends on the other side, he means the other side of the Chamber, not the other side of this House, because we, you and I, acted, Mr. Speaker, to solve those issues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is the 113th Congress. We haven't done one thing to solve this fiscal crisis that's looming on March 1st. This is the 113th.

Under the Constitution, when a new Congress begins, we have to start all over again. Okay?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, my friend is exactly right. Of all of the multiple efforts that we did last year that were all rejected by the other side, we have not recreated those efforts again this year. He's exactly right.

What we have done, however, is created a pathway that's going to produce the first budget on the Senate side, the first opportunity for the bodies to come together in conference.

My friend from New York tells us about, I'm just a bill and what schoolchildren are learning all over America. Mr. Speaker, they're going to have to learn on TV because they have not seen it in this town. We can't. We can't go to conference on a budget unless the Senate passes one. And this year, Mr. Speaker, as governed by the rule book, the United States Constitution that I have right here in my hand, we're going to be able to get that done. That's the kind of work this House is doing. That's the groundwork that we're laying.

My friend from New York is exactly right, Mr. Speaker, when she says that this body, led by Chairman RYAN on the Budget Committee, is going to produce a budget so serious and so responsible, it's going to come to balance, the balance the American people are demanding, faster than any other budget we have seen in this President's administration.

All we're asking, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't it seem reasonable to let the President submit any budget he wants to? We don't want to change the budget he's submitting at all, but just to share with the American people because they don't know when they come to balance.

Who knew, Mr. Speaker, when the budget was entitled a "New Era of Responsibility," that it wasn't going to come to balance in 80 years? Who knew? I didn't. There are people in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, who did not know that in 4 years of his Presidency, this President has never, ever—assuming a world where he gets everything that he wants—crafted a plan that begins to pay back the very first penny of

our debt. That's dangerous, Mr. Speaker.

This bill can put a stop to that process. That is why I know it's going to get support here in the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing. It does absolutely nothing. It's a press release.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's replacement for the sequester, which was blocked yesterday in the Rules Committee.

My friend from Georgia talks about this being a good rule and a good process. This bill was not even considered by the Budget Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction. It had no hearing. It had no markup. It mysteriously appeared at the Rules Committee. We wanted an open rule, and we were denied an open rule. Mr. VAN HOLLEN actually had a substantive amendment to replace the sequester. That was denied.

So I want to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, to discuss his amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, who said it exactly right. This unfortunately is another political gimmick we've seen from our Republican colleagues, and it is exactly why the American people hate this Congress so much.

Rather than doing something to create jobs, rather than doing something to help support the economy, this does absolutely nothing other than point fingers at the President because his budget is a little late and then tell the President that he has to submit a budget that meets the Republican requirements rather than what we've done with every other President, which gives them the ability to present the budget they like.

With respect to the delay, our Republican colleagues know very well what the cause of that delay was. The cause of the delay was we were working very hard to try and avoid the fiscal cliff, which would have hurt jobs and the economy.

I'm not surprised some of our Republican House colleagues have forgotten about that because they overwhelmingly voted against the fiscal cliff agreement, which by the way was supported by the overwhelming majority of Senate Republicans. But here in the House, Republicans in great numbers said that they would rather risk the economy and risk jobs than ask the very wealthiest Americans to pay a little bit more.

□ 1340

That's why the fiscal cliff agreement took so long. We didn't get it done until January 2. I would hope my colleagues on the Budget Committee

know, if you're putting together a budget, you need to know what you're spending, but you also need to know what your revenues are. Until we were able to get that agreement, the President didn't know what the revenues were. Nonpartisan groups, like the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax, were also delayed in their assessments. These are nonpartisan groups.

Now, the shame of it is, instead of playing these political games, we should do what my colleagues have said we should do in that we should be focused on avoiding the sequester—the meat-ax, across-the-board cuts. This House has taken no action in this Congress, in this 113th Congress, to deal with that, so we on the Democratic side said, Hey, let's give our Members an opportunity to vote on something to replace the sequester and to do it in a balanced way so that we don't hurt the economy and so that we don't put jobs at risk.

We brought a substitute amendment to the Rules Committee that would have prevented those across-the-board cuts, that would have replaced them with balanced and sensible alternatives like, for example, eliminating direct payments in agricultural subsidies, like getting rid of the taxpayer subsidies for big oil companies, that we would replace the across-the-board, meat-ax cuts, which would do great harm to our economy, with those sensible measures.

The response from our Republican colleagues: You don't get a vote. You don't get a vote. They rushed to the floor a measure that hadn't had a single hearing, that did not go through the regular order; and in keeping with that philosophy, we don't even get a vote on something that is important to the American people, which is to replace the across-the-board sequester, which we know is going to hurt jobs because we just heard from the last quarter economic report that even the fear of those across-the-board cuts was having a damaging impact on the economy, even the fear of it. Now, within less than a month, it's going to happen, and here we're talking about a political gimmick bill instead of something that does something real, and we are not even allowed a chance to vote on a proposal to replace the sequester.

Vote against it if you want. Vote against it. That's the way the democratic process works, but allow this House to work its will.

When this House worked its will, we were able to get a fiscal agreement passed and were able to avoid going over the cliff and hurting the economy. Let's do the same thing now. Let's just have a vote, up or down, on the merits of a substitute proposal rather than playing games with this very unfortunate proposal that does nothing but play politics.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friends that I haven't actually mentioned that the President's budget was

late. You're exactly right. He did miss the statutory deadline. He's not going to make it on time. In fact, the story is that it's not going to get here until March. In the years that I've had a voting card, he has never submitted a budget on time. I'm not asking him to get it here on time. I am only asking him, when it gets here, would he tell us when it's going to balance.

With that, I would like to yield 4 minutes to a colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is an important discussion that we're having today, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and to vote for the underlying bill that follows.

Look, the President is going to be here talking to us next week. He'll deliver his State of the Union address. He will do so without a plan on the table. There will be no budget. We will not know about the proposals that are put forward as to whether or not they're reasonable in the context of outlays and allocations. We just simply don't know.

The underlying bill that is being discussed today is that, when the President does submit that plan, when the administration does submit that plan, if that plan does not come into balance within a reasonable period of time—10 years, I think, any American would say would be a reasonable period of time—give us an idea as to when you think that will happen. After all, when there was a campaign being run in 2008, the Presidential candidate for the Democrats said that he'd cut the deficit in half in 4 years, and we're still waiting. We would like to see the plan that is going to achieve these goals.

We're also hearing a lot of talk today about the sequester. It's not the purpose of this legislation to deal with the sequester. We did have reconciliation bills on the floor of this House in May and then again in December. We had a bill dealing with the expiration of the Tax Codes right before the August recess. So there were opportunities to talk about the fiscal cliff. I, for one, felt that the delay in the sequester on January 1 was not in the country's best interest.

These were the cuts that the Congress promised to the American people. When the debt limit was raised in August of 2011, this was the promise that was made, and it was a promise that was made by the President. It was proposed by people within the administration. The bill was signed into law by the President. The President cannot now come back and retroactively veto a bill that has already been signed. This is settled law, and these are cuts on which the American people are depending. They're depending on us to keep our word.

It's very difficult to cut spending. It's very difficult to cut the budget. Every line in the Federal budget has a constituency. Every line in every ap-

propriations bill has a constituency somewhere that cares deeply about that language being retained. So, when all else fails, an across-the-board cut may be the only way that you can ever achieve that spending restraint.

Now, I understand that the White House does not agree with the Republican House that there is a spending problem. They think it's a revenue problem. Well, great. Put that in writing. Put it in the budget. Tell us when that revenue that you wish to achieve will bring this budget into balance. I, for one, don't think it's possible, but I would like to see the academic exercise of their at least trying to get it to balance at some point in the future.

Then, finally, Mr. Speaker, may I just say—and I hate to give a history lesson—when the Republicans were in the minority in this House, there was a very large bill that was passed, and it was called the Affordable Care Act. This was a bill that did not receive a hearing in the House of Representatives. To be sure, H.R. 3200 had received a markup in a hearing in the House, but H.R. 3590, although it had a House bill number, was not a House bill. It was a housing bill that passed the House of Representatives in July of 2009 and went over to the Senate. It was completely changed in the Senate Finance Committee, and this was the bill that came to the House of Representatives on which we had to vote in a very short period of time. No amendments were allowed. It was a very closed process. I was in the Rules Committee that night. I remember the ranking member being there, and the good ideas that I thought I brought forward were all excluded from discussion.

So don't lecture me about the process that this bill was rushed and didn't have a hearing. For heaven's sake, we have a bill that is now signed law that will cost \$2.6 trillion over the next 10 years that never had a hearing in this House. That's the travesty, and that's why we have to deal with spending.

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

Let me just respond to the gentleman from Texas by saying he's wrong. He's on the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Affordable Care Act had hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee—and markups. There were multiple hearings on that bill. I'm not sure what he's talking about.

Then to the gentleman from Georgia who says that he didn't mention the fact that the President missed the deadline, I thought he did, but the bill that he's touting here mentions it in these very political, inspired findings. Read your own bill. It's three pages long. I know that may be too much, but we're all told to read the bill.

Look, rather than being here and telling the President what to do—he's going to submit a budget—we've got to do our job. Our job is to avoid this sequestration because, if we don't, there are millions of people in this country who will be without work. There are

programs that will be arbitrarily cut, and this economy will be hurt. Now, if you want sequestration, then you can continue to take your recesses and do this kind of trivial stuff on the House floor, but we ought to be finding a way to avoid going over this sequestration cliff.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. What most of America is waiting for is for us to address the very abyss that we've put ourselves in, the cliff that we've put ourselves in—the fact that we became hostage to this idea of a commission that was necessary because we could not get Members on both sides of the aisle to be able to work together on what should be cut. It was particularly because my friends on the other side of the aisle had Members who did not understand how government functioned. Republicans did not understand that government, in fact, is a rainy-day umbrella, that we are supposed to serve the American people.

So, while we are fiddling, one could say that Rome is burning, or maybe they could say that the cities and towns of America are asking us to finally answer the question. Under the laws that we adhere to, the President has a right to submit his budget. That should be very clear. No legislation here on the floor is going to dictate the President's budget.

□ 1350

There is a law that says it is supposed to be the first Monday in February. We will admit that. But what President has ever had the hostage-taking of the debt ceiling so that you can't write a budget if there are individuals in the Congress that won't do the normal business, which is to raise the debt ceiling so that the American people can be taken care of?

As we speak, however, the President has introduced, today, a short-term fix to avert the sequester. The Democrats have offered a way of averting the sequester. We have nothing from the Republicans except a resolution that says a request for a plan, the very plan that the President knows by law he is going to submit as long as he knows what the amount of money is we have to work on. And, of course, the budgeting process is going through the House. The chairman of the Budget, Mr. RYAN, the ranking member of the Budget, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, we all know the regular order, and we're going to do our work.

But putting us on the floor today and ignoring what we should be doing, I'm saddened that my amendment that indicated that I wanted to make sure that the most vulnerable in any budget process, 15.1 percent of Americans living below the poverty line, which includes 21 percent of our Nation's children, I wanted to have a sense of Congress that whatever we did, we would not do anything to harm these vulnerable children who, through no fault of

their own that they may be suffering from the kind of economy, or their parents are suffering so that they live in poverty, whatever we do, we should not do anything more to make their life more devastating.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentle-lady 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My other amendment had to do with the estate tax to raise revenue, and that would have been a reasonable debate to address what we can do to make the lives of Americans better.

Request a plan; a plan is not action. The President does a budget; we do a budget. Mr. Speaker, let's do our work and help the American people and avoid the sequester.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my colleague that I share her great passion for America's children and protecting America's children. And I would say to my friend that I don't believe we can continue to operate under budgets that borrow from those children, not just this year, not just next year, but forever, and candidly say that we're protecting them. We're putting our most vulnerable at risk with these deficits, and we have to make the tough decisions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say, I don't think anyone on this side of the aisle is not prepared to work collaboratively on the question of the deficit, on the question of growing America's economy and working with our children. Can we find common ground that indicates that we must invest in our children at the same time that we are likewise talking about debt and deficit? And that's what the Democrats are talking about, investing in our children, making their lives better.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all want to make sure that our children are protected, but embracing a sequester that cuts things like Head Start, that's no way to protect our children.

At this point, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 23 days, by law, an indiscriminate chain saw is going to go through all quarters, all sectors of the American Government.

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta on Sunday, along with General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, very bluntly warned this country that if sequestration goes into effect, America's military readiness is going to be damaged in a very critical way. The Navy has told us specifically what this means: 23 ships whose repairs are scheduled will be cancelled; 55 percent of flying hours on aircraft carriers

will be cancelled; 22 percent of steaming days for the rest of the U.S. fleet will be cancelled; submarine deployments will be cancelled.

Today, right now, we have the USS *Stennis* and the USS *Eisenhower* stationed in the Middle East making sure that our allies, Israel, Turkey, critical missions like protecting the Straits of Hormuz, they have to have aircraft that can fly. They can't cancel 55 percent of their flight time and expect to carry out their mission. Yet in 23 days, because of inaction by this Chamber, we are putting, again, America's national security interests at risk.

The Bipartisan Policy Center, founded by Bob Dole and Tom Daschle, has told us we will lose a million jobs if sequestration goes through. So those shipyards that are planning to do that repair work, they're basically going to get layoff slips.

And we are debating a bill today that has absolutely no connection to those realities. This is a pure political stunt. It has no bearing in terms of whether or not the military readiness of this country or the economic recovery that's headed in the right direction right now is going to be protected and preserved. That's our job. That's what we should be focused on here today. And denying the Van Hollen amendment, which would replace that sequestration, is why this rule must be defeated.

I urge Members of this Chamber to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to read from the President's inaugural address. It took place just outside our backdoor here. He said:

We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit.

He didn't say we should make the easy choices, because there aren't any easy choices left to make. Every single one of them is hard. And I have such great respect for Members of this body who have taken the hard votes and made those hard decisions.

All this bill says is: Mr. President, put your budget where your speeches are. Make the hard choices, any of the choices you want to make to balance, anytime you want to balance, but we can't begin to pay down the debt until we stop running up the debt. And we have yet to see a budget from this President that puts us on that path.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today disappointed that my amendment to the Require a PLAN Act has been left out of this rule.

This bill is bad political theater. Not even the devastatingly dangerous Ryan budget could achieve the balanced budget in 2014 this bill demands of the President.

Setting this silliness aside, my amendment would address a separate issue: this bill's use of the phrase "unified budget" and the inclusion of Social Security as part of that unified budget. This is a blatant attempt to nullify Social Security's historic independence from the Federal budget. Social Security is funded by the payroll tax. It was created with its own revenue stream so these hard-earned benefits would never fall victim to the political shenanigans of a Congress like this one.

As President Franklin Roosevelt said:

With those taxes in there, no damn politician can ever scrap my Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security is not an item in the budget. It is social insurance that protects all Americans against destitution due to old age, a disability or illness, or the death of a breadwinner.

Workers have built up \$2.7 trillion in the Social Security trust fund which ensures that benefits will be paid in full at least until the mid-2030s. I have called for small adjustments to strengthen Social Security for the long term, and I'm ready to have that debate. But to put Social Security on the general budget's ledger as America's largest generation retires is simply beyond the pale.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, puts Social Security on the GOP chopping block. This is a dangerous precedent. We cannot allow the accounting tricks in this bad legislation to endanger the Social Security that keeps so many Americans financially secure.

President Truman said:

Social Security is not a dole or a device for giving everybody something for nothing. True Social Security must consist of rights which are earned rights that are guaranteed by the law of the land.

Today, Mr. Speaker, these earned rights of millions of Americans are in jeopardy, as is that guarantee. We must vote down this rule and we must vote down this bad bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend that I know his commitment to Social Security is heartfelt, and it's one that I share. I hope it gives him comfort to know that there is absolutely nothing in this legislation that changes any of those commitments that he read there on the House floor. In fact, I would say the opposite is true. As someone who's going to retire after Social Security is projected to have gone bankrupt, I think it is critically important that every budget we look at looks at how it is we're going to pay back all of those government bonds that this Congress has swapped the cash in the Social Security trust fund for. Without paying back those bonds, there is no Social Security check to go out the door.

The reason we talk about balanced budgets is because numbers are important. We talk about balanced budgets because commitments are important. And we cannot, we cannot meet our

Medicare commitments. We cannot meet our Social Security commitments, and everyone in this body knows it.

□ 1400

Every budget the President produces shows it. But we can do better; and working together, we will do better, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia how many more speakers he has.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd say to my friend, I'm prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm prepared to close as well, Mr. Speaker. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very frustrating debate, in large part because it's much ado about nothing. What we're doing here today is a press release. It's doing nothing at all to avoid this prospect of sequestration in which arbitrary cuts will go into play. This is just more talk and talk and talk and talk.

Again, that's one of the reasons why the American people are so frustrated with this place. They want less talk and more work. We should be working. We should be coming to some sort of agreement to avoid the catastrophe of sequestration; but, instead, we're doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put some things in perspective. The Center for American Progress reported that since the start of fiscal year 2011, President Obama has signed into law approximately \$2.4 trillion of deficit reduction for the years 2013 through 2022. Nearly three-quarters of that deficit reduction is in the form of spending cuts, while the remaining one-quarter comes from revenue increases. Congress and the President have cut about \$1.5 trillion in programmatic spending, raised about \$630 billion in new revenue, and generated about \$300 billion in interest savings, for a combined total of more than \$2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. That's a quote from the Center for American Progress.

So three-fourths of the deficit reduction we've achieved so far was from spending cuts. But my friends on the other side have the nerve to continue to claim that Democrats are "loathe" to agree to spending cuts. I mean, give me a break, Mr. Speaker. Give me a break.

The CBO projects the Federal deficit to be about \$845 billion, which I think is very high; but it's the first time the nonpartisan office forecast a deficit below \$1 trillion. So we are going in the right direction, and the President wants to continue to move in that right direction in a fair and balanced way.

Now, here's the deal. My friends keep on referring to what they did last year which, again, was last year. We have to get them to think about this year because they have to act now; it's a new Congress.

But last year the proposals they came up with to try to bring our budget into balance were all about lowering the quality of life for our citizens. Their budget proposal ended Medicare as we know it. Ended Medicare. It's gone.

My friend from Florida talked about Social Security. Their plan for Social Security is to privatize it. And deep reductions and cuts that provide support for people who are most vulnerable. That's their plan.

And now, we see, because we're not trying to address this latest fiscal cliff, I think they really do want the sequestration to go into effect. I think that is outrageous. I think it's going to be dangerous to our economy. But their plan, by allowing sequestration to go into effect, is basically to try to balance the budget by making more people unemployed.

You know, we will lose jobs. In the defense sector that's already happening. But then we're going to see losses in jobs in other areas. There'll be cuts in education. Police grants are cut. Payments to Medicare providers are cut. And The New York Times reports that even the aid just approved for victims of Hurricane Sandy will fall under the sequester's axe.

I mean, this is how we're going to solve our budgetary problems?

Yes, we do have a big debt. A lot of it has to do with these unpaid-for wars, with these tax cuts that weren't paid for; and it's going to take us a while to get out of it. But as we get out of it, we can't destroy our country. We need a balanced approach. We need to cut where we can cut, we need to raise revenues where we need to raise revenues, but we also need to invest.

Cutting the National Institutes of Health, which will happen if sequestration goes into effect, will not only cost jobs, but it will prolong human suffering. If we could find a cure to Parkinson's disease or Alzheimer's disease, not only will we prevent a lot of human suffering, you would end up solving the budgetary challenges of Medicare and Medicaid. There's a value in investing in these things, not arbitrarily cutting them.

Now, last night in the Rules Committee, we tried to bring some substance to this debate. Mr. VAN HOLLEN had his amendment, which was blocked. The one substantive thing that we could have done here today to avoid sequestration was blocked.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's replacement for the sequester which was, again, blocked last night in the Rules Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I would urge my colleagues to reject this rule which, again, is illustrative of how closed this process has become in this House. We ought to reject the rule because it is not open. The Budget Committee never even considered this bill.

But we ought to also reject the underlying bill because this is nonsense at a time when we should be doing something real to avoid a real catastrophe in this country, to avoid something that will have an adverse impact on our economy. Instead, you know, we're all fiddling while Rome is burning.

This is outrageous. We can do so much better. We ought to work. You know, you're passing resolutions asking the President to do X, Y, and Z. We ought to pass a resolution to instruct us to do our job, and that's what we ought to do. That's what the American people expect.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to thank my friend from Massachusetts for being down here with me today to get this rule to a place where we can vote on it. I always look to my friend from Massachusetts to find those things that we agree on, and we certainly agree that Congress has an awfully low approval rating.

I would disagree with my friend though, Mr. Speaker, and say it's a low approval rating because we don't deal with important issues like this. It's a low approval rating because folks will say Republicans want to privatize Social Security, even though our budget did no such thing.

It's a low approval rating because folks will say our budget destroys Medicare forever, even though our budget did no such thing. It's a low approval rating because folks say they want to grapple with the tough challenges of the country, and yet they continue to borrow and spend as they always have.

But I'm an optimist, Mr. Speaker. I really do believe that we've come to a place—not just in this country, not just in this House—I think we've come to a place in each individual in this country, where folks are prepared to do those things that must be done to ensure that our children's tomorrow is better than their today.

Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about their deep love and affection for the next generation and how they want to ensure that the most vulnerable are taken care of, they mean it from the heart. They mean it from the heart.

But when the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tells us that our biggest national security concern is our growing debt and deficits, how

much love can you show to the next generation, Mr. Speaker, when you continue to dig into their pockets instead of your own?

It's not incumbent upon us to decide how our children set their priorities. It's incumbent upon us to set our priorities so that they don't have to make those tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, if we went out in the street in front of this Capitol and asked every man and woman who brought their family here to visit the Nation's Capitol how many of them knew that in not one budget, and for not 1 year does the President ever propose that we come to balance, that would be shocking, shocking news. And yet it's the truth.

Mr. Speaker, title 31 lays out in intricate detail congressional requirements for the President's budget. Congressional requirements for the President's budget. H.R. 444 would incorporate those requirements and add one more and, that is, that in this time of economic challenge, you be honest with the American people about the tough choices that we're all facing.

Mr. Speaker, if it was easy, they'd have done it before you and I got here. It's hard, and it's getting worse every single day any one of us fails to deal with it.

We can deal with it today, Mr. Speaker. I know our Budget Committee is committed to dealing with it. I know this House is committed to deal with it. Let's make the President a partner in that today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the resolution. I urge strong support for the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 48 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment in the nature of a substitute received for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative VAN HOLLEN of Maryland or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject be-

fore the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. 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 adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—188

Andrews Capps Crowley  
 Barber Capuano Cummings  
 Barrow (GA) Cárdenas Davis (CA)  
 Bass Carney Davis, Danny  
 Beatty Carson (IN) DeFazio  
 Becerra Cartwright DeGette  
 Bera (CA) Castor (FL) Delaney  
 Bishop (GA) Castro (TX) DeBene  
 Bishop (NY) Chu Deutch  
 Blumenauer Clarke Dingell  
 Bonamici Clay Doggett  
 Brady (PA) Cleaver Doyle  
 Braley (IA) Clyburn Duckworth  
 Brown (FL) Cohen Edwards  
 Brownley (CA) Connolly Ellison  
 Bustos Cooper Engel  
 Butterfield Courtney Enyart

Eshoo Lujan Grisham Ruiz  
 Esty (NM) Ruppertsberger  
 Fattah Luján, Ben Ray Rush  
 Foster (NM) Lynch Ryan (OH)  
 Frankel (FL) Maffei Sánchez, Linda  
 Fudge Maloney, T.  
 Garamendi Carolyn Sanchez, Loretta  
 Garcia Carolyn Sarbanes  
 Grayson Maloney, Sean Schakowsky  
 Green, Al Markey Schiff  
 Grijalva Matsui Schneider  
 Gutierrez McCarthy (NY) Schrader  
 Hahn McColmum Schwartz  
 Hanabusa McDermott Scott (VA)  
 Hastings (FL) McGovern Serrano  
 Heck (WA) McIntyre Sewell (AL)  
 Higgins Meeks Shea-Porter  
 Himes Meng Sherman  
 Hinojosa Michaud Sinema  
 Holt Miller, George Sires  
 Honda Moore Slaughter  
 Horsford Moran Smith (WA)  
 Hoyer Murphy (FL) Speier  
 Huffman Nadler Swalwell (CA)  
 Israel Napolitano Takano  
 Jackson Lee Neal Thompson (CA)  
 Jeffries Negrete McLeod Thompson (MS)  
 Johnson (GA) Nolan Tierney  
 Johnson, E. B. O'Rourke Titus  
 Kaptur Owens Tonko  
 Keating Pallone Pascrell  
 Kennedy Pascrell Tsongas  
 Kildee Pastor (AZ) Van Hollen  
 Kilmer Payne Vargas  
 Kind Pelosi Veasey  
 Kirkpatrick Perlmutter Vela  
 Kuster Peters (CA) Velázquez  
 Langevin Peters (MI) Visclosky  
 Larsen (WA) Peterson Walz  
 Larson (CT) Pingree (ME) Wasserman  
 Lee (CA) Pocan Schultz  
 Levin Polis Waters  
 Lewis Price (NC) Watt  
 Lipinski Quigley Waxman  
 Loeb sack Rahall Welch  
 Lofgren Rangel Wilson (FL)  
 Lowenthal Richmond Yarmuth  
 Lowey Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—14

Black DeLauro Sensenbrenner  
 Cicilline Farr Walberg  
 Conyers Gabbard Weber (TX)  
 Costa McNeerney Young (FL)  
 Crawford Scott, David

□ 1430

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Messrs. HONDA, PAYNE, POLIS, Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. CASTOR of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 444, REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 189, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—228

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