

NOT VOTING—16

Amodei	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Brady (TX)	Lankford	Smith (WA)
Castor (FL)	Miller (FL)	Waxman
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gutiérrez	Noem	
Johnson (GA)	Rangel	

□ 1047

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

Messrs. POSEY and LONG changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 220, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—220

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

Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García
Grayson

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

NOES—194

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Castor (FL)	Lankford	Smith (WA)
Duncan (TN)	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gutiérrez	Noem	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1054

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.

PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1874.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1874.

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

□ 1057

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for the first time.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I want to thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for his tireless work and activity, especially in the area of budget process reform. He understands, as we all do, that the budget process is broken, clearly by the results that we have had or have not had here in Congress over the past number of years. I also want to commend the Budget staff and my staff for the work that they have done on bringing this bill forward and the work they have done on the commonsense kinds of reforms that are necessary in the budget process.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple and a commonsense piece of legislation.

□ 1100

What we do here has consequences. What we do in Congress has consequences. Some of them are good; some of them are bad.

This amendment, when adopted, will allow us to have more information upon which to make decisions here in Congress. This is especially helpful in the area of economic activity. Economists from across the political spectrum agree that legislation considered by Congress can have significant effects on economic growth, what happens in the real world.

Major legislation, such as the tax reform legislation that is being discussed right now, is likely to have longer-term macroeconomic effects that will increase growth and, as a result, produce increased revenues, reduce spending, or some combination of the two. For example, the Congressional Budget Office's, CBO's, prior macroeconomic work has shown that deficit reduction has positive economic effects. I will quote from one of their reports:

Over the medium term and long term, when economic output is determined by the supply of labor and capital in the productivity of those inputs, the reduction in Federal borrowing that would result from smaller deficits would induce greater national saving and investment and, thereby, increase output and income.

In another report, Congressional Budget Office work concluded that:

Higher marginal tax rates tend to discourage some economic activity.

Now, while the current law that we operate under requires that the Congressional Budget Office provide Congress with information on the fiscal impact—what something costs—of all legislation reported from a committee, there is no systematic requirement for analysis of the economic impact, the realistic effects in the real world out there in the economy. This bill remedies that shortcoming.

This bill would require that the Congressional Budget Office provide a macroeconomic impact analysis for legislation that the CBO—that the Congressional Budget Office—estimates would have a budgetary impact of more than .25 percent of the annual gross domestic product. That is about \$43 billion. In addition, the bill would require that the Congressional Budget Office provide a statement of the critical assumptions and sources of data underlying their estimate.

This new macroeconomic impact analysis would not, Mr. Chairman—would not—replace the current work that CBO does, but it would provide more important information. I can't imagine anybody in this House who desires us not to have more information on the pieces of legislation that we are dealing with.

So, again, this is a simple, common-sense, and, I hope, bipartisan bill that we will be talking about and voting on today. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

I was interested to hear my colleague from Georgia end his comments by say-

ing we should have more information rather than less. As I look at this legislation, on page 3, they say they want more information on the dynamic effects of different policies but specifically exclude, for example, the Committee on Appropriations; investments that we might make in our kids' education; or investments that we might make in other areas to power our economy—research and development, for example.

It is particularly interesting because the Republican budget that was just released and voted on the other night in the Budget Committee, according to CBO, in the next couple of years will create a drag on the economy, will actually hurt jobs in the next couple of years. Why is that? That is, in part, due to the fact that they make deep cuts in parts of the budget for investment in research and development and other areas that help power our economy. So it is kind of interesting, Mr. Chairman, that they specifically excluded the CBO from doing an analysis on that.

Now, a couple of my colleagues will have amendments to the bill, and if our Republican colleagues don't somehow mean to ignore those important investments, hopefully they will join us in supporting those amendments.

If you were the CEO of a company and you were projecting your growth and you were projecting your income, you would want to look at how much you are going to make from certain investments you make in your workforce and those kinds of investments. According to this bill, you don't want that. What this bill is after is simply to do an analysis primarily on a tax policy. It is motivated primarily by this idea that, if you provide big tax breaks to people at the very high end of the income ladder, it will trickle down and lift up all the boats, everybody else, trickle-down theory.

We saw how well that worked in the 2000s. We had big tax cuts in 2001 and 2003. A few years later, for a variety of reasons, the economy tanked. You heard the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve who predicted that those tax cuts would generate growth come back and say, you know, he was wrong.

So, I am all for additional information. On that point, I want to say to my colleagues that, on the most recent tax reform proposal that came out of the Ways and Means Committee, you actually do have a number of scores from the Joint Tax Committee, from our nonpartisan scores.

They have eight. They have eight scenarios. One projects .1 percent growth; one projects 1.6 percent growth. That is, of course, the one that Chairman CAMP ran with in all the information he put out. But what he failed to mention is they came up with eight scenarios. The reason they came up with eight scenarios is because they couldn't boil it down to say this will be the dynamic impact of that particular legislation because there are too many

unknown variables. That is why they had eight.

Now you want them to somehow come up with one when they have repeatedly informed this Congress that it depends so much on the different assumptions that you make, that you can't make one prediction on that kind of legislation.

I have trouble with this legislation for a variety of reasons; one being, when it comes to tax policy, we have been informed by the experts that it is hard to pinpoint one number and boil it down to a growth figure. Then, as I mentioned, my colleagues have left out the benefits of investing in things like infrastructure, things like our kids' education, things like scientific research, so they are certainly not asking for more information when it comes to those important investments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I urge my friend from Maryland to read the bill. Read the bill. This isn't about tax increases or tax decreases specifically.

Page 4, the macroeconomic impact analysis. An estimate of the changes of economic output: employment, interest rates, capital stock, tax revenues, all. In fact, the kinds of things that the gentleman points to in infrastructure or education, if they have an economic impact of greater than .25 percent of the gross domestic product, they would be evaluated and we would get a report from CBO on that.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah, CHRIS STEWART.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. PRICE, who is one of the really bright lights here in Congress, for his leadership on this.

Imagine the CEO of a business telling the board of directors that he would like to buy a new piece of equipment. Unfortunately, this piece of equipment is fairly expensive. But there is good news, and that is, by buying and making this investment, they are going to become more profitable; they are going to improve their cash flow; they are going to be able to hire more people and grow the business. That is a beautiful thing.

But then imagine that the board of directors goes back to the CEO and says, yes, you have to consider the cost of this equipment but you cannot consider the benefits of buying this piece of equipment, so it messes up entirely his profit projections. They are not able to consider the higher revenue and the growth that this company would undertake. That would be absurd and, of course, that wouldn't be a sound business decision. But that is exactly the situation that we find ourselves in right now.

The Congressional Budget Office does not have the ability to account for economic growth, specifically, the impact on GDP when it comes from tax cuts. CBO is, unfortunately, in the role of the board of directors telling the businessowner—or the business CEO, in

my example—that it can't use the full toolkit of economic modeling in making projections upon which to make these critical decisions.

I have a degree in economics. I was a small business owner. I understand this isn't rocket science. The modeling of this is relatively simple. It is certainly something that we could do, and we hurt ourselves when we don't allow us to take advantage of this modeling.

There is something that Members from both sides of the aisle can agree upon, and it is that many times the numbers provided by CBO are simply not accurate. This is a way that will fix that. Part of the reason they object, frankly, is that it underestimates the impact of tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that could help us make better decisions. I implore Members to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, look, the gentleman who just spoke mentioned some important examples. If you are a CEO, you want to know when you buy a piece of equipment or capital what the economic dividend is going to be on that. But I go back to the fact, on page 3, our Republican colleagues are asking for information on economic growth impacts of all sorts of things, but they specifically exclude anything that comes out of the Appropriations Committee.

It is not a surprise, because the Congressional Budget Office, in its analysis of the Republican budget, says that during the next couple of years it will actually slow down economic growth. In fact, if you look at their proposal, it calls for deep cuts in important investments. CBO says that will have a negative economic impact over the next couple of years. So it is not surprising that they don't want that information provided as part of this analysis.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1874 and to explain to my Republican colleagues why their tax policies have not worked and will not work to produce economic growth and jobs.

I am a scientist who has spent over 20 years at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory conducting research and a successful businessman before that, and a scientist proceeds on the basis of facts. The historical facts on Republican tax policies are clear.

Tax policies during the Clinton years, predicted by the Republicans to restrict economic growth, in fact generated the strongest uninterrupted period of job growth in our lifetimes—over 22 million new American jobs in 8 years.

Then the Bush tax cuts enacted in 2001 reversed those policies, and in the following 8 years, the net number of new jobs was essentially zero—actually, slightly negative. Twenty million Americans entered the workforce during the Bush years, and the Republican

policies produced zero net jobs for them, opening up a jobs gap of over 20 million jobs, a jobs gap that we are still closing today.

So to the extent that there is a causal link between tax policies and job creation, the data is clear: Republican policies have destroyed jobs and Democratic policies have created them.

I will now attempt to explain why this is and why the simplified macroeconomic modeling promoted by this legislation will fail to match the real world.

Generally speaking, Democratic tax breaks deliver benefits to the middle class while Republican tax breaks deliver benefits to the very wealthy, and, as it turns out, the very wealthy spend and invest their money very differently than the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, the macroeconomic models promoted in this legislation typically model our economy with a single aggregated consumer. Like the Republicans, they pretend that giving an extra dollar to a billionaire is no different than giving an extra dollar to a working class family. However, if you give an extra dollar to a middle class family, they will spend it in the local economy, increasing local economic growth, or they will invest it in some of the highest return investments available to anyone, investing in their children's college education or, perhaps, buying a second car so that their spouse can get a job.

Now, if you give that same dollar to a very wealthy individual, they will not change their spending habits because they are already spending as much as they feel like spending and this will not change, so there will be no local economic growth.

The investments of the very wealthy are also very different since they no longer have available to themselves the high-return investments available to the middle class. The very wealthy have already spent everything they can to send their children to the finest schools. They already have seven Cadillacs in their garages. So the marginal investments of the wealthy are intrinsically less productive due to the basic principle of economics known as the "law of diminishing returns."

Since economic growth is equal to investments times return on investment—sorry about the equation—the economic growth from channeling money to the wealthy is far less than the same relief being given to the middle class.

□ 1115

Democratic middle class policies are pro-growth policies, and Republican policies are not.

Mr. Chairman, there is also another important effect not captured by the single-consumer macroeconomic models in this legislation, which is the increasing propensity for wealthy people to move their money offshore.

If you give an extra dollar to wealthy people, they will turn it over to their

money managers, who look around for high yields and who will increasingly invest those dollars overseas, perhaps increasing the net worth of the wealthy investors but competing with and destroying American jobs. Had that same dollar been given in tax relief to middle class families, it would have been much more likely to stay in America.

So, in the real world, Republican policies trickle down, but they trickle down to jobs in China, and that is why the Bush tax cuts have generated zero jobs in the 8 years after having been enacted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee and an individual who knows well the imperative of reforming the budget process.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the vice chair of the Budget Committee for bringing this bill forward and for his hard work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is really pretty simple. It will help Members understand how legislation affects the economy. Under current law, the CBO doesn't have to provide that kind of big picture analysis. It usually assumes the economy will stay the same no matter how much in government taxes is spent. Think about that. We all know that that is not true. People respond to incentives. Federal policy changes the economy, and under this administration, the economy has consistently failed to meet expectations.

This is the chart that the CBO has shown over the years where they have consistently lowered their economic outlook. This has had a huge effect on our budget, and it has made balancing the budget that much harder. Traditionally, our economy has grown at about 3 percent a year, but over the past 4 years, it has grown only by 2 percent a year. It has grown less than half the average rate of other recoveries since World War II. The labor force participation rate has fallen to 63 percent. That is close to the lowest level in over 35 years. There are 10.5 million Americans who are now unemployed, and 7.2 million Americans are working part time for economic reasons. Those who are working have seen meager growth in their wages. The typical household income for families has actually declined. In fact, it is at the lowest level since 1995.

This weak recovery isn't something that just happened to us. It is not just by accident. It is clear that now that we are 5 years into this that the President's policies are weighing down the

economy and are hurting the budget outlook.

The Congressional Budget Office now expects us to take in much less revenue, and that makes it much harder to balance the budget because of this poor economy. Since just last year, the baseline deficit has grown by \$1.2 trillion. The top line shows you last year's estimate, and the bottom red line shows you this year's estimate. Just from last year's estimate of where the economy was heading to this year's estimate of where the economy is heading by the Congressional Budget Office, it tells us there will be \$1.2 trillion in more deficits because of these failed economic policies.

We want to stop the failure. We want to get this economy growing. The CBO knows that if you actually have a better policy that actually grows the economy, you will help the budget outlook, and you will help get people back to work. You will help increase take-home pay. Just as a weak economy can drag us into the red, a good budget can push the economy forward. That is why Members need to know this before they vote on legislation. They need to know what the world might look like under a new law. It is common sense to ask how legislation will affect the economy.

This bill requires the CBO to give Members just that estimate. We are asking the CBO to give the same kind of analysis that we use in our own budget. In an analysis provided by the CBO, they find the deficit reduction like we are proposing will help the economy grow. In 2024, economic output will be 1.8 percent higher per person than it otherwise would be. That is about \$1,100 per person. That is a pretty crucial piece of information. So we are adding to the toolkit. We are not taking anything away.

To the criticism I am hearing from others that, gosh, you are not doing this on every piece of legislation, you need to do this for the appropriations process, do you have any idea how many thousands of estimates come from the Appropriations Committee? If you actually gummed up the works like that, you would bring this place and the estimating agencies to a screeching halt. That is why there is an important threshold that is for significant pieces of legislation, legislation that is a quarter a point of the economy or higher, so that we can be well informed on big pieces of fiscal policy and so that we don't gum up the works and bring this agency and this institution to a screeching halt.

We think this hits the fine balance between the two. We think it is important that Members of Congress have a sense of how their votes will be affecting the economy. That is only common sense, and I urge the adoption of this bill.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for actually bringing this to our attention.

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

Just to respond to the last point of the chairman of the Budget Committee with respect to the appropriations process, as I indicated earlier, this bill specifically exempts those pieces of legislation even if they meet the threshold with respect to the other legislation in here.

Again, it is, perhaps, not surprising. I think the American public knows that we have a short-term budget agreement, the Murray-Ryan agreement, but if you look at the budget that Republicans in Congress are proposing, it calls for a 24 percent cut to the current services in the recent bipartisan legislation over a 10-year period.

Let's just take one category of investments—in our kids. That means about an \$18 billion cut in early education. It means about an \$80 billion cut in K-12 education. It means about a \$205 billion cut in current policy higher education. It calls for charging college students higher interest rates for the period of time when they are in college. That raises about \$40 billion at a time when that same budget doesn't ask for anything from the highest-income individuals and doesn't raise one penny to reduce the deficit from closing special interest tax breaks.

So it is no surprise to me that they would want to exclude the economic impacts of those investments that they are dramatically cutting. As I said earlier, the CBO, in its most recent analysis of the House Republican budget, says it will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. It is very interesting that they don't want that quantified with respect to the appropriations bills. At the same time our Republican colleagues are saying they want more information, they specifically limit the information to certain areas.

The other thing I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, is immigration reform. We want the CBO to give us an analysis, when they have a specific bill, so they can determine the economic benefit and the impact of it. That is a good thing, and the CBO has done that for immigration reform. In fact, of all of the pieces of legislation that are before this House right now, one of the things that could have the most immediate economic growth benefit is the bipartisan immigration bill before this House.

The Congressional Budget Office has looked at that. They say that will generate a lot more economic activity. In fact, they say, over year 10, it will actually boost economic growth by 5 percent compared to what it would otherwise be. They say it will reduce the deficit in this 10-year window by almost \$200 billion and, in the 20-year window, by almost \$1 trillion. That is an analysis that we all should benefit from.

Interestingly, while that would provide great economic growth, based on CBO reports, and when Democrats the

other night proposed an amendment in the House Budget Committee to adopt that bipartisan immigration reform bill which would generate economic growth, all of our Republican colleagues voted "no." We want more information—the more the better—but it needs to be information that the economists say they can usefully provide us.

I get back to the fact that, when it comes to the tax reform proposal, for example, that Chairman CAMP put in, they said that they couldn't narrow it down to one answer. They gave eight different models based on different assumptions. Our Republican colleagues are trying to say to professional economists, We really don't care what you say; you come up with a particular answer. Whereas, we think we should be asking for information in every case where it can be plausibly provided. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues don't want it everywhere it can be plausibly provided because they specifically exclude the economic benefit of important investments in our economy and jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a very productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is whether we are going to continue to ignore the economic consequences of the major actions that we take or whether we are going to start recognizing that incentives matter and that the legislation we pass has profound economic consequences that must be taken into account.

Why does Amsterdam have the narrowest houses on Earth? It is because they tax by street frontage.

Incentives matter.

What happens to our revenues if we tax all of a person's \$100,000 income? The static scoring on which we now exclusively depend says that that would raise us \$100,000, but we all know the correct answer is that we would raise zero dollars because that person now has no incentive to work.

Macroeconomics gives us tools to anticipate the real-world effect of major policy changes, and we ought not to be blind to them. It is not perfect, but it comes far closer to the mark than does a static model that assumes that people are mindless automatons whose behavior never varies despite major changes in the economic environment that our laws create.

This measure doesn't presume to tell the CBO how to do its job or what formula to use in its analysis. We will still get all of the static scoring the same as before, but on major legislation that greatly impacts the overall economy, this bill says: give us the complete picture. If a proposal is going to affect the economy by more than a quarter percent for good or ill, then

tell us. Tell us what you think, and show us why you think so.

For too long, Congress has blundered from one economic policy to another with its eyes wide shut, and it is time we got the complete picture and took into account the real-world consequences of our actions.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I really want to thank the vice chairman of our Budget Committee for his leadership in trying to continually protect the working family budget from the onslaught of the Federal budget.

I am a little bit in disbelief, Mr. Chairman, from what I hear on the floor. Rarely has there been a more commonsense bill that has come to this floor. It simply says two things. As we make important legislative decisions in this body, we should have more information instead of less, and we should think longer term as opposed to shorter term. Yet it is opposed by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I am somewhat incredulous. I would say, if my Democratic colleagues don't want the information, maybe they don't have to pay attention to the information. I have heard, Well, not all of the information I want is going to come from this particular piece of legislation. I would encourage the distinguished gentleman from Maryland to encourage his staff to provide him then with the information that he wants.

What is really important here, Mr. Chairman, is that we understand in an economy in which millions of our fellow countrymen are unemployed or are underemployed how major pieces of legislation will impact the economy and their hopes, their dreams, their aspirations as they lay awake at night, wondering how they are going to make ends meet. I just wonder if one of the reasons that our Democratic colleagues are opposing this bill is that they know the Congressional Budget Office has now told us that ObamaCare is going to cost this economy 2.5 million jobs that otherwise we would have had.

□ 1130

What if we had that information before the bill instead of after the bill? Maybe the crown jewel would not have appeared.

So maybe they don't want the American people or Members of Congress to have that information, but the American people deserve this information, and we demand it on their behalf.

We need to support this commonsense bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing our Republican colleagues say they want the "complete picture" and "more information is better than less." We agree. This is why it is so interesting, that they specifically exclude information based on bills that come out of the Appropriations Committee that call for investments in our economy and in areas that can help promote job growth.

They say they want more information, but their bill says they want it only in one area and not in another.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I guess I am not surprised, given the fact that the budget that the Republicans just voted out of the Budget Committee and expect to be on the floor next week makes dramatic, historic cuts to important investments that this country has made in the past. In fact, it is 40 percent below the lowest investments as a share of the economy we have made since the 1950s.

This country has been able to compete and has been an economic powerhouse, in part, because of the great investments we have made as a Nation in important areas like science, research, infrastructure, and education; and yet Republicans want to exclude that in this bill.

Again, it is not surprising because the Congressional Budget Office, the very entity that they say they want to provide us this analysis, has said, over the next couple of years, their budget is going to slow down the economy and economic growth, in part, because of the deep cuts they make in this one area of budget that they don't want this information about. Surprise, surprise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from the State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished ranking member and the manager of this bill.

I want to associate myself with Mr. VAN HOLLEN's analysis and add some other thoughts.

We are on the floor today, April 4, and might I make mention of two points that are not particularly related, but I do want to, again, acknowledge the men and women at Fort Hood, Texas.

I was there in 2009 to mourn with those families. Today, I mourn as well with those families whose loved ones have lost their lives and those who suffer. It is important for us as a Nation to be responsive to their needs. I know that we will do so in a bipartisan manner.

I also want to make mention that today is the date of the assassination of one of the greatest peacemakers in the world, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Besides his concern for those who did not have equal rights, he was also an

economist, to the extent that his advocacy was to extinguish poverty.

The last days of his life were spent planning the Poor People's March in 1968 to raise incomes and the quality of life of men and women across America.

So I raise the question of where we are in 2014. This is not a conversation that we easily engage with our friends on the other side of the aisle.

As you are passing the budget resolution, the process that you are in, to my knowledge, there was no effort to include an increase to the minimum wage.

There was no effort to ensure that 164,000 persons in the State of Texas would get an unemployment insurance extension, thereby ceasing them from losing their homes or being evicted from their rental properties or literally not being able to support their families.

Now, we have on the floor of the House legislation that simply exacerbates the circumstance of those who are aspiring to be in the middle class. It is a push toward dynamic scoring.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the microeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen and continue to pop up everywhere. In fact, it was even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the supercommittee, which, by the way, with no condemnation, did not work. It could not get a common ground.

You would wonder why Republicans are pushing this dynamic scoring bill. It is because they claim the traditional cost estimates prepared by the CBO are not enough, when we have used the Congressional Budget Office for decades, and it has been an effective tool to balance between revenue and tax.

So you wonder why the dynamic scoring comes in because it breaks the backs of poor people and the middle class.

We believe that it is simply an attempt to force Congress and the CBO to accept this concept of dynamic scoring and promote the efforts of the Republicans to, again, give more tax cuts.

We know that tax cuts did not work. In the good intentions of the Bush administration, those tax cuts put us in the predicament we are in, after leaving the Clinton administration with a billion-dollar surplus and the ability to invest in infrastructure.

I remember the smiles on those citizens during that timeframe that the economy was turning.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In the context of this particular legislation, a budget bill led by Mr. RYAN has now given a \$200,000 tax cut already to those who hold most of the wealth, but yet cutting Medicaid and cutting food stamps to give an opportunity for soldiers' families to be able to eat.

I am against this bill because I think CBO has an effective structure to give

us the information we need, and cutting taxes is not going to move America forward to be the greatest Nation in the world with research, with infrastructure rebuild, education, and good health care.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1874, The Pro-Growth Budget Act of 2013.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chairman, this bill could very well be entitled the Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Champions Act, because that's in essence what's going on here.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen, and continues to pop up everywhere; in fact, even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the Super Committee.

Dynamic scoring finds its roots in the anti-tax movement. Dynamic scoring is problematic for the agencies that score and estimate the cost of legislation, and has been soundly rejected.

It is clear from the bill's language and approach that it is designed to make it easier to enact deficit-increasing tax cuts.

The bill requires CBO to produce supplementary estimates of the economic impact of major bills using dynamic scoring, an approach that involves more uncertainty and subjectivity than current scoring rules.

None other than Former Republican Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle opposed moving to dynamic scoring, noting that CBO "generally have done a better job than some of the dynamic score-keeping. That has been part of the challenge of moving to something called dynamic scoring is that we have not found anything that was any more accurate than the current way."

Believers in dynamic scoring argue that tax cuts pay for themselves, generally by spurring so much economic growth, to the extent that revenues will actually increase. If I didn't know any better, Mr. Chairman, I'd think they were talking to us about trickle-down economics.

Mr. Chairman, where have we heard that before?

I recall that the Bush administration attempted to impose the use of dynamic scoring to estimate the cost of its tax cuts, asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue enough to pay for themselves, sort of a trickle-down form of budgeting.

Unfortunately Mr. Chairman, the Bush tax cuts did no such thing, but instead caused our national debt to explode. My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) administers several programs to support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone program.

The HUBZone program is a small business federal contracting assistance program

"whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities."

It provides participating small businesses located in areas with low income, high poverty rates, or high unemployment rates with contracting opportunities in the form of "set-asides," sole-source awards, and price-evaluation preferences.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the federal government awarded contracts valued at \$12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about \$3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program.

Mr. Chairman, that's the gist of my amendment—job creation—because that's what we should be talking about in this Committee today.

The Budget Committee has held hearings on the general topic of budget process reform and the recommendations crossed party lines. Former Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness, testified that, "It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used."

Similarly, Dr. Philip Joyce, former Congressional Budget Office (CBO) staff member and a Democratic witness, testified that "My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox. If the goal is to deal with the larger fiscal imbalance that faces us, the most important thing to do is to make use of them, not search for more tools."

Mr. Chairman, dynamic scoring is the wrong tool at the wrong time—though—in the interest of fairness to the small businesses in distressed communities around this country, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, even though I have serious reservations about dynamic scoring.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for this commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, to hear the debate on the floor this morning about Mr. RYAN's budget, you would think that we are arguing about increases or decreases in taxes, but indeed, we are debating more information to make informed decisions, Mr. Chairman. It has nothing to do with those.

There will be a time to debate the new budget, but this is about job creation, Mr. Chairman. This is about the CBO and the flawed method—many times—that they use in preparing documents for us to make informed decisions.

I will give you a prime example. We had CBO come in and talk to us about energy policy. I said: Well, if we start to tax some of our natural resources so that we can lower gas prices for those people that are having to fill their tanks and having to make decisions between food on the table and gas in their tank, if we tap that, what would be the impact?

They say: Oh, well, you would get a negative CBO score. I said: Well, how

could that be? Because, if we had revenues from that, it would create \$1.7 trillion over 10 years; and yet what we have somehow is a justification. He says: Well, we are making the assumption that you have already tapped that.

As a business guy, when you have that kind of logic, you can't make correct decisions.

This is about job growth, Mr. Chairman. We lost 400 jobs in the last 48 hours in my district. That is 400 families that are going to have to start to worry about putting food on the table.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get behind this and have informed decisions so that we can make good decisions on legislation going forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just ask one more time, if our Republican colleagues want information to make informed decisions, why did they specifically exclude one whole category of information based on legislation coming out of the Appropriations Committee to make some important investments that can help our economy grow? They say they want all this additional information, but apparently, they didn't.

Again, I say it is not surprising because some of the changes that the Republican budget makes in that area do, according to the Congressional Budget Office, create a drag on the economy in the coming few years.

So, again, you are going to have an amendment later on offered by Mr. CONNOLLY—and he will talk about that point—to find out if our Republican colleagues really do want full information, but at least in the current form of this bill, they don't.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank Congressman PRICE and the Budget Committee for their hard work in trying to give Members of this body better information.

Families and small businesses back home didn't need to read today's jobs report to know that this isn't the strong recovery they deserve. They know that, with Washington's \$17 trillion of debt, it isn't hard to see why our economy isn't creating enough jobs.

Hoosiers understand the problems, but they wonder if Washington even cares.

Republicans owe taxpayers a clear plan to tackle the debt and jumpstart the economy with private sector job growth. That is why my colleagues and I are offering a commonsense reform to Washington's broken budget process.

We have to force the Federal Government to take an honest look at how its policies affect Americans struggling in this real economy. It is not too late to save the American Dream from a future of debt and decline, but we have to do that work now.

We owe taxpayers a clear vision for how we can force Washington to stop spending money we don't have and make ends meet without raising taxes. That starts with reforms like the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a senior member of the House Republican Conference.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As an original cosponsor, I am very grateful to Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE for his insight and leadership on this very important issue.

It is no secret that Washington's budget process is broken. The over \$17 trillion debt jeopardizes our national fiscal security and threatens future opportunities for our children and grandchildren.

I appreciate House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's work to produce a path forward that restores prosperity and makes substantial reductions to our debt over the next 10 years.

For far too long, Congress has passed bills without a full understanding of how policies will affect jobs and our economy. The Congressional Budget Office, the body we as lawmakers depend upon to provide fiscal and economic impacts of all legislation, has a bad track record of providing accurate information due to a significant loop-hole.

House Republicans have made meaningful strides in restoring fiscal accountability and responsibility back to Washington. We recognize, as the Lexington County Chronicle promotes, it is the taxpayers' money, not money the government allows citizens to hold temporarily.

Providing the CBO with the necessary toolkit to determine a bill's potential fiscal impacts on every aspect of our economy is a step in the right direction.

Take ObamaCare, for example. Seeing its failed implementation, which has destroyed jobs, proves we must see how a law will impact American job creators and the way families spend hard-earned paychecks.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and give CBO the likely consequences that may occur.

□ 1145

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

The CBO provides lots of information right now. I hope all Members of Congress will take advantage of the information they provide.

We have now heard, for the second time today, that the Affordable Care Act has cost the economy jobs. Well, the CBO looked at that. They studied

it. They gave the Congress information just like our colleagues are asking for. They didn't say that it had any negative job impact at all right now. Now, they said, in the outyears, that now that people are able to go into exchanges to afford health care, that people may decide to not go to a job where the job had been the only way to get taxpayer-benefited health care.

Under our current system, if you want a tax benefit for your health care, if you want preferential tax treatment on your health care, where do you go? You go to a job. That is where the tax benefit comes from. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, people now can get a tax credit and go into the exchange. So they can decide to launch a business from their home and get health insurance without having been locked into another job which had been the only place where they got tax-benefited health care.

So I encourage my colleagues to read the CBO reports that have already been issued on the Affordable Care Act. I also urge them to read the CBO reports that have already been issued on the recovery bill because the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that, as a result of the recovery bill, the economy actually saved millions of jobs, that that helped the economy from falling farther and farther.

Remember, when President Obama was sworn in, we were losing 800,000 jobs every month, and the recovery bill helped stop that free fall and turned that around. That is what the Congressional Budget Office said, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

So it is great our colleagues are asking the Congressional Budget Office for more information, and we welcome that. It would be great if they read the information the Congressional Budget Office has already issued.

I just want to make one final point, Mr. Chairman. I have made it before, but it is important because we keep saying we want more information, more complete information, and if you read this legislation, it says that. Then it says: except. We want information except. We don't want any information on the job impact of those parts of our budget that invest in jobs and our economy, like R&D at places like NIH, National Institutes of Health, like our kids' education. We want all the information, but don't tell us about the benefits of those investments.

And I wonder why. It is because the Republican budget slashes our investments in those areas. So don't tell us about the impact of that, Congressional Budget Office.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013.

I thank Dr. PRICE for his leadership on this issue.

Now, this issue may strike many Americans as somewhat arcane, but it has very important and real-world implications for our Nation's economic growth, for job creation, and for wage levels.

Under current law, when legislation is introduced, our Budget Office is prevented from taking into account how individual Americans will actually respond to that legislative proposal; so our Budget Office has to produce this artificial sort of analysis, failing to accurately estimate the true costs or benefits of a given proposal. This obscures, for policymakers, for members of the media, and for many rank-and-file Americans, the true negative impact that tax hikes can have on our Nation's economy, on the private sector, and so forth; and it fails to recognize how tax cuts can actually stimulate the very work, savings, and investment that lead to jobs, higher wages, and a secure retirement.

So the Price bill takes an important first step to eliminating CBO's unrealistic economic analysis by requiring CBO to apply real-world analysis of the impact a proposal will have on our Nation's economy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who will be offering an amendment a little bit later.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Maryland.

Listening to the debate on the floor, one feels one is living out an "Alice in Wonderland" chapter. My friends on the other side of the aisle continue to repeat their orthodoxy that slashing taxes and slashing spending leads to prosperity. We went down that road in spades under the previous President's administration, President Bush's, and it led to the most ruinous economic performance since the Great Depression.

Now they want to sell us a budget, once again, that slashes \$5 trillion in this investment. This is actually disinvesting in America. It is disinvesting in research and development. It is disinvesting in human capital. It is disinvesting in education. It is disinvesting in infrastructure.

We are handing over our future with this budget and this philosophy to our world competitors, and somebody is going to have to stand on this floor 20 years hence and explain to that generation how a great Congress handed over the country's future to foreign competition.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of a commonsense budget proposal, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2014.

This bill is genius. It is simple and it is darn important. It requires the Congressional Budget Office to analyze the

macroeconomic impacts of major bills before they pass Congress. What a concept. This tool will give Congress and the American people a real-world picture of how the laws we pass impact our economy before we pass them.

Current law requires CBO to provide Congress with information from fantasyland on the fiscal impact of legislation. There is no requirement to stay in our world and analyze the economic impact of legislation, of jobs.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that such scoring is impossible, yet they proudly tout that CBO used a macroeconomic analysis in its report on the impact of the Senate's immigration bill last year. They left fantasyland, joined our world. Welcome.

The more information we have about the economic impacts of bills, the better decisions we can make. Mr. Chairman, a simple but important policy change like this will help get our economy back on track, create jobs, protect hardworking Americans, and keep us in their world.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I was glad the last speaker mentioned the CBO report on immigration reform. I just wish that, if they really wanted to have a pro-growth policy, they would adopt the bipartisan immigration legislation that the CBO wrote about, because what the CBO report said was that would be a great boost to economic growth in our country. It would create more jobs. It would create more economic activity. As I said, because it would generate more economic activity and more pro-growth revenue, it would actually reduce the deficit over the next 10 years by \$190 billion, and almost a trillion over 20. So, great.

I haven't really heard a response to this, Mr. Chairman, but we want more information. CBO does reports all the time. But they have this big except. We want more information, except we don't want information about this part of our budget that deals with important investment in our future.

As Mr. CONNOLLY said, a lot of our economic competitors have been copying successful models from the United States. For example, the Chinese are trying to hire more scientists in the areas of biomedical research, yet the Republican budget, if you apply it across the board, cut 24 percent—cut—over the next 10 years from the amount for research at NIH that was in the Ryan-Murray document. Again, not surprising they don't want the Congressional Budget Office to look in detail at that.

When the Congressional Budget Office looked at the budget that just came out of the Budget Committee the other night, which will be on the floor next week, they said, over the next couple of years, these fiscal policies would reduce output and employment

below the levels projected in CBO's baseline—translation: it would reduce economic activity and reduce job growth over the next couple of years.

So, again, not surprising that in the legislation before us, pro-growth budgeting, our Republican colleagues don't want the CBO to tell us about the pro-growth benefits of those important investments.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, and I thank Dr. PRICE for his leadership on this issue.

This simple legislation would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a full analysis of major legislation so that we know how bills will impact our economy and our Nation's employment.

It appears today that Democrat opposition to this bill seems to indicate their satisfaction with the anemic job growth, a historic \$17 trillion debt and growing, no attempt to balance our budget, and devastation of the middle class.

Before Congress even considers passing another legislative overhaul like the Dodd-Frank or stimulus or the President's health care law, let's understand exactly how these thousand-page bills will impact our economy and potentially result in lost jobs and lost futures.

As we craft fiscal policy to get our economy back on track and improve the livelihoods of our constituents, I would ask my colleagues: Is it better for us to have more information or less? understanding or ignorance? reality or spin?

Supporting the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act is a commonsense step that will help us judge the long-term impact of legislation, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in support.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

It is time to end the budget games in Washington, D.C., and this bill is one way to bring more accountability and more honest budgeting to Washington.

Four years ago, when the President's health care law was passed, it included a number of budget gimmicks so that it appeared to be cheaper than it really

was. The gimmicks included collecting premiums for 10 years but only paying benefits for 5, delaying some provisions to the year 11, 12, or 13.

We need commonsense budgeting, like the rest of America has to budget. The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act simply allows the Congressional Budget Office to take a policy proposal and measure its impact on future growth. And understand, that also means future generations. That way we can tell if it is a good or a bad policy and make more informed decisions. Some people really don't want to do that.

This bill is about doing what is right for the next generation. No more passing the buck. Let's bring realistic budgeting and accountability to Washington, D.C. Let's pass this bill today.

□ 1200

The CHAIR. The Chair wishes to make a clarification on the time remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I know I sound like a broken record. Our colleagues keep saying they want more information, but the bill specifically excludes a major portion of information.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill. Dynamic scoring, as contemplated in this legislation, is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a desperate attempt to revive a failed theory of trickle-down economics that has been widely discredited by academics but, more importantly, has been discredited in practice.

Let's just look at a side-by-side comparison: Eight years under Bill Clinton, he raises the top tax rate to 39.6 percent, and 20.3 million jobs were created. George Bush comes into office. He lowers the top tax rate from 39.6 percent to 35 percent, and what happens? Did the economy grow? Did the rich invest more in the economy? Does the economy take off? No. We lose 650,000 jobs. A side-by-side comparison.

Dynamic scoring is just designed to revive a theory that has hurt the American people when put into practice by a Republican Congress and George Bush.

We should be investing in job training, investing in education, investing in transportation and infrastructure, investing in research and development, and investing in technology and innovation. Instead of trying to promote progress for the greatest number of Americans possible, this budget, this bill, this Republican majority is simply trying to protect prosperity for the few. And that is why we should reject this bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have to admit, I am puzzled. All this bill does is say that Members of Congress ought to have more information about the decisions that we are making here on behalf of the American people, not less. That is a pretty simple concept in the real world. Only here in Washington do we not want more information. I guess we want to stick our heads in the sand.

The gentleman who just spoke said that this bill's purpose is to trot out and continue to put in place a failed theory.

This bill doesn't do anything about the outcome of the results that CBO would give us under this bill. We don't game the system at all. What we do is want the Congressional Budget Office to give us more information. If the gentleman is correct, then that is the information that we will get. Why would he not want more information?

What else has been said here this morning, Mr. Chairman? We had a scientist take the floor and say that he was against using more information. A scientist.

As a physician, I can tell you that I never met an individual—any of my medical colleagues—who didn't want all of the information that they could get. In fact, that is what happens in the real world. In families and in communities and in businesses, people want as much information as they can so that they can make wise decisions. And that is what this bill would do, give us more information so that hopefully, hopefully Congress would be able to make more wise decisions.

I will tell you, I am puzzled by the gentleman from Maryland who stands up over and over and talks about the benefits of dynamic scoring on a particular piece of legislation that he supports. But then he doesn't want dynamic scoring or a macroeconomic analysis of legislation on anything else, just what he supports. You talk about being duplicitous, Mr. Chairman. I am telling you.

The gentleman from Maryland keeps talking about slower growth in the budget that we are going to be talking about next week, and he always adds "over the next few years" because he doesn't want to talk about the out-years, where the growth explodes, and we have that pro-growth economy and getting people back to work and the jobs that are going to be created.

So, Mr. Chairman, this really is pretty doggone simple. Either we want more information or we don't. Republicans in this House at this point want more information. In fact, in the Senate, a piece of legislation that is similar to this—asking for macroeconomic analysis, offered by Senator PORTMAN—was voted on in a bipartisan way. The Senate, in a bipartisan way, supported that amendment.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to stand up today and say to the American people, yes, we want more information, so that, hopefully,

we are able to make more wise decisions. And I urge adoption of the underlying piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chair, as chair of the Committee on Rules, I submit my exchange of letters with the chair of the Committee on the Budget regarding the provisions that warranted a referral of H.R. 1874 to the Committee on Rules.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 27, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: On June 19, 2013, the Committee on the Budget ordered reported H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1874. In addition, the Committee on Rules reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Rules for conferees on H.R. 1874 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, August 27, 2013.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013, which the Committee on the Budget ordered reported on June 19, 2013.

I acknowledge that certain provisions in this legislation are in your Committee's jurisdiction. I appreciate your decision to facilitate prompt consideration of the bill by the full House. I understand that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Rules is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Per your request, I will include a copy of our exchange of letters with respect to H.R. 1874 in the Congressional Record during House consideration of this bill. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill, and the amendment in part

A of House Report 113-400, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows.

H.R. 1874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION

"SEC. 407. (a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—The Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each major bill or resolution reported by any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations of each House), as a supplement to estimates prepared under section 402, a macroeconomic impact analysis of the budgetary effects of such bill or resolution for the ten fiscal-year period beginning with the first fiscal year for which an estimate was prepared under section 402 and each of the next three ten fiscal-year periods. The Director shall submit to such committee the macroeconomic impact analysis, together with the basis for the analysis. As a supplement to estimates prepared under section 402, all such information so submitted shall be included in the report accompanying such bill or resolution.

"(b) ECONOMIC IMPACT.—The analysis prepared under subsection (a) shall describe the potential economic impact of the applicable major bill or resolution on major economic variables, including real gross domestic product, business investment, the capital stock, employment, interest rates, and labor supply. The analysis shall also describe the potential fiscal effects of the bill or resolution, including any estimates of revenue increases or decreases resulting from changes in gross domestic product. To the extent practicable, the analysis should use a variety of economic models in order to reflect the full range of possible economic outcomes resulting from the bill or resolution. The analysis (or a technical appendix to the analysis) shall specify the economic and econometric models used, sources of data, relevant data transformations, and shall include such explanation as is necessary to make the models comprehensible to academic and public policy analysts.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'macroeconomic impact analysis' means—

"(A) an estimate of the changes in economic output, employment, interest rates, capital stock, and tax revenues expected to result from enactment of the proposal;

"(B) an estimate of revenue feedback expected to result from enactment of the proposal; and

"(C) a statement identifying the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate;

"(2) the term 'major bill or resolution' means any bill or resolution if the gross budgetary effects of such bill or resolution for any fiscal year in the period for which an estimate is prepared under section 402 is estimated to be greater than .25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for any such fiscal year;

"(3) the term 'budgetary effect', when applied to a major bill or resolution, means the

changes in revenues, outlays, deficits, and debt resulting from that measure; and

“(4) the term ‘revenue feedback’ means changes in revenue resulting from changes in economic growth as the result of the enactment of any major bill or resolution.”.

“(d) LEGISLATION WITH REVENUE PROVISIONS.—The macroeconomic analysis described in subsection (c) shall rely on macroeconomic analysis prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation for any provisions of such legislation that are described in section 201(f). For legislation consisting solely of provisions described in section 201(f), the macroeconomic analysis described in subsection (c) shall be prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 406 the following new item:

“Sec. 407. Macroeconomic impact analysis of major legislation.”.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-400.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike “(except the Committee on Appropriations of each House)”.

Page 3, line 18, before the comma, insert “or as a standalone analysis in the case of the Committee on Appropriations of each House”.

Page 5, lines 13 through 15, strike “.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for any such fiscal year;” and insert “\$1,000,000,000 for any such fiscal year;”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, I listened to my friend from Georgia, and Lord Almighty, do I agree with him. We should have all that information available to us on dynamic scoring, including—and I assume the gentleman will support my amendment—to correct what must have been a mistake in the Republican majority’s bill on page 3. Because knowing my friend’s commitment to full information available to the public and Mem-

bers of Congress, I can’t imagine line 16 got it right. It must have been a typo because it says here, yes, dynamic scoring by CBO, except—except the Committee on Appropriations of each house.

Think about what that means, Mr. Chairman. Every single appropriations bill, the entire funding of the Federal Government, is exempted. I thought my friends wanted full disclosure. I thought they wanted full information.

I heard my friend talk about the parallel with the medical profession. No doctor wants to be deprived of key information when making a key decision about a patient, a client. It could be life-and-death. Well, it is no less than here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that in response to my friend from Georgia, I have a simple but important amendment to ensure that the broader economic analysis required by the bill is applied equally to all congressional actions. The bill, as currently drafted, as I said, it exempts all appropriations bills.

Now, I know some of my friends on the other side of the aisle don’t want to acknowledge this, but funding basic research, making transportation improvements, and purchasing ships for the Navy, to name just a few examples in which we invest taxpayer money, have a stimulative effect on the economy. For example, it is estimated that 28,000 construction jobs are created with every \$1 billion we invest in transportation infrastructure. In addition, the Federal Government spent \$13 billion over the past 25 years supporting the Human Genome Project. That \$13 billion Federal investment, it is estimated, had a receipt to it of \$780 billion, and counting.

We have arrived at the point, Mr. Chairman, sometimes in our debate here on the floor, where we know the cost of everything but the value of nothing. Investments have returns on them.

Whatever the cost of the Internet, which originally started out as entirely a Federal investment, DARPA/NET, whatever that cost, it was worth every penny because the return on it has been transformative throughout the globe.

Dwight D. Eisenhower’s decision to invest in infrastructure in the interstate highway system, whatever its cost, is a gift that keeps on giving. Its returns continue to this day, and it has helped America.

Let’s not disinvest in America, and let’s make sure we do have full dynamic scoring for all appropriations bills in the spirit that my friend from Georgia has laid down.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

COLE), a senior member of both the Appropriations and the Budget Committees.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If I did not know my friend from Virginia as well as I do, I would have thought I had detected a little sense of sarcasm in his remarks, but, frankly, I know that is not the case. I know it is a sincere proposal.

I must say, though, as chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations, which has jurisdiction over the CBO, I am pretty familiar with its operations, its resources, and its capabilities, and the simple fact of the matter is that the amendment would create an unsustainable amount of work for the CBO for no benefit in new or additional information to the Congress of the United States. By arbitrarily picking \$1 billion as the threshold for the analysis, this amendment would force CBO to conduct analyses on dozens of additional bills.

CBO Director Elmendorf wrote to Chairman RYAN yesterday to explain the limits of their capability and capacity. Let me quote from his letter:

The CBO would not be able to perform the analyses envisioned by that set of amendments: We do not have the analytical capabilities or the level of staffing that would be needed to undertake and complete the tasks that would be assigned to us, nor would the usual timetable for considering legislation allow the time that would be required to complete such analyses, even if we did not face those analytical and staffing constraints.

The time that it would take the CBO to produce these additional estimates showing no discernible impact would delay Congress’ legislative work at both the committee level and on the floor. The simple fact is, the amendment is unworkable and ill-conceived, and I urge its rejection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that I have the utmost respect—and he knows it—of my friend from Oklahoma. No sarcasm was meant.

But he might forgive me for being shocked at a speech I took certainly at face value about the need for full information and then a carve-out explicitly in the law, the draft law, that exempts all appropriations.

Now, if my friend feels that it is too much work for the CBO with this threshold, then let’s name a threshold. But his threshold in this bill is zero. There will be no dynamic scoring by CBO on any appropriations. I think that is not serving the American people well. I don’t think that is full disclosure. I don’t think that is transparency in government. I don’t think that is good government. And I think that suggests we have something to hide around here. And I am sure that is not the message we intended to send.

That is the spirit of my amendment, full disclosure. And I am sorry if this

means that CBO has to work harder, but we need full disclosure for our citizenry. And that is what this amendment does.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-400.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike “, and labor supply” and insert “, labor supply, and State and local governments”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would direct the CBO to analyze the impact of our major bills here in Congress on some of the Nation's most critical institutions, our State and local governments, and State and local taxpayers.

The State Budget Crisis Task Force is cochaired by former Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York Richard Ravitch and the former Federal Reserve Board Chair Paul Volcker. They spent a great deal of time analyzing the impacts of what we do here on State and local governments and taxpayers.

What did they find? They found that fiscal stress runs downhill, and very often, local taxpayers are the recipient of that stress. Everything we do here in Congress, Mr. Chairman, or everything that we don't do has significant implications on broader levels of government and local taxpayers.

But no mechanism exists at all to assess the fiscal impact of Federal actions on those taxpayers. I am offering this amendment today because if we are going to analyze how our fiscal actions affect the economy, we need to make sure we are not just pushing off the hard decisions to local taxpayers.

Let me give you an example. The Republican budget, offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, cuts over \$50 billion from road repair and infrastructure investments.

□ 1215

And so the implication of that budget is that the Federal Government does

less but local taxpayers have to pay the bill to fill in the potholes. That is just fundamentally wrong. That is a wrong priority. We have to stop staying in this position where we are cutting taxes and spending here only to increase taxes and spending in our local communities. We can't keep pushing off these costs and the accompanying uncertainty surrounding this funding. That is why my amendment is so important, Mr. Chairman. It would tell us if we are actually being fiscally responsible at all levels, or are we simply moving costs from one level of government to the other?

I hope my friends will support this amendment. We all represent not just Federal taxpayers but local taxpayers, and we should protect the interests of both.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this truly is a great idea. There is no question that Congress ought to have more information about the legislation that we are going to consider and how it affects State and local governments. Far too often, we in Washington decide that we are smarter than everyone else and choose to impose burdens on those governments that are closer to the people.

Frankly, far too many of us here in Congress simply don't take the principle of federalism seriously. In fact, this is such a great idea that a Republican Congress passed it and a Democratic President signed it into law in 1995. It is called the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act or, more popularly, UMRA. This law requires CBO to analyze every piece of legislation for the burdens that it imposes on State and local governments.

Here is how CBO describes their work under the law:

In 1995, the UMRA was enacted to ensure that the Congress receives information, during the legislative process, about Federal mandates—requirements that would be imposed on State, local, and tribal governments and on entities in the private sector.

So, as with this amendment we are debating, the job is already done; and, as with the next amendment, the job is already done. The issue is already addressed. So I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the issue, but there is simply no need for the amendment, and, consequently, we will have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, two responses to my friend from Georgia:

Number one, the law that he cites does not analyze the impact of budget and tax decisions that we engage in here in Washington, D.C. So the gentleman's response, with all due respect, in the world, is wrong.

Secondly, I do find it ironic that this entire debate has focused on the critical need for more information. I have

heard my friends talk about the need for a complete picture; except when it comes to local taxpayers, we don't want that information, we don't need to see that picture, and we will continue to pass legislation and pass the bill to those local taxpayers.

So, for all the high-minded speeches that we hear from my friends about needing to protect the taxpayer, opposing this amendment essentially says to the taxpayer you foot the bill for the decisions we make here.

So we talk about cutting taxes and we put out our press releases and we pat ourselves on the back for cutting Federal taxes and cutting spending when what we are really doing is stabbing local taxpayers in the back with those decisions.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-400.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

“(c) JOBS IMPACT.—The analysis prepared under subsection (a) shall also, using analytical principles and procedures consistent with section 402, provide an estimate of the number of jobs which would be created, sustained, or lost in carrying out the applicable major bill or resolution in the fiscal year in which it is to become effective and in each of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, together with the basis for each such estimate, and to the extent practicable, the analysis shall include regional and State-level estimates of jobs that would be created, sustained, or lost.

Page 4, line 21, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the most important issue confronting our Nation today is the jobs crisis, something my constituents and I know all too well as my home State of Rhode Island continues to be plagued with the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, currently 9 percent.

While most Members would agree that the best way to address this jobs crisis is to pass legislation that gets

our economy growing more quickly, we clearly have different ideas on how best to achieve such growth. But we will have that important conversation in great detail next week as the House is scheduled to consider the Republican budget authored by Chairman RYAN and the substantive alternatives on the floor.

Today, however, we have before the House a bill that modifies the budget process. Specifically, this bill changes the rules that our independent umpire, the Congressional Budget Office, uses to determine the costs of implementing major pieces of legislation, defined as those impacting gross domestic product by more than approximately \$40 billion.

While your new rules would supplement—not replace—existing scoring rules, let's be clear, the macroeconomic impact analysis, or dynamic scoring process, that is called for under the bill is something my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle view with great apprehension and serious concern, as it relies upon much more uncertain and subjective analytical principles, procedures, and assumptions than what the Congressional Budget Office currently utilizes for scoring the costs of legislation.

So while my colleagues across the aisle pursue what they believe is an ideal set of scoring rules, I rise today with a proposal to give a more targeted and specific picture of the impact pending legislation will have on jobs in our communities.

The amendment I offer does not change your desired dynamic scoring analysis; it merely requires production of a separate estimate, using CBO's existing analytical principles and procedures, of the number of jobs that will be created, sustained, or lost, including regional- and State-level estimates when practicable, for the same proposals my colleagues wish to score using their preferred set of rules.

Keep in mind, this is not a partisan proposal. This amendment is derived from legislation, the Jobs Score Act, which I introduced along with Senator MANCHIN, and has received balanced, bipartisan support in both Chambers.

So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and help ensure that Members of Congress are fully prepared to conduct their due diligence and have the most complete understanding possible of how the major bills considered in Congress impact jobs in our communities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Rhode Island for bringing the amendment. He and I were elected in the same class together just 3 years ago, and I think we have been able to work together to make a difference in the short time that we have been here.

I share his commitment to making sure that we have jobs estimates coming out of legislation, which is why I am so proud that as drafted—as drafted—this bill, introduced by my friend from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, requires “employment and labor supply analysis” in subsection B.

Now, that is incredibly important, Mr. Chairman, because what we do in Washington absolutely has consequences, and what those consequences are is a fair subject of debate here in the Chamber. But today there is no mechanism for determining, again, employment and labor supply numbers on a dynamic basis over time recognizing what those actions are.

Now, my concern about the amendment from my friend is that, rather than scoring those jobs dynamically—again, understanding that for every action there is a reaction—it scores in a static methodology assuming that the government creates jobs, that there is anything at all that the government does that actually creates a job.

Now, we can redistribute the wealth, but short of putting someone on the Federal payroll, this amendment perpetuates the myth that the government is in the job-creation business. The government is absolutely in the job-destroying business, and we both work together on that facet, and we can make some decisions that help the private sector to succeed. It is those decisions, Mr. Chairman, that the bill, as drafted, will make sure are measured, recorded, and reported here on the House floor for the first time.

Again, I very much appreciate the intent of the gentleman to make sure that this Congress is focused like a laser on job creation, but scoring it as if the government is creating jobs instead of recognizing it is only our actions that the private sector is being impacted on that creates those jobs, I believe, would take what is a very good underlying bill and move it in the wrong direction.

With that, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, I thank my colleague for his kind words, but I think he is actually missing the point.

The dynamic scoring, in fact, does allow you to assess the employment impact, and, obviously, we think it does that through a tainted lens because such analysis will be subjective and uncertain, and we have made the arguments about dynamic scoring. But it doesn't impact that at all. That remains in the bill.

This simply adds a provision that would require an analysis be done under the traditional methods that the CBO uses. It will ensure that CBO conducts the same kind of analysis of jobs impact when using the static method currently used by CBO. And we can and should do both.

The fact of the matter is this is an opportunity to be sure that we have as much information as possible about the

impact of actions that we take on job creation, on the ability to sustain or cost jobs. In fact, providing this amendment will only ensure that that analysis happens in both places.

You have recognized in the underlying bill that jobs impact matters—we agree—but let's not limit that information. Let's be sure there is a jobs impact both in the static analysis that is done by CBO as well as in your new provision for dynamic scoring. Let's have an assessment in both of those side by side. It will provide a full picture of the potential range of likely employment effects in our communities. We certainly have a responsibility to understand that and to deal with as much information as we can about the impact on jobs.

There is no more urgent issue, and we have heard lots of conversations this morning about how important it is that we have good data, good information. This simply supplements that. Let's make sure that jobs analysis happens in both places at the CBO.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113-400.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

“(c) REPORTING ON ACCURACY OF MACROECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSES.—Upon completion of the fifth fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of any major bill or joint resolution for which the Congressional Budget Office prepared an analysis under subsection (a), the Congressional Budget Office shall report on the accuracy of the original macroeconomic impact analysis of such enacted bill or joint resolution and submit these reports to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Page 4, line 21, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward but one that I think is important to consider. Simply put, my

amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to review and report on the accuracy of dynamic scoring estimates 5 fiscal years after any dynamically scored bill is enacted.

Under H.R. 1874, very few pieces of legislation are likely to meet the threshold for requiring this type of macroeconomic analysis. However, as we have heard during this debate, the use of these estimates is controversial. There is a body of opinion that says that this type of scoring is legitimate, and there is a body of opinion that asserts that this type of scoring undermines the budget process and produces highly uncertain projections. My amendment would provide a way to follow up on estimates performed under H.R. 1874 and help shed light on whether those estimates, in fact, offered accurate data.

I will confess that I, for one, remain skeptical of dynamic scoring; but if we proceed in this vein and enact dynamic scoring, I think having the accountability put in place by having the CBO come back to Congress with information on whether the actual economic impact of certain legislation turns out to be, in fact, accurate would be very helpful in helping us assess whether or not this particular form of scoring is, in fact, legitimate and fact-based.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, although I don't oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I may claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the vice chairman for his time.

Looking at the amendment, it makes sense. It looks like the right thing to do. I think it is important that we always reassess these models to make sure that we are getting it right. People call this dynamic scoring. I like to call it reality-based scoring, and we always want to have a better measurement of reality. So I think the gentleman's amendment makes sense, and we would accept it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank the majority for accepting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time, as well.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113-400.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 23, insert the following:

“(d) HUBZONE.—The Director shall include in any macroeconomic impact analysis submitted pursuant to this section the impact, if any, of the applicable major bill or resolution on any historically underutilized business zone, as that term is defined in section 3(p)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(1)).”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with the spirit of cooperation and recognition that there are definitive distinctions and differences of opinion on the underlying legislation. I am trying to make this bill better.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, if this bill passes, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act. My amendment only seeks to look at the effects, should this measure pass, on HUBZones as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chairman, this bill could be entitled the “Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Act.” If that is the essence of the bill, we need to find the impact of it.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt measure that macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen. We want to know in the defined areas that deal with underserved areas all around America, in everyone's State, whether or not there is an impact on these important areas.

I believe that dynamic scoring has an impact on the outreach and the funding that we have to support the concept of a HUBZone, and therefore, my amendment is clear in its effort to make sure that those particular areas are in fact impacted.

The Small Business Administration administers several programs that support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone.

I recall that the Bush administration tried to use dynamic scoring to estimate the cost their tax cuts—asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue in sort of a trickle-down budgeting, but the question is, these smaller businesses that are attempting to thrive and impacted by Small Business Administration programs, how would this type of structure impact them.

The HUBZone program is a small business Federal contracting assistance program whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities.

That is an important responsibility, and it is an important goal for this Na-

tion because we know that small businesses can help generate any number of jobs; and the assistance, I know, personally, to small business has been effective and productive.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1874, The Pro-Growth Budget Act of 2013.

My amendment requires the Congressional Budget Office to include as part of their macroeconomic analysis, estimates of the potential impact, if any, on HUBZone areas as defined by the Small Business Act.

My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

In all actuality, Mr. Chair, this bill could very well be entitled the, Revenge of Dynamic Scoring Champions Act, because that's in essence what's going on here.

Dynamic scoring is an attempt to measure the macroeconomic effects of policy changes before they happen, and continues to pop up everywhere; in fact, even in negotiations of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the Super Committee.

Dynamic scoring finds its roots in the anti-tax movement. Dynamic scoring is problematic for the agencies that score and estimate the cost of legislation, and has been soundly rejected.

It is clear from the bill's language and approach that it is designed to make it easier to enact deficit-increasing tax cuts.

The bill requires CBO to produce supplementary estimates of the economic impact of major bills using dynamic scoring, an approach that involves more uncertainty and subjectivity than current scoring rules.

None other than Former Republican Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle opposed moving to dynamic scoring, noting that CBO “generally have done a better job than some of the dynamic score-keeping.”

That has been part of the challenge of moving to something called dynamic scoring is that we have not found anything that was any more accurate than the current way.”

Believers in dynamic scoring argue that tax cuts pay for themselves, generally by spurring so much economic growth, to the extent that revenues will actually increase. If I didn't know any better Mr. Chair, I'd think they were talking to us about trickle-down economics.

Mr. Chair, where have we heard that before?

I recall that the Bush administration attempted to impose the use of dynamic scoring to estimate the cost of its tax cuts, asserting that tax cuts would increase revenue enough to pay for themselves, sort of a trickle-down form of budgeting.

Unfortunately Mr. Chair, the Bush tax cuts did no such thing, but instead caused our national debt to explode. My amendment only seeks to look at the effect, should this measure pass, on HUBZones, as defined in the Small Business Act.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) administers several programs to support small businesses, including the Historically Underutilized Business Zone Empowerment Contracting, better known as the HUBZone program.

The HUBZone program is a small business federal contracting assistance program

"whose primary objective is job creation and increasing capital investment in distressed communities."

It provides participating small businesses located in areas with low income, high poverty rates, or high unemployment rates with contracting opportunities in the form of "set-asides," sole-source awards, and price-evaluation preferences.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the Federal Government awarded contracts valued at \$12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about \$3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program.

Mr. Chair, that's the gist of my amendment—job creation—because that's what we should be talking about in this Committee today.

The Budget Committee has held hearings on the general topic of budget process reform and the recommendations crossed party lines. Former Budget Committee Chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness, testified that, "It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used."

Similarly, Dr. Philip Joyce, former Congressional Budget Office (CBO) staff member and a Democratic witness, testified that, "My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox. If the goal is to deal with the larger fiscal imbalance that faces us, the most important thing to do is to make use of them, not search for more tools."

Mr. Chair, dynamic scoring is the wrong tool at the wrong time—though—in the interest of fairness to the small businesses in distressed communities around this country, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, even though I have serious reservations about dynamic scoring.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment and for recognizing the value and importance of economic analysis for legislating here in Congress.

Too often, we hear from the other side of the aisle these taunts about magic asterisks and phony numbers, but your amendment rightly recognizes that legislation can make a difference on the economy.

However, what we can't accept about the amendment is the idea that CBO should try to estimate its effects on only small sections of the country rather than the Nation as a whole.

Instead of dictating every detail of the macroeconomic analysis for CBO, we think that we need to give them the flexibility to adapt their analysis to the specifics of particular legislation. This amendment would unnecessarily limit that flexibility, so we urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the full Budget Committee and thank him again for his leadership.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Ms. JACKSON LEE. We have heard from our colleagues all morning that they want more information, a more complete picture of the impact of legislation on our economy.

Well, the legislation before us, as we have pointed out repeatedly today, exempts the part of the budget that deals with investments in discretionary spending. From the start, it does that.

Then they said no to amendments on the impact on jobs. They have said no to getting more information on the impact on State and local governments and local taxpayers, and now, they are saying no to getting more information on vital portions of our economy.

This doesn't say the CBO can't look at other things. It just says that it is important that they look at this part of the economy. There are HUBZones in every part of the country, and they are an important part of our strategy that a lot of us are working towards to try to make sure that everyone in this country has an opportunity to move forward and succeed.

So it is discouraging to hear our colleagues reject a request for more information on jobs, local taxpayers, and now in this particular area.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his astute comments and build on the comments made by the ranking member.

Let me put into the record that the Congressional Research Service, in FY2010, the Federal Government awarded contracts valued at \$12.7 billion to HUBZone certified businesses, with about \$3.6 billion of that amount awarded through the HUBZone program. That is an investment in small business. That is the creation of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the gist of my amendment is jobs and what will be the impact of this type of budget structuring on the HUBZones. Why wouldn't we want that information?

Let me quote former Budget chairman Jim Nussle, a Republican witness who testified:

It may not be that the budget process is broken. It may not be, in other words, that tools are broken, but it may be the fact that the tools are not even being used.

If you are going to add more responsibilities to the CBO, give them additional tools to assess who the job-creating small businesses are going to be impacted by this bill.

Dr. Philip Joyce, former CBO staff member, said:

My main message is that most of the tools that you need to solve the budget problems faced by the country are already in your toolbox.

Therefore, I am saying if we are putting another tool in the toolbox, if this bill passes, then give them the ability

to make sure that we are not killing small businesses that are impacted by the HUBZone funding and assistance.

We already see that small businesses create jobs. I would make the argument to my colleagues, and I thank Dr. PRICE for his earlier kind words about the gist of this legislation, and I would ask for his reconsideration. This is a good amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support it. I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-400 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ISRAEL of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 214, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—182

Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera (CA)	Capuano	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)	Courtney
Braley (IA)	Chu	Crowley
Brown (FL)	Cicilline	Cuellar

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson

Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—214

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Baretta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Shoock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

NOT VOTING—35

Barton
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Costa
Garcia
Garrett
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Honda
Johnson (GA)

Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Lankford
Lofgren
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Noem
Nunes

Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Rangel
Rooney
Runyan
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Young (IN)

□ 1303

Messrs. LOBIONDO, BROOKS of Alabama, CAMP, STUTZMAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MESSER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HECK of Washington, STOCKMAN, CLEAVER, MEADOWS, and PETERSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 159 I missed the vote, but I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 159 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 211, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—189

Barber
Baretta
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownlee (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva

Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson

NOES—211

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Baretta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway

Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert

Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline

Labrador	Perry	Simpson	Cárdenas	Himes	O'Rourke	Massie	Posey	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Peterson	Smith (MO)	Carney	Hinojosa	Owens	Matheson	Price (GA)	Southerland
Lamborn	Petri	Smith (NE)	Carson (IN)	Holt	Pallone	McAllister	Reed	Stewart
Lance	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Cartwright	Honda	Pascrell	McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Stivers
Latham	Pitts	Smith (TX)	Castro (TX)	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)	McCaul	Renacci	Stockman
Latta	Poe (TX)	Southerland	Chu	Hoyer	Payne	McClintock	Ribble	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Stewart	Cioccilino	Huffman	Perlmutter	McHenry	Rice (SC)	Terry
Long	Posey	Stivers	Clark (MA)	Israel	Pingree (ME)	McKeon	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
Lucas	Price (GA)	Stutzman	Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pocan	McKinley	Roby	Thornberry
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Terry	Clay	Jeffries	Polis	McMorris	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Lummis	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Maffei	Ribble	Thornberry	Clyburn	Kaptur	Quigley	Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Tiberi	Cohen	Keating	Rahall	Messer	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Marino	Rigell	Tipton	Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Richmond	Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher	Valadao
McAllister	Roby	Turner	Conyers	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard	Mica	Rokita	Wagner
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Upton	Cooper	Kildee	Ruiz	Miller (MI)	Rooney	Walberg
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Valadao	Costa	Kilmer	Ruppersberger	Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Wagner	Courtney	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Mulvaney	Roskam	Walorski
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Walberg	Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanchez, Linda T.	Murphy (PA)	Ross	Weber (TX)
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Walden	Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes	Neugebauer	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Rokita	Walorski	Cummings	Kuster	Schakowsky	Nugent	Royce	Wenstrup
McMorris	Rooney	Weber (TX)	Davis (CA)	Lance	Schiff	Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)	Davis, Danny	Langevin	Schneider	Nunnelee	Sanford	Whitfield
Meadows	Roskam	Wenstrup	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Schrader	Olson	Scalise	Williams
Meehan	Ross	Westmoreland	DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schwartz	Palazzo	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Rothfus	Whitfield	Delaney	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)	Paulsen	Schweikert	Wittman
Mica	Royce	Williams	DeLauro	Levin	Scott, David	Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wolf
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)	DeBene	Lewis	Serrano	Perry	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Mullin	Sanford	Wittman	Dent	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)	Peters (CA)	Sessions	Woodall
Mulvaney	Scalise	Wolf	Deutch	Loebach	Shea-Porter	Peterson	Shimkus	Yoder
Murphy (PA)	Schock	Womack	Dingell	Lofgren	Sherman	Petri	Shuster	Yoho
Neugebauer	Schweikert	Woodall	Doggett	Lowenthal	Sinema	Pittenger	Simpson	Young (AK)
Nugent	Scott, Austin	Yoder	Doyle	Lowey	Sires	Pitts	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)
Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner	Yoho	Duckworth	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Slaughter	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)	
Olson	Sessions	Young (AK)	Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Speier	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)	
Palazzo	Shimkus	Young (IN)	Engel	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)			
Paulsen	Shuster		Enyart	Eshoo	Takano			

NOT VOTING—31

Barton	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Bass	Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)
Brady (TX)	Joyce	Rangel
Campbell	Kelly (IL)	Runyan
Castor (FL)	Lankford	Rush
Coble	Lynch	Salmon
Garcia	Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Smith (WA)
Graves (MO)	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Green, Gene	Noem	
Gutiérrez	Nunes	

□ 1308

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, on Friday, April 4, I missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on No. 160.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 219, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—186

Barber	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Bustos
Beatty	Bonamici	Butterfield
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capps
Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)	Capuano

NOES—219

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hanna
Amash	Culberson	Harper
Amodei	Daines	Harris
Bachmann	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Bachus	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Barr	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Benish	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bentivolio	Duffy	Holding
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Black	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Hultgren
Boustany	Fincher	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Jenkins
Broun (GA)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Forbes	Jolly
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Jones
Burgess	Fox	Jordan
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Camp	Gardner	King (NY)
Cantor	Garrett	Kingston
Capito	Gerlach	Kline
Carter	Gibbs	Labrador
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Chabot	Gohmert	Lamborn
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Latham
Coffman	Gowdy	Latta
Cole	Granger	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Long
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Conaway	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Cook	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Cotton	Grimm	Maffei
Cramer	Guthrie	Marchant
Crawford	Hall	Marino

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)
Brady (TX)	Joyce	Rangel
Campbell	Lankford	Runyan
Castor (FL)	Lynch	Rush
Coble	Matsui	Salmon
Farr	Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Smith (WA)
Gutiérrez	Noem	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	

□ 1312

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 222, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—185

Barber	Butterfield	Cohen
Barrow (GA)	Capps	Connolly
Bass	Capuano	Conyers
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cooper
Becerra	Carney	Costa
Bera (CA)	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Chu	Cummings
Bonamici	Cioccilino	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Braley (IA)	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeGette
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	Delaney
Bustos	Clyburn	DeLauro

DelBene Kirkpatrick
 Dething Kuster
 Dingell Langevin
 Doggett Larsen (WA)
 Doyle Larson (CT)
 Duckworth Lee (CA)
 Edwards Levin
 Ellison Lewis
 Engel Lipinski
 Enyart Loebsock
 Eshoo Lofgren
 Esty Lowenthal
 Farr Lowey
 Fattah Lujan Grisham
 Foster (NM)
 Frankel (FL) Lujan, Ben Ray
 Fudge (NM)
 Gabbard Maloney,
 Gallego Carolyn
 Garamendi Maloney, Sean
 Garcia Matsui
 Gibson McCarthy (NY)
 Green, Al McCollum
 Green, Gene McDermott
 Grijalva McGovern
 Hahn McIntyre
 Hanabusa McNerney
 Hastings (FL) Meeks
 Heck (WA) Meng
 Higgins Michaud
 Himes Miller, George
 Hinojosa Moore
 Holt Moran
 Honda Murphy (FL)
 Horsford Murphy (PA)
 Hoyer Nadler
 Huffman Napolitano
 Israel Neal
 Jackson Lee Negrete McLeod
 Jeffries Nolan
 Johnson, E. B. O'Rourke
 Jones Owens
 Kaptur Pallone
 Keating Pascrell
 Kelly (IL) Pastor (AZ)
 Kennedy Payne
 Kildee Pingree (ME)
 Kilmer Pocan
 Kind Polis

NOES—222

Aderholt Duffy
 Amash Duncan (SC)
 Amodei Duncan (TN)
 Bachmann Ellmers
 Bachus Farenthold
 Barletta Fincher
 Barr Fitzpatrick
 Benishek Fleischmann
 Bentivolio Fleming
 Bilirakis Flores
 Bishop (UT) Forbes
 Black Fortenberry
 Blackburn Foxx
 Boustany Franks (AZ)
 Bridenstine Frelinghuysen
 Brooks (AL) Gardner
 Brooks (IN) Garrett
 Broun (GA) Gerlach
 Buchanan Gibbs
 Bucshon Gingrey (GA)
 Burgess Gohmert
 Byrne Goodlatte
 Calvert Gowdy
 Camp Granger
 Cantor Graves (GA)
 Capito Graves (MO)
 Carter Grayson
 Cassidy Griffin (AR)
 Chabot Griffith (VA)
 Chaffetz Grimm
 Coffman Guthrie
 Cole Hall
 Collins (GA) Hanna
 Collins (NY) Harper
 Conaway Harris
 Cook Hartzler
 Cotton Hastings (WA)
 Cramer Heck (NV)
 Crawford Hensarling
 Crenshaw Herrera Beutler
 Culberson Holding
 Daines Hudson
 Davis, Rodney Huelskamp
 Denham Huizenga (MI)
 Dent Hultgren
 DeSantis Hunter
 DesJarlais Hurt
 Diaz-Balart Issa

Price (NC) Palazzo
 Quigley Paulsen
 Rahall Pearce
 Richmond Perlmutter
 Roybal-Allard Perry
 Ruiz Peters (CA)
 Ruppersberger Peterson
 Ryan (OH) Petri
 Sánchez, Linda Pittenger
 T. Pitts
 Sarbanes Poe (TX)
 Schakowsky Pompeo
 Schiff Posey
 Schneider Price (GA)
 Schrader Reed
 Schwartz Reichert
 Scott (VA) Renacci
 Scott, David Ribble
 Serrano Rice (SC)
 Sewell (AL) Rigell
 Shea-Porter Roby
 Sherman Roe (TN)
 Sinema Rogers (AL)
 Sires Rogers (KY)
 Slaughter Rogers (MI)
 Speier Rohrabacher
 Stockman Rokita
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA) Barton
 Tierney Brady (TX)
 Titus Campbell
 Tonko Castor (FL)
 Tsongas Coble
 Van Hollen Gosar
 Vargas Gutiérrez
 Veasey Johnson (GA)
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Rooney Thornberry
 Ros-Lehtinen Tiberi
 Roskam Tipton
 Ross Turner
 Rothfus Upton
 Royce Valadao
 Ryan (WI) Wagner
 Sanford Walberg
 Scalise Walden
 Schock Walorski
 Schweikert Weber (TX)
 Scott, Austin Webster (FL)
 Sensenbrenner Wenstrup
 Sessions Westmoreland
 Shimkus Whitfield
 Shuster Williams
 Simpson Wilson (SC)
 Smith (MO) Wittman
 Smith (NE) Wolf
 Smith (NJ) Womack
 Smith (TX) Woodall
 Southerland Yoder
 Stewart Yoho
 Stivers Young (AK)
 Stutzman Young (IN)
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)

NOT VOTING—24

Johnson, Sam
 Lankford
 Lynch
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Noem
 Pelosi
 Peters (MI)
 Rangel
 Runyan
 Rush
 Salmon
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Smith (WA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Waxman

□ 1317

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 539, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1874, as reported, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the

same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, lines 16 and 17, strike “(except the Committee on Appropriations of each House)”.

Page 4, line 4, insert “AMERICA’S FIRST PRIORITY IS JOB CREATION, INVESTING IN AMERICA’S FUTURE, AND” before “ECONOMIC IMPACT”.

Page 4, line 12, insert “The analysis shall include the impact of Federal expenditures contained in the applicable bill or resolution, including investments in education, transportation, and infrastructure, in promoting job creation and economic growth.” after “product.”.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend with the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, some of us will support this bill, and some of us will oppose it; but Republican and Democrat alike, we can all agree on the need for both parties to work together, invest in our future, and help create jobs and opportunity for all Americans.

Yes, we must reduce the deficit and tackle our national debt, and yes, we need to cut wasteful spending whenever we can, but to get the Federal budget in order, we need to make smart investments to help grow our economy.

To help American workers and businesses compete and win, we need to double down on education, job training, research, and infrastructure, the very foundation of our economy; and yet the legislation we are debating today disregards the importance of these investments.

This bill will require the Congressional Budget Office to study the long-term benefits of some proposals, but not others. Under this bill, the CBO would have to tell us how another tax break would help billionaires, but not how early investments in education will help middle class families and long-term economic growth.

That just doesn’t make any sense to my constituents in New Hampshire.

Under this bill, the CBO would not analyze the impact of investments to revitalize our bridges and highways; train our veterans for good jobs when they return home; prepare students for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; fund cutting-edge medical research; or expand our National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, which is already helping more workers and businesses make it in America.

These investments make our economy stronger and are of long-term benefit to our economy. If we are going to

pass this bill, we should recognize their value. To that end, my amendment would broaden the underlying bill and apply it to major investments in education, infrastructure, economic growth, and job creation—smart investments to help hard-working families all across our Nation.

These are the issues that the American people want us to focus on, so let's work together across the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to improve this bill and to invest in a better future for our children.

I urge support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have very good news for my friend from New Hampshire. The underlying bill would include macroeconomic analysis on all of these items: education, infrastructure, employment, growth, and so much more. Therefore, we must oppose the MTR, as it is redundant and unnecessary.

I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 218, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—187

Barber	Clyburn	Farr
Barrow (GA)	Cohen	Fattah
Beatty	Connolly	Foster
Becerra	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gabbard
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Galleo
Blumenauer	Crowley	Garamendi
Bonamici	Cuellar	Garcia
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Grayson
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Bustos	DeGette	Hahn
Butterfield	Delaney	Hanabusa
Capps	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Deutch	Higgins
Carney	Dingell	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Cartwright	Doyle	Holt
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Honda
Chu	Edwards	Horsford
Cicilline	Ellison	Hoyer
Clark (MA)	Engel	Huffman
Clarke (NY)	Enyart	Israel
Clay	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Cleaver	Esty	Jeffries

Johnson, E. B.	McIntyre	Schakowsky
Jones	McNerney	Schiff
Kaptur	Meeke	Schneider
Keating	Meng	Schrader
Kelly (IL)	Michaud	Schwartz
Kennedy	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Moore	Scott, David
Kilmer	Moran	Serrano
Kind	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kirkpatrick	Nader	Shea-Porter
Kuster	Napolitano	Sherman
Langevin	Neal	Sinema
Larsen (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Sires
Larson (CT)	Nolan	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	O'Rourke	Speier
Levin	Owens	Swalwell (CA)
Lewis	Pallone	Takano
Lipinski	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Loeback	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Lofgren	Payne	Titus
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Tonko
Lowe	Peters (CA)	Tsongas
Lujan Grisham	Peterson	Van Hollen
(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Veasey
(NM)	Polis	Vela
Maffei	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Maloney,	Quigley	Visclosky
Carolyn	Rahall	Walz
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Matheson	Ruiz	Schultz
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
McCollum	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
McDermott	T.	Wilson (FL)
McGovern	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOES—218

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

Smith (MO)	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Smith (NE)	Tipton	Whitfield
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Williams
Smith (TX)	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Southerland	Valadao	Wittman
Stewart	Wagner	Wolf
Stivers	Walberg	Womack
Stockman	Walden	Woodall
Stutzman	Walorski	Yoder
Terry	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Wenstrup	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Bass	Lankford	Richmond
Brady (TX)	Lynch	Runyan
Campbell	Miller (FL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Miller, Gary	Salmon
Coble	Noem	Sanchez, Loretta
Gosar	Nunnelee	Smith (WA)
Gutiérrez	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1332

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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 224, noes 182, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—224

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Denham	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Dent	Hensarling
Bachmann	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bachus	DesJarlais	Holding
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Barr	Duffy	Huelskamp
Barrow (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Bentivolio	Ellmers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Hurt
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Issa
Black	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Fleming	Jolly
Bridenstine	Flores	Jones
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Joyce
Broun (GA)	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burgess	Gardner	Kingston
Byrne	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Calvert	Gerlach	Kline
Camp	Gibbs	Labrador
Cantor	Gibson	LaMalfa
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Carter	Gohmert	Lance
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Latham
Chabot	Gowdy	Latta
Chaffetz	Granger	LoBiondo
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Long
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Grayson	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lummis
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Marchant
Cook	Grimm	Marino
Cotton	Guthrie	Massie
Cramer	Hall	Matheson
Crawford	Hanna	McAllister
Crenshaw	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Culberson	Harris	McCaul
Daines	Hartzler	McClintock

McHenry	Renacci	Southerland
McIntyre	Ribble	Stewart
McKeon	Rice (SC)	Stivers
McKinley	Rigell	Stockman
McMorris	Roby	Stutzman
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Terry
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Messer	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Turner
Mullin	Rooney	Upton
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Wagner
Neugebauer	Ross	Walberg
Nugent	Rothfus	Walden
Nunes	Royce	Walorski
Nunnelee	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)
Olson	Sanford	Webster (FL)
Palazzo	Scalise	Wenstrup
Paulsen	Schock	Westmoreland
Pearce	Schweikert	Whitfield
Perry	Scott, Austin	Williams
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Pittenger	Sessions	Wittman
Pitts	Shimkus	Wolf
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Womack
Pompeo	Simpson	Woodall
Posey	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Price (GA)	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)

NOES—182

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

NOT VOTING—25

Barton	Johnson, Sam	Richmond
Brady (TX)	Lankford	Runyan
Campbell	Lynch	Rush
Castor (FL)	Miller (FL)	Salmon
Coble	Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta
Farr	Noem	Smith (WA)
Gosar	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Gutiérrez	Peters (MI)	
Johnson (GA)	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1341

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to attending the funeral of Tuskegee Airman, Chief Master Sergeant Walter H. Richardson, USAF, Retired, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 157 through 164 on April 4, 2014. If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall vote No. 157—H. Res. 539, On Ordering the Previous Question, “aye.”

Rollcall vote No. 158—H. Res. 539, On Agreeing to the Resolution, “aye.”

Rollcall vote No. 159—Connolly of Virginia Amendment to H.R. 1874, “nay.”

Rollcall vote No. 160—Israel of New York Amendment to H.R. 1874, “nay.”

Rollcall vote No. 161—Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment to H.R. 1874, “nay.”

Rollcall vote No. 162—Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment to H.R. 1874, “nay.”

Rollcall vote No. 163—H.R. 1874, Motion to Recommit, “nay.”

Rollcall vote No. 164—H.R. 1874, Pro-Growth Budgeting Act of 2013, “aye.”

□ 1345

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider three bills from the Budget Committee.

The first bill, H.R. 1871, the Baseline Reform Act, authored by Representative ROB WOODALL of Georgia, would require CBO and OMB, when scoring legislation, to assume that the baseline does not increase or decrease for discretionary spending, which they do now. This practice added \$1.2 trillion to the baseline in 2013.

The second bill, H.R. 1872, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, written by Representative SCOTT GARRETT of New Jersey, brings off-budget programs on-budget to provide a more accurate accounting of these programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider and pass a budget resolution on time for a fourth consecutive year. The Republican budget, under the leadership of Chairman PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin and the Budget Committee members, will adhere to the agreed-upon spending limits and balance the budget in 10 years, as we did last year, increase economic growth and job creation, create opportunity, lessen the middle class squeeze, cut wasteful government spending, and strengthen our entitlement programs.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. It is wonderful news that that budget is going to do all of those things, I want you to know. And we are pleased that a budget is coming forward. We may not be pleased with the budget, but we are pleased that it is coming forward.

As the gentleman knows, we have already had the budget levels for fiscal year '15. You indicate that the budget will adhere to the Ryan-Murray agreement. I assume that also means that it will adhere to the firewall division between defense and nondefense discretionary spending as well.

Is that accurate, Mr. Leader?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, for this fiscal year, he is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I will tell my friend, the majority leader, The Wall Street Journal had an editorial of about 13 or 14 paragraphs. I disagreed with the first 13 paragraphs, but I did agree with the last paragraph.

It said, “But the Ryan outline does the service of showing the policy direction in which Republicans would head if they regain control of the Senate next year.”

Then it goes on to say, “Senate Democrats don’t want to declare themselves with any votes, but they favor higher taxes and much more spending for everything other than defense. Voters will have to decide on the direction they want Congress to go.”

So, Mr. Leader, as I said, we welcome a debate on this budget. We do believe it expresses the priorities of your party, and, as you know, we differ with those priorities in many instances. So I think the American people will get a spirited, informative, and educational debate on the Ryan budget, and I think that that will do much to inform them of the priorities of both parties. As I say, we look forward to that budget.