

It is the moral obligation of every Member of Congress to protect the men and women who helped Americans, who protected us in some of the most difficult of circumstances.

Please don't just cosponsor H.R. 4594; demand action before we adjourn. Lives are at stake.

#### THE NEED FOR A MORE EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF TITLE I FUNDING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, I had the opportunity to join rural school advocates from across the country here in Washington for the release of the Why Rural Matters 2013–2014 report, a biennial report from the Rural School and Community Trust which analyzes the state of rural education for communities in each of the 50 States.

This important research document gives policymakers and the public fresh insight into the social and economic contexts that influence educational outcomes and also reinforces how these conditions must be better understood, including in the context of how the Federal Government allocates title I funding.

Title I was initially created to offset the impacts of poverty on student learning. Unfortunately, the report shows once again that children receive preferential treatment based not only on their economic circumstances, but on the basis of their ZIP Code.

Surely my colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe that all children are equal. Unfortunately, most are surprised to learn, as we were reminded again this week, this is not the case.

I believe this body can do better, for our children deserve as much.

#### PASSING OF U.S. SENATOR ALAN DIXON

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a good friend, a hardworking public servant, and a true advocate for the American people. Today, I rise to talk about Senator Alan Dixon, the gentleman from Illinois.

Senator Dixon was from my hometown, Belleville. He was one of the finest public servants our country has ever known. Through a storied career, he walked the halls of power in Springfield, Illinois, and Washington, D.C., but never forgot his southern Illinois roots.

He was a mentor to generations of southern Illinoisans. His sense of civility is a commodity that was sorely needed during his time in government and is in even greater demand today.

It is in his honor and memory that I encourage the spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation as we continue to serve our fellow citizens in America.

#### AMERICA'S FLEET SHOULD LEAVE THE COAST OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last month, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas openly united with the evil terrorist group Hamas, and at this very moment they are raining down rockets upon the innocent citizens of Israel. Half of all Israelis have sought cover in bomb shelters across their tiny country. And the Obama administration has had the reprehensible gall to praise Abbas as someone who is "committed to nonviolence and cooperation with Israel," and to further proclaim in an Israeli newspaper that "finally, peace is possible."

Mr. Speaker, I thought nothing this President could ever say or do would surprise me anymore, but this flushed and breathless rush to embrace terrorists launching rockets at Israeli children is an unprecedented act of cowardice and betrayal.

America's fleet should, this minute, be off the coast of Israel, and the world, including Abbas, Hamas, and Hezbollah, should know that America's arsenal of freedom stands ready to defend our most precious ally on Earth.

#### END THE VIOLENCE IN INDIANAPOLIS

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sadness and outrage over the violence that has ravaged my Indianapolis congressional district.

Eighty people, Mr. Speaker, have been murdered so far in 2014. In the last year alone, two police officers—Officer Rod Bradway and Officer Perry Renn—were senselessly gunned down in the line of duty.

Enough is enough. I am calling on my fellow Hoosiers to end this violence, and I am asking my colleagues here in Congress and in the administration for help.

With violence on the rise, police levels in Indianapolis have dropped below 1,500 officers, the lowest number in 7 years. We need increased funding for law enforcement and programs that keep our children off of our streets. We need the resources to not only combat crime, but prevent it from happening in the first place.

It is time for us to end the violence and make our streets safe again.

#### BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 661, I call up the bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–517, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4718

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

#### SECTION 1. BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT; INCLUSION OF QUALIFIED RETAIL IMPROVEMENT PROPERTY.—Section 168(k)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(2) QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified property’ means property—

“(i)(I) to which this section applies which has a recovery period of 20 years or less,

“(II) which is computer software (as defined in section 167(f)(1)(B)) for which a deduction is allowable under section 167(a) without regard to this subsection,

“(III) which is water utility property,

“(IV) which is qualified leasehold improvement property, or

“(V) which is qualified retail improvement property, and

“(ii) the original use of which commences with the taxpayer.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR ALTERNATIVE DEPRECIATION PROPERTY.—The term ‘qualified property’ shall not include any property to which the alternative depreciation system under subsection (g) applies, determined—

“(i) without regard to paragraph (7) of subsection (g) (relating to election to have system apply), and

“(ii) after application of section 280F(b) (relating to listed property with limited business use).

“(C) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) SALE-LEASEBACKS.—For purposes of clause (ii) and subparagraph (A)(ii), if property is—

“(I) originally placed in service by a person, and

“(II) sold and leased back by such person within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service, such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date on which such property is used under the leaseback referred to in subclause (II).

“(ii) SYNDICATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), if—

“(I) property is originally placed in service by the lessor of such property,

“(II) such property is sold by such lessor or any subsequent purchaser within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service (or, in the case of multiple units of property subject to the same lease, within 3 months after the date the final unit is placed in service, so long as the period between the time the first unit is placed in service and the time the last unit is placed in service does not exceed 12 months), and

“(III) the user of such property after the last sale during such 3-month period remains the same as when such property was originally placed in service, such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date of such last sale.

“(D) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 280F.—For purposes of section 280F—

“(i) AUTOMOBILES.—In the case of a passenger automobile (as defined in section 280F(d)(5)) which is qualified property, the Secretary shall increase the limitation under section 280F(a)(1)(A)(i) by \$8,000.

“(ii) LISTED PROPERTY.—The deduction allowable under paragraph (1) shall be taken into account in computing any recapture amount under section 280F(b)(2).

“(iii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2014, the \$8,000 amount in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(II) the automobile price inflation adjustment determined under section 280F(d)(7)(B)(i) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting ‘2013’ for ‘1987’ in subclause (II) thereof.

If any increase under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$100, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100.

“(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—For purposes of determining alternative minimum taxable income under section 55, the deduction under section 167 for qualified property shall be determined without regard to any adjustment under section 56.”.

(b) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—Section 168(k)(4) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(4) ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a corporation elects to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year—

“(i) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply for such taxable year,

“(ii) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method, and

“(iii) the limitation imposed by section 53(c) for such taxable year shall be increased by the bonus depreciation amount which is determined for such taxable year under subparagraph (B).

“(B) BONUS DEPRECIATION AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) applied to all such property, over

“(II) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) did not apply to any such property.

The aggregate amounts determined under subclauses (I) and (II) shall be determined without regard to any election made under subsection (b)(2)(D), (b)(3)(D), or (g)(7) and without regard to subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(ii) LIMITATION.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year shall not exceed the lesser of—

“(I) 50 percent of the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for the first taxable year ending after December 31, 2013, or

“(II) the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for such taxable year determined by taking into account only the adjusted net minimum tax for taxable years ending before January 1, 2014 (determined by treating credits as allowed on a first-in, first-out basis).

“(iii) AGGREGATION RULE.—All corporations which are treated as a single employer under section 52(a) shall be treated—

“(I) as 1 taxpayer for purposes of this paragraph, and

“(II) as having elected the application of this paragraph if any such corporation so elects.

“(C) CREDIT REFUNDABLE.—For purposes of section 6401(b), the aggregate increase in the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A for any taxable year resulting from the application of this paragraph shall be treated as allowed under subpart C of such part (and not any other subpart).

“(D) OTHER RULES.—

“(i) ELECTION.—Any election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

“(ii) PARTNERSHIPS WITH ELECTING PARTNERS.—In the case of a corporation which is a partner in a partnership and which makes an election under subparagraph (A) for the taxable year, for purposes of determining such corporation's distributive share of partnership items under section 702 for such taxable year—

“(I) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply, and

“(II) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method.

“(iii) CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership in which more than 50 percent of the capital and profits interests are owned (directly or indirectly) at all times during the taxable year by 1 corporation (or by corporations treated as 1 taxpayer under subparagraph (B)(iii)), each partner shall compute its bonus depreciation amount under clause (i) of subparagraph (B) by taking into account its distributive share of the amounts determined by the partnership under subclauses (I) and (II) of such clause for the taxable year of the partnership ending with or within the taxable year of the partner.”.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—Section 168(k) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any tree or vine bearing fruits or nuts which is planted, or is grafted to a plant that has already been planted, by the taxpayer in the ordinary course of the taxpayer's farming business (as defined in section 263A(e)(4))—

“(i) a depreciation deduction equal to 50 percent of the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be allowed under section 167(a) for the taxable year in which such tree or vine is so planted or grafted, and

“(ii) the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be reduced by the amount of such deduction.

“(B) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this subparagraph for any taxable year, this paragraph shall not apply to any tree or vine planted or grafted during such taxable year. An election under this subparagraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

“(C) ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION MAY BE CLAIMED ONLY ONCE.—If this paragraph ap-

plies to any tree or vine, such tree or vine shall not be treated as qualified property in the taxable year in which placed in service.

“(D) COORDINATION WITH ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS.—If a corporation makes an election under paragraph (4) for any taxable year, the amount under paragraph (4)(B)(i)(I) for such taxable year shall be increased by the amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) for such taxable year.

“(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (2)(E) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 168(e)(8) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this paragraph with respect to any class of property for any taxable year, this subsection shall not apply to all property in such class placed in service (or, in the case of paragraph (5), planted or grafted) during such taxable year. An election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.”.

(3) Section 168(l)(5) of such Code is amended by striking “section 168(k)(2)(G)” and inserting “section 168(k)(2)(E)”.

(4) Section 263A(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 168(k)(5).—This section shall not apply to any amount allowable as a deduction by reason of section 168(k)(5) (relating to special rules for trees and vines bearing fruits and nuts).”.

(5) Section 460(c)(6)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “which—” and all that follows and inserting “which has a recovery period of 7 years or less.”.

(6) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by striking “ACQUIRED AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2007, AND BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014” in the heading thereof.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

(2) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (b) (other than so much of such amendment as relates to section 168(k)(4)(D)(iii) of such Code, as added by such amendment) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(B) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 2014, and ending after December 31, 2013, the bonus depreciation amount determined under section 168(k)(4) of such Code for such year shall be the sum of—

(i) such amount determined without regard to the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service before January 1, 2014, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(C)(ii) of such Code (determined without regard to the amendments made by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year before January 1, 2014, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year, and

(ii) such amount determined after taking into account the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service after December 31, 2013, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(B)(ii) of such Code (as amended by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year after December 31, 2013, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year.

(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TREES AND VINES.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall apply to trees and vines planted or grafted after December 31, 2013.

#### SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4718.

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

There was no objection.

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

Our current Tax Code is a wet blanket on this economy. It puts our businesses, their workers, and their products at a severe disadvantage. In this current climate, businesses aren't growing and hardworking Americans are seeing stagnant wages and fewer hours.

Adding insult to injury, the United States is the only country that allows important pieces of its Tax Code to expire. The result: businesses and their workers are left constantly guessing whether certain policies will be around next year, hurting their ability to plan for the future.

The National Association of Manufacturers told Congress that the "expiration of bonus depreciation at the end of 2013 has had a chilling effect on the economy." This statement is clearly supported by the fact that for the first 3 months of 2014 total capital investment across the country fell by almost 12 percent, a major factor in why the entire U.S. economy contracted by nearly 3 percent.

A survey of NAM members found that nearly a third of business owners would not make any investments this year without bonus depreciation and section 79 expensing, which the House voted on a bipartisan basis to make permanent in May.

The legislation we have before us today would provide a permanent 50 percent bonus depreciation deduction and make the deduction available to more farmers and business owners across the country.

In Congress, we always find a way to make things more complicated, but today we can enact a simple, bipartisan provision that provides an immediate incentive for businesses to invest and hire new workers. Bonus depreciation has received longstanding bipartisan support and has been renewed on a short-term basis 9 out of the last 12 years. After so many years of this policy being in place, it is time for us to agree that we should make it permanent so businesses can do what they do best: invest in the economy and hire new workers.

The effects of making bonus depreciation permanent are real. Analysis done by the Tax Foundation found that permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent, which would add \$182 billion to the economy; would increase capital stock by over 3 percent; would increase wages by about 1 percent, or \$500 for an individual making \$50,000 a year; and would create 212,000 jobs.

Growing a healthier economy, creating jobs, and helping Americans see bigger paychecks is exactly what this country needs.

Making 50 percent bonus depreciation permanent is supported by associations representing a variety of industries: farmers, telecommunications, manufacturers, energy, construction, retailers, and technology. Over 100 groups have voiced their support for bonus depreciation stating that it "will provide an immediate incentive for businesses to make additional capital investments, thereby boosting the U.S. economy and job creation."

This provision has gained strong bipartisan support in the past, as have many of the permanent tax policies the House has voted on this year. By making longstanding features of the Tax Code permanent, we can facilitate a comprehensive overhaul of the Tax Code. Such an overhaul in turn will create an America that works with a strong, vibrant economy. Today's vote will bring the immediate economic relief so many businesses and hardworking taxpayers are asking for.

I urge my colleagues to join us in making a stronger, healthier economy by passing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the Budget Act of 1974. If you look at section 311, it is entitled, "Enforcement of Budget Aggregates."

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, violates that section of the Budget Act because it cuts the revenues below the levels that were set forth in the Republican budget that was passed on this House floor with much fanfare on May 15. The bill before us does not keep the revenues at those levels.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this point of order, to point

out that on May 15 of this year Chairman RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee, filed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reporting the current revenue level for fiscal year 2015 and the remainder of the budget window.

□ 0915

And this is what he said when he filed that. This is, Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of May 15, page H4428. This is what Mr. RYAN said:

"This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels."

This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, clearly violates that provision of the statute of section 311(a) of the Budget Act because it increases the deficit to the taxpayer by \$287 billion above what was cited in the budget resolution adopted by this House. It is a clear breach of the rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the point of order be sustained and that the House Republicans have to live up to their own budget resolution which, as I say, they passed with much fanfare not that long ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the gentleman's position has absolutely no merit after the failures of this administration to grow the economy and create jobs. We have an economy that is contracting. We have more kids living at home than ever before. We have real wages declining.

After the failure of the policies of this administration to get the economy moving—

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAMP. I do not yield.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will suspend.

Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to direct his comments to the point of order?

Mr. CAMP. I do.

After the failures of the policies of this administration, the House has spoken, and the gentleman's position has absolutely no merit.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, the gentleman from Michigan clearly wasn't addressing any of the issues raised in the point of order.

I would ask the gentleman about section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which is what this point of order is based on. Let's talk about the point of order.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee voted for the House Budget Act. He voted for it, and now he is bringing to the floor of the House a provision that violates the same Budget Act that that budget was passed pursuant to.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's continue to focus on this point of order because

what we have here is a situation where Republicans came to this House floor not long ago, passed that budget, and are now here on the floor today with another bill that violates the Budget Act's section 311(a).

So I would like a ruling on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Maryland makes a point of order against consideration of the bill. Any such point of order is untimely at this point. The gentleman from Maryland is free to engage in debate on the bill.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is the point of order as a result of the fact that the Republicans apparently passed a rule that waives section 311(a) of the Budget Act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The legislation before the House is already under consideration. Therefore, the gentleman's point of order is not timely. The gentleman's point of order would have had to have been made before the legislation was being considered.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Did the Republican rule—the rule that was brought to the floor of the House—include a provision that waived section 311(a) of the Budget Act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may consult House Resolution 661 for the answer to that question.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am looking at that, and it does indicate to me that the House Republican rule actually waived the statutory provision that requires that the bill that they brought to the floor comply with their own budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman was free to make those points during debate either on the rule or during the consideration of the legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I just would point out, Mr. Speaker, that here is exactly what happened. The rule—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will suspend.

The gentleman from Maryland is not recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN raises such an important point. What is being done here

is totally inconsistent, and I will come to that a bit later, but what is really important today about this bill is not what is being done here, but what is not being done here.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN points out how inconsistent this bill is. But no matter how inconsistent, it is going nowhere. And it should go nowhere.

Essentially, what it does is to make permanent what has always been considered temporary. Bonus depreciation, which has been temporarily enacted during the previous two recessions to help assist the economy during the short term—that is what it has been—allows companies to write off investments more quickly than normal, providing them an incentive to make capital investments now rather than later. And that incentive actually disappears when the provision is made permanent. That is why CRS has said its temporary nature “is critical to its effectiveness.”

Secondly, it is unpaid for. Talk about consistency, talk about a budget bill that talks about the importance of deficit reduction, and here you have the Republicans proposing a bill that would add \$287 billion in debt. That would bring the total of the bills that the Republicans have brought forth here to over \$500 billion.

When all is said and done, House Republicans will have added more than \$1 trillion to the deficit by permanently extending a select group of corporate tax cuts.

But let me just say I must confess I am amazed at the inconsistency of this position. It was 5 months ago in the chairman's and the Republican Ways and Means draft that they proposed to eliminate this provision entirely. Bonus depreciation was gone. And now they come forth and they say, Let's make it permanent.

That gives inconsistency a bad name. It is appalling. It is really also dangerous. And let me indicate why.

The more than \$500 billion in tax spending that the House Republicans will have approved today is the equivalent of what we spent last year on all nondefense domestic discretionary spending, which Republicans have cut so deeply in recent years that it is at its lowest level on record as a percentage of GDP. That includes spending for such vital domestic priorities as health research, food safety, and veterans' health.

Left unaddressed in this approach with the Republicans are key domestic priorities such as the New Markets Tax Credit, the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, and the renewable energy tax credits.

So here we are.

Unfortunately, this bill is going nowhere. There likely will be an extension of bonus depreciation in an extender package, if we ever get to it, but for a short period of time, costing a fraction of this bill.

So what is really important today is not a bill that is going nowhere—and

should go nowhere—but for what is not being done.

I just want to list what is not being done.

We have immigration reform. A Senate bill is not being brought up by the House Republicans. On unemployment insurance, a Senate bill providing help for those looking for work is not brought up here.

The employment nondiscrimination bill, the Senate bill is not brought up here. Paycheck fairness is not being brought up. A minimum wage bill is not brought up.

We have the Ex-Im Bank caught in the contest and the conflicts within the Republican Conference. We also have a highway bill we are going to get next week with another patch because of the inability of the House Republicans to face up to the need for a long-term highway bill. And voting rights reform, you have a bill sponsored by a senior Republican in this House, and it has not seen the light of day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish by saying how appalling it is that the Republicans come forth and say, Let's make it permanent, unpaid for, costing \$287 billion, when in the proposal that they put forth, this provision would have been eliminated.

That is 180 degrees in a split second. It just shows, I think, the hypocrisy of bringing this bill up, made especially hypocritical when there has been this utter failure to address all of these other legislative proposals, many of which have passed the Senate.

So we are going through the motions here today. It is really a sad moment for this institution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBERI. Thank you, Chairman CAMP, for your leadership on this important issue and your leadership on the tax-writing committee. If we would have had similar leadership in the Senate and at the White House, we would have a different discussion today, and that would be one on comprehensive tax reform.

Unfortunately, we are not having that discussion because there hasn't been leadership. In fact, there has been zero leadership from this White House. And after 5½ years of this President being in the White House, he still doesn't want to take responsibility for this economy. Taxes are higher. We have more regulations. We have an economy that is sputtering along. In fact, the facts are that the first quarter of this year, our economy retracted.

This bill is a jobs bill. It is that simple. It is a jobs bill. We have had bonus

depreciation since 2002. This isn't new. It has been in the Tax Code under temporary law since 2002, and extended many times—many times, retroactively. It expired, ladies and gentlemen, in December.

I was talking to a CFO of a large American manufacturer this week, and he said to me, You understand that when you retroactively do this, it doesn't help our economy.

□ 0930

When you only do it, in essence, for 1 year, which is the narrative that my friends on the other side of the aisle are acquiescing to, in that this is a fruitless waste of time because we should just accept the Senate bill that passed out of the Senate Finance Committee at the end of the year, which will retroactively extend bonus depreciation back to January of this year for another year—next year, 2015—that doesn't do a whole lot to grow our economy.

It is better than a sharp stick in the eye, 1 year; yet, if you talk to a CFO, like I did this week and as I have over and over and over again, a business plan is for several years.

When a business owner who is a manufacturer buys a piece of machinery to make a widget, it costs a lot of money. This expense is 50 percent of that, Mr. Speaker.

Guess what? You can make more widgets, and you can hire a new employee. The new employee makes money, pays taxes to the city of Columbus, pays taxes to the State of Ohio, pays taxes to the Federal Government—more tax revenue, a job, more jobs.

That is why hundreds of businesses and organizations are for this piece of legislation, which has been around—unpaid for—for 10 years.

I mean, think of the logic here, ladies and gentlemen. If we extend spending, we tell the American people that it doesn't cost them any more money. If we extend a current tax cut—so stopping a tax hike—it costs them more money. That is Washington, D.C., math. It makes no sense. That is the inconsistency.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is this is about jobs; this is about our economy. This is bipartisan. It doesn't need to be partisan. I have said before that I don't want to give up my voting card to the U.S. Senate. Let the House speak.

Let's have a good, old-fashioned conference committee. I don't expect I will get my way. I know Chairman CAMP doesn't expect he will get his way. We will have a good, old-fashioned compromise. I know that is a dirty word sometimes around here.

As my sixth grade daughter says: Isn't it supposed to work where the House passes a bill, and the Senate passes a bill, then you kind of work out the differences, and it goes to the President?

Yes, Angelina, that is the way it is supposed to work.

I wish the folks on the other side of the aisle would allow us to change this narrative of the Senate won't accept this, so let's just take the Senate bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Republicans say they would like to help, but they claim we just don't have enough resources for medical research in order to address cures for Alzheimer's, cancer, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, and other dread diseases—diabetes, for example.

Wildfire season is approaching, and there are not enough resources to begin planning to prevent those wildfires because there is not enough money to actually address the fires when they begin, and delay is occurring.

We have hurricane season and tornadoes all over the country, but there is not enough money for the National Weather Service to give us all of the details we need.

Only yesterday, we learned that Republicans were refusing, once again, to correct the bankrupt transportation fund. The best they can do is postpone the bankruptcy into next year—after the election—as our highways crumble and bridges literally fall down.

As for the comprehensive safety inspection of our food and our drugs, they would like to do it, but there is just not enough money, and there are not enough funds available to monitor effectively infectious diseases or to produce vaccines to stop other diseases.

There is not enough to adequately staff our Federal prisons. There is not enough to fully fund Federal law enforcement. There is certainly not enough to provide strong, effective foster care for the many children, after having been abused and neglected, who are removed from their homes.

As for workforce development, so that we can be competitive with our friends abroad, there doesn't seem to be the resource to permit children from pre-K to postgrad to achieve their full God-given potential.

While there are so many vital needs that we just don't seem to have the resources to address, these same Republicans tell us today that we can afford to borrow from the Chinese or the Saudis—or whoever will lend to us—the resources to deliver bonuses to some people. They urge more public debt to fund more bonuses.

While they rightfully argue on every expenditure program that we should be looking for evidence-based programs—programs that actually work and that provide the promised outcomes—and that we ought to eliminate duplication and inefficiency, they have absolutely no interest in evidence-based tax expenditures, which is what is involved today. When the evidence conflicts with their ideology, they abandon evidence and pursue ideology.

The evidence-based approach to this particular expenditure could not be clearer. What is involved here is that when any business goes out and obtains machinery, a vehicle, a truck, a building, they depreciate it over the useful lifetime of that asset—standard accounting principles.

What is involved here today is Washington math. It is the Washington manipulation of traditional accounting rules. It is a matter of violating those traditional accounting rules, and we have learned from the economic studies that that is a very sorry, not evidence-based investment.

Indeed, even as a stimulus, the analysis shows that, for every dollar that is invested, we get 20 cents of growth. A fellow could go bankrupt with that kind of economics, and that is exactly what they would have the country doing and not meeting its other needs while funding something that doesn't work.

Both the Federal Reserve bank and Goldman Sachs—which is not exactly a Democratic organization—concluded this year that letting this special tax treatment expire that they want to make permanent and extend forever will not have any significant economic impact.

Today's bill is an example of the very kind of waste and inefficiency line items that they always say, in campaign rallies, they can discover and eliminate, but which, today, they are perpetuating.

I am for a pro-growth, pro-jobs creation set of government policies—including tax policies—that promote competitiveness. It is competitiveness that involves an adequate transportation system, a trained workforce, the research in medicine as well as in technology to help us compete, but we don't have the Federal resources to hand out one bonus after another to corporations when we know it won't work, when it will not grow our economy and at the same time that the same people who are advocating for policies that don't work refuse to pay for policies that do work.

We should reject this bill. It is not in the interest of the country. It may be good politics in an election year, but it is bad economic policy, as near every economist who has looked at the issue in an objective way has concluded.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an outstanding member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that short-term tax policy is bad for business, bad for the economy, and bad for jobs, yet we have heard today from our friends on the other side of the aisle a couple of things.

Number one, some have argued that we are too busy, and there are too many other things to be dealing with

in Congress and so forth, and we ought to be doing other things rather than this. I guess you could make that argument. I don't think it is really persuasive. We can do all of these things, and they are not mutually exclusive.

There is some argument that said that this proposal somehow is a manipulation. That is how the gentleman from Texas described it. I think the manipulation is having something in the Tax Code that we know we need to make permanent and not making it permanent, so let's manipulate the adverse effect out of the Tax Code. That is what we should be doing.

There are some who have said that this is insignificant. I heard that a couple of minutes ago. This is not insignificant. According to the Tax Foundation, they say:

Permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent.

That is not insignificant.

It would increase capital stock by over 3 percent.

That is not insignificant.

It would increase wages by 1 percent, and it would create over 200,000 jobs.

That is not insignificant. That is according to the Tax Foundation.

So what is the choice? The choice is to vote "no" and walk away from that type of growth, Mr. Speaker. Now, who would do that?

You get these types of numbers, according to the Tax Foundation, by just pushing the green button. You get that type of growth by voting "yes" and then by getting out of the way and letting the economy come back.

The gentleman from Ohio is not over-characterizing this. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI)—who has great insight, by the way—is not somebody who is saying this is the panacea, and it all goes away. That was the hype we heard during the stimulus debate.

Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? It was the characterization of, if you just spend \$1 trillion, it is all going to be roses after that. There is hardly anybody who uses the word "stimulus" anymore on the other side of the aisle with a straight arrow. It has been completely eviscerated from the talking points of the White House.

The point is we can do something significant today—not monumental, not colossal—but to characterize the type of growth that the Tax Foundation has said this will yield to as "insignificant" is either not a clear view of economic reality or it is just too dismissive and too much a view that we can just be saviors in this situation.

We can do some good things today, and we can support the gentleman from Ohio. We can make permanent this proposal, and we can move this economy forward.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

To the gentleman from Illinois, I favor long-term tax reform. He helped produce a long-term proposal that

eliminated this provision. It eliminated it.

Now, you come down and say you want to make it permanent. I guess I can't speak directly to you.

Mr. ROSKAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. You make a fair point, and that is that permanency is something that we need to strive for. You and I would be on common ground with the idea of permanently fixing this provision.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute.

Mr. ROSKAM. Will the gentleman yield 20 seconds?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. I take your point that permanency is a good thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I said "long-term."

My point is you, 6 months ago, helped produce a package that eliminated this provision, and now, you come here, and you say you want it permanent. This is acrobatics. This is congressional acrobatics.

You are just spinning in an opposite direction, and you are making this place a circus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this place is riddled with ironies from week to week, and this week is no different.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee was working on a markup of legislation for another short-term extension of the highway trust fund—the transportation and infrastructure investment we desperately need in this country.

We were scratching and clawing to try to find an additional \$10 billion over the next 10 months to try to keep some of these projects moving forward; and here, today, we have another permanent change to the Tax Code at a cost of \$287 billion over the next 10 years and not a nickel of it paid for—no offset, no effort to pay for this at all; yet our roads are deteriorating, and our bridges are falling down.

We are literally becoming a Third World nation when it comes to our infrastructure system, and I am afraid that is becoming an insult to Third World countries today. We are turning into a Fourth World nation when it comes to our infrastructure.

Instead of having this fruitless debate on the floor yet again, knowing that this legislation won't be moving forward, we ought to be having a hearing in the Ways and Means Committee to develop consensus on a 6-year transportation bill that every State desperately needs in our country, but we are not doing that. In fact, the easiest thing to do during an election year, ap-

parently, is to support tax cuts without paying for them.

Every economist and virtually every business owner will tell you that, substantively, this doesn't make any sense either. The whole point of bonus depreciation is to try to spur capital investment at a time when the marketplace has frozen up, and it is the fear of uncertainty that is preventing business owners from moving forward on their capital purchases.

□ 0945

You take away that temporary nature of bonus depreciation and you ruin the whole desired effect of what you are trying to accomplish.

But I have a feeling that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, and others in the committee, they already know this, and that is why, earlier this year, when they introduced their comprehensive tax reform discussion draft, they completely eliminated bonus depreciation. And not only that, they clawed back the accelerated depreciation, which is the basis of this as well, in order to help pay for a lowering of rates overall.

I would submit, of the 14 tax bills that would permanently change the Code that have been reported out of the committee so far at a cost of close to \$900 billion, none of which is being proposed, if we support those measures and they get enacted into law, we might as well kiss comprehensive tax reform good-bye, because the tools that we will need to be able to lower the rates and broaden the base and make our Code more competitive are taken away from us. If you permanently extend bonus depreciation, you take away an important tool when we do run into recessionary times when businesses may need an additional incentive to invest capital and get off the sidelines.

That hasn't been the problem here. Since 2002, we have had bonus depreciation. We have got a track record now. You look back on it. Most economists will tell you it has been dubious, at best.

The 2000s were the worst job growth decade in our Nation's history. When President Bush left office in 2008, he had a net negative job growth during those 8 years when he was in office.

Since bonus depreciation expired at the end of last year, we have been averaging, every month, close to 240,000 additional private sector jobs being created in our economy today. That is without bonus depreciation being in place.

So what we ought to be doing today is having a serious discussion of how we can come together as an institution and find a way to help pay for a 6-year infrastructure bill that will create jobs, that will start spurring the economic activity that we desperately need, that will lay the foundation for long-term economic growth with a viable infrastructure system that is there to sustain it, rather than having another debate that we know is going nowhere.



And that is unfortunate because we do—and I agree with my friend from Texas, we need a pro-growth, competitive economic policy for the American people, one that recognizes reform the Tax Code to help our businesses, large and small, to be more competitive globally, but one that also recognizes that there are important public investments that we have to make as a nation in order to ensure the type of growth in the future.

Part of that is the infrastructure investment that is being neglected, or 23 extensions merely being kicked down the road with short-term measures. Part of it is having a top-flight, quality education system and a workforce development system so that we have got the best educated, best trained workforce in order to compete with increased global competition. It is broadband expansion in every inch of our territory. It is basic research funding. It is these type of things that, yes, we are going to need some resources in order to do an effective job.

But we keep coming to the floor, week after week, calling for permanent changes to the Tax Code without any ability to pay for it, that is going to hinder our flexibility in the future to really spur the type of economic growth and job creation that we desperately need.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this. Let’s start coming together on a real pro-growth strategy and work on the jobs that we desperately need.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and then I will yield to Mr. ROSKAM.

To the American people it must be really confusing. So we have had bonus depreciation, this tax policy, temporary for over 10 years, unpaid for; supported by many on the other side of the aisle, unpaid for; temporary, many times retroactive. And yet, moving that policy forward for 10 more years, the same way it has been paid for over 10 years, costs money, bad policy, even though we are giving for the first time certainty, predictability to people who actually create jobs in America, who must have a business plan and must make those big purchases. Amazing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address two of the criticisms that I heard from my colleague.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a fair point about permanency. Look, permanency is a great goal. Permanency in tax reform is an outstanding goal. In this current environment it becomes clear that the President of the United States has made raising marginal rates a precondition for tax reform. We are of the view that that doesn’t help grow the economy. The President clings to his orthodoxy that it does, and so it is not likely that this is going to be—a massive tax reform effort is going to be completed.

So then the alternative is, all right, well, so what do you do in the meantime? I think in the meantime what we do is we make this provision permanent. It keeps open the opportunity for us to revisit tax reform in the future. But we ought not to be leaving the types of numbers that I mentioned a minute ago.

Just to refresh your recollection, Mr. Speaker, those numbers were, by voting “yes” on this, according to the Tax Foundation, it grows the economy by 1 percent, increases capital stock by over 3, increases wages by 1 percent, and creates over 200,000 jobs.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin made an interesting point. There were several assertions, but one of them I found to be very, very broad. He says, substantively, this doesn’t make any sense. Those were his words. Those aren’t my words. Those were his words.

Now, think about that assertion, Mr. Speaker, in the context of dozens and dozens and dozens of business groups who say this does make sense, including, from his home State, the Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce; the Rhode Island Manufacturers Association; American Farm Bureau; the Associated Equipment Dealers; Illinois Manufacturers’, from my home State; and, Mr. Speaker, from the great State of Kansas, which is near and dear to you, the Kansas Chamber of Commerce, all of which say that this makes sense.

This is not dubious, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, that—what?—dozens of economists from all over the world have said, oh, this is a nefarious plot and it is completely not going to do anything. That is ridiculous. This is good.

The gentleman from Ohio has been working on this for months and months and months. And while it is not about him, he brings great insight to this debate. There is an opportunity, by voting “yes,” according to the Tax Foundation, to grow this economy. We should vote “aye.”

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let the facts be shown: in 2006 and 2007, bonus depreciation expired, and it was renewed when the recession really took a hold. CRS has said research suggests that bonus depreciation was not very effective. We will renew it, but not for 10 years, costing \$287 billion made permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), also a member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

The longer I listen to this discussion and debate, it reminds me of a game that children play: around and around and around we go, around the mulberry bush, because we keep going around and around and around.

I strongly oppose the bill that is before us that would make bonus depreciation permanent. Yes, I support

bonus depreciation on a short-term basis to boost the economy if there is a letdown and to provide some incentives to do things that we might not be doing. But I cannot support adding \$287 billion to our deficit for a permanent corporate giveaway while tens of thousands of my constituents and tens of millions of Americans experience deep poverty, unemployment, and economic distress.

H.R. 4718 is a corporate giveaway that even the Republican tax reform bill repealed.

There is a tremendous need to incentivize economically distressed communities like many parts of Chicago, other urban as well as rural areas, and those incentives have lapsed. They are threatened. We are not sure that they are going to be coming.

This bill continues the Republican legislative focus on the wrong issues, ignoring the key programs that create jobs, strengthen our citizens, and grow our economy.

Just imagine what unemployment insurance does. It allows the person who does not have a job—the knowledge that something is going to be coming—to go to the grocery store and buy milk or bread.

Or what happens when there is employment opportunities, if roads and bridges are being repaired? A person gets a sense of confidence that there might be work for them to do.

I remember a song several years ago about “Get a Job”; and the guy said that every day, when he reads the paper, he reads it through and through, trying to find out if there is any work for me to do, but his wife says, “Get a job.”

Individuals who have become totally upset because, no matter what they seem to do, there is no relief. So how could I vote for this bill when there are still 3.3 million long-term unemployed individuals who have not been aided?

I can’t go to church on Sunday or walk down the street without somebody asking me: When is Congress going to do something about our unemployment checks? Are they going to come?

Or they ask: When are the repairs going to be made on our roads and bridges? When are we going to get some new sidewalks? How do you fix the potholes that are erupting all over our community?

When are we going to really take care of the Medicare physician or doctors fix?

When are we going to stop irrational budget cuts that strangle education, research, and innovation?

When are we going to provide confidence and hope?

When are we going to stop the process where the rich continue to get rich and the poor continue to get poor, and the middle class gets squeezed in to where we almost create two groups and two categories of people: those who have much and those who have little?

So I would urge that we vote “no” on this bill and give confidence to the American people that their needs will be taken care of.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas, I would like to submit, for the RECORD, a letter from over 100 associations that represent thousands of employers and job creators, of whom represent hundreds of thousands of employees. In the letter they say, this piece of legislation that we are about to vote on today helps them create jobs and increases productivity.

JULY 9, 2014.

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned associations—and the companies we represent—appreciate the efforts of the House Ways and Means Committee to make permanent important tax provisions that expired at the end of 2013. In particular, we support swift action on legislation (H.R. 4718) to permanently extend bonus depreciation, creating a pro-investment tax climate that will spur much needed economic growth and jobs and provide a bridge to broader tax reform.

Continued uncertainty about bonus depreciation is discouraging investment in the United States and, in some cases, keeping companies totally on the sidelines. This impacts both companies that make investments and companies that manufacture capital equipment.

In contrast, since 2008, members of our associations have responded positively to the availability of 50 percent expensing, including an important part of the legislation allowing companies to utilize Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) credits in lieu of 50 percent expensing.

Many of our companies have been recognized for this commitment to domestic investment that creates jobs and increases productivity. Renewing bonus depreciation and the comparable AMT credit in lieu of bonus depreciation will provide an immediate incentive for businesses to make additional capital investments, thereby boosting the U.S. economy and job creation.

Thank you in advance for supporting this important legislation when it comes to the House floor for a vote later this week. Our associations and member companies will continue to support comprehensive tax reform, but until an agreement becomes effective, extending bonus depreciation is essential to maintaining the nation's economic momentum. In order to plan with certainty, companies must know as soon as possible what the tax rules for capital investment and job creation in America will be in 2014 and beyond.

Sincerely,

Aeronautical Repair Station Association; Aerospace Industries Association; Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute; Airlines for America; American Boat Builders & Repairers Association; American Composites Manufacturers Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Foundry Society; American Lighting Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Trucking Associations; AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology; Arizona Manufacturers Council; Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce; Asso-

ciated Equipment Distributors; Associated Industries of Arkansas; Associated Industries of Florida; Associated Industries of Missouri; Association of American Railroads.

Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Association of Washington Business; Auto Care Association; Biotechnology Industry Organization; Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.; California Manufacturers & Technology Association; Chemical Coaters Association International; Colorado Association of Commerce & Industry; Corn Refiners Association; Council of Industry of South-eastern New York; CTIA—The Wireless Association; Forging Industry Association; Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Energy Association; General Aviation Manufacturers Association; Georgia Association of Manufacturers; Greater North Dakota Chamber; Illinois Manufacturers' Association; INDA, Association of the Nonwoven Fabrics Industry; Indiana Manufacturers Association.

Industrial Energy Consumers of America; Industrial Fasteners Institute; Industrial Heating Equipment Association; Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries; Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute; International Sign Association; Iowa Association of Business and Industry; IPC—Association Connecting Electronics Industries; ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association; ITTA—The Voice of Mid-Size Telecommunications Carriers; Kansas Chamber of Commerce; Kitchen Cabinet Manufacturers Association; Medical Device Manufacturers Association (MDMA); Metals Service Center Institute; Mississippi Manufacturers Association; Missouri Association of Manufacturers; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Air Transportation Association; National Association of Electrical Distributors; National Association of Manufacturers.

National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers; National Association of Trailer Manufacturers (NATM); National Automatic Merchandising Association; National Business Aviation Association; National Cable & Telecommunications Association; National Council for Advanced Manufacturing; National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA); National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Mining Association; National Propane Gas Association; National Roofing Contractors Association; National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association; National Tooling and Machining Association; National Waste & Recycling Association; Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Nevada Manufacturers Association; New Jersey Business & Industry Association; Non-Ferrous Founders' Society; North American Die Casting Association; North Carolina Chamber.

NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Convening Technologies; NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association; Outdoor Power Equipment Institute; Portland Cement Association; Precision Machined Products Association; Precision Metalforming Association; Resilient Floor Covering Institute; Rhode Island Manufacturers Association; San Antonio Manufacturers Association; Secondary Materials and Recycled Textiles Association (SMART); South Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association; Specialty Equipment Market Association; Specialty Graphics Imaging Association.

SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association; Steel Manufacturers Association; Texas Association of Manufacturers; Textile Rental Services Association; The Hardwood Federation; The State Chamber of Oklahoma; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United States Telecom Association; USA Rice Federation; Valley Industrial Association; Window and

Door Manufacturers Association; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Woodworking Machinery Industry Association; World Alliance for Decentralized Energy.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1000

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to make 50 percent bonus depreciation permanent because it grows the economy and creates jobs. Short of comprehensive tax reform, a permanent extension of bonus depreciation is our best option to grow the economy, create jobs, and lift wages.

This bill is important to Kansas manufacturers and to Kansas farmers and ranchers. The Tax Foundation found that permanent bonus depreciation would grow the economy by 1 percent, adding \$182 million to the economy, increase wages, and create over 210,000 jobs. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this legislation will increase economic growth and could reduce the debt by as much as \$10 billion.

But, most importantly, today's bill moves our Tax Code in the right direction. It is broad-based in that it does not pick winners and losers and does not favor one type of investment over another. Simply, it favors investment in the types of capital that create jobs and put more money in people's pockets.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with this faulty effort for one reason and one reason only: the failure of fundamental tax reform.

Now, a good-faith effort was made in terms of drafting the proposal, but it really didn't go anywhere.

I would note in this institution, known for its emotions, that the response of the Democratic minority to the Camp draft proposal was fairly muted, thinking that this might be a worthwhile start to an ongoing conversation that would be bipartisan and bicameral.

A good start, we had. The model that we embraced over 3 years really worked quite well. Without the glare of publicity, we actually had an adult conversation back and forth between the parties, the stakeholders, and heard from virtually everybody you could hear from.

Well, when the proposal was offered publicly, the response on the Republican side was one of histrionics—Well, you can't do this. And you can't do that. Well, let's not try this. And let's not do that—even though an academic exercise had been undertaken that was worthwhile. So tax reform was killed



in the crib before there was even an opportunity to have a conversation.

Now, my friend from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) said that everybody on this side is afraid to use the word “stimulus.”

Stimulus, stimulus, stimulus, stimulus. I am going to use it, and I am going to use it in the motion to recommit.

Stimulus has worked in America's economic history, when America actually did big things. Mr. Lincoln found time during the midst of the Civil War to do the Transcontinental Railroad. Mr. Roosevelt did the Panama Canal. Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Reagan did the Big Dig in Boston. These are worthwhile undertakings that need to be done, and not to shy away from the principle of economic growth under the guise of a remedy that has dubious economic consequences.

Now, let me say this as well. And I intend, in the motion to recommit, to speak to it.

Remember the days when tax policy here was done between the two parties? Remember when there was a healthy give-and-take, where we actually talked about our differences in the quiet of the Ways and Means room, still the most desired committee to sit on in the Congress?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NEAL. The point that I make on this is very simple. We started out with a bona fide effort to do tax reform. This is not the way to do tax reform. We need to go back to the drawing table and draft a proposal that the American people will come to see as competitive and will highlight the role that optimism has always played in American public life.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Health Subcommittee chairman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TIBERI and Chairman CAMP for bringing this very important jobs bill to the floor.

The truth is, America's economy is really hurting. This is the slowest recovery, most disappointing recovery in half a century. We are missing about 5 million jobs from our economy. We have a lot of small businesses struggling. The average family of four in America is missing over \$1,000 a month from their paycheck, their budget because of this disappointing recovery.

So what is missing? Well, it is not government spending. That is above where it was in 2008. It is not family spending. That is above what it was. What we are missing is business investment. When businesses along Main Street buy new buildings, new equipment, and new software to make themselves more competitive, that is when jobs occur. And that is what is missing out of the economy.

What this bill does is make it more affordable for our local businesses to immediately write off, deduct from their taxes a portion of what they buy in equipment and software and technology. That makes it more affordable, it allows them to do more of it, and that creates jobs along Main Street. And that is what this bill is all about, creating not government jobs, not temporary jobs, not stimulus jobs. This is about creating jobs along Main Street by letting our local businesses invest.

It has always been a bipartisan bill. This is an area that Republicans and Democrats agree on. Unfortunately, it is an election year. We are going to hear all of the arguments against it. But the truth is, our local businesses are struggling. They need this tax relief. And our economy needs the jobs because we are not going to get back to a balanced budget until we have more people working and more jobs created and more revenue coming in the door.

I commend our leadership for bringing this very important business bill, jobs bill, to the floor. And I urge Republicans and Democrats to come together to support it.

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

I would like to read the Statement of Administration Policy:

The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 4718, which would permanently extend “bonus depreciation” rules that allow corporations to speed up deductions for certain investments and, thereby, delay tax payments. This provision was enacted in 2009 to provide short-term stimulus to the economy, and it was never intended to be a permanent corporate giveaway. Moreover, H.R. 4718 includes no offsets and would add \$287 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years, wiping out more than one-third of the deficit reduction achieved by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013.

The deficit increase in H.R. 4718 is more than 20 times the cost of the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits, which Republicans are insisting be offset, and more than triple the discretionary funding increases for defense and nondefense priorities enacted in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which were offset. House Republicans also are making clear their priorities by rushing to make business tax cuts permanent without offsets, even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the earned income tax credit, child tax credit, and education tax credits expire.

The administration wants to work with the Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen the economy and help middle class families, including pro-growth business tax reform. However, making costly business tax cuts permanent without offsets represents the wrong approach.

If the President were presented with H.R. 4718, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. TIBERI. I yield myself such time as I may consume for my closing.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is very clear. As the gentleman from Massachusetts—who is a friend of mine and who I agree with on a lot—said we should be here to talk about comprehensive tax reform and not temporary tax policy.

In my years here in this United States Congress and my years, more importantly, on the Ways and Means Committee, there hasn't been a chairman that has been more bipartisan, more inclusive, and made a stronger effort to comprehensively reform our Tax Code than Chairman DAVE CAMP. If he would have had a partner in the White House and a partner in the Senate to move the ball along as far as he did, quite frankly, in a very bipartisan way, we wouldn't be here today.

But here are the facts: for the past 5½ years, Barack Obama has been the President of the United States of America. Here is a fact: the first quarter of this year, our economy retracted 2.9 percent.

This bill is a jobs bill. Simple enough. And, in fact, during my time on the Ways and Means Committee—putting Chairman CAMP aside—without Chairman CAMP, with other chairmen, we haven't had any bipartisanship. We haven't had tax bills. We didn't have an effort to comprehensively, in a bipartisan way, have a Tax Code rewritten. It has only been Chairman CAMP.

So we can talk about theory and academics. But here we are today, with one choice in an economy that is not near where any of us want it to be after 5½ years of Barack Obama as President.

We have a piece of legislation that we know creates jobs that for 10 out of the last 12 years hasn't been paid for. For 10 out of the last 12 years, it hasn't been paid for. And there is no benefit to job creators for long-term certainty. None. Zero.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have already submitted for the RECORD a list of hundreds of associations that represent thousands and thousands of employers around the country who create jobs for hundreds of thousands of employees who say this is one of the best job-creating tools they have.

I know people who want a job. They would rather have a job than unemployment insurance. They want a job really badly.

Something my dad said to me a long time ago when he lost his manufacturing job of 25 years: “The most important thing is a job.” And that is how simple this is, ladies and gentlemen. That is how simple this is.

In 5½ years, we have higher taxes, more regulations. This is about jobs. This is what job creators want. Let's give them what they want. Let's go to the Senate. Let's have a conference committee. Let's work it out the good old-fashioned way.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts and I, if we got locked in a room, we could work it out the good old-fashioned way. Let's do it.

I urge my colleagues, let's not make this partisan. Let's make this bipartisan, as it should be, as it has been, and go work with the Senate to get this done and help Americans get a job.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4718 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, line 22, strike "or".

Page 3, line 24, strike "and" and insert "or".

Page 3, after line 24, insert the following:

"(VI) which is qualified restaurant property, and".

Page 4, line 2, strike the period and insert ", and".

Page 4, after line 2, insert the following:

"(iii) which is placed in service by the taxpayer before January 1, 2016.".

Page 13, line 20, strike the quotation marks and final period.

Page 13, after line 20, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

"(F) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to any tree or vine planted or grafted after December 31, 2015.".

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—Section 168(k) of such Code, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(G) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer which is, or is a member of an expanded affiliated group which includes, an inverted domestic corporation, paragraphs (1), (4), and (5) shall not apply.

"(B) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of paragraph (6), the term 'inverted domestic corporation' means any foreign corporation—

"(i) which, pursuant to a plan or a series of related transactions, completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

"(I) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

"(II) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

"(ii) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of which, after such acquisition, is held—

"(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

"(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

"(iii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group of which, after such acquisition, occurs (directly or indirectly) primarily within the United States,

and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation for purposes of this paragraph if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under section 7874 regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this subparagraph.

"(D) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iii)—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

"(ii) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

"(E) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

"(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

"(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

"(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

"(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in subparagraph (C) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

"(F) EXPANDED AFFILIATED GROUP.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'expanded affiliated group' has the meaning given such term in section 7874(c).".

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1015

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my comments to the other side.

Mr. TIBERI, who is indeed my friend and a terrific guy, said that there is no partner at the White House. When we undertook this very significant proposal on tax reform, it wasn't the White House; it was the Speaker of our House—the Speaker of this House—who said, "Blah, blah, blah."

Now, I want to tell you that I am not bilingual, Mr. Speaker, but when you tell me blah, blah, blah, I get it. It ain't going anywhere. To blame the White House when the Speaker of the House poured cold water on it is outrageous.

Now, we heard of several companies that have been proceeding with inversions. For those of you paying attention to this, it simply means that a company moves offshore, they declare that they are no longer a corporate citizen of America, but instead, they will reincorporate to a foreign address for the express purpose of avoiding American corporate income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal that we have here is pretty simple. As they line up, the dam is breaking. I hear in the next few weeks that up to 47 companies—as the Congressional Research Service has pointed out—are lining up to leave. They include manufacturing, pharmaceutical, and financial services sectors.

We should be doing fundamental tax reform as Mr. CAMP laid out the proposal, but the issue of inversions and depreciation before us today, while seemingly unconnected, are intimately connected.

Mr. Speaker, given the Republican opposition to Chairman CAMP's proposal, we cannot move forward on a House bill that reforms our Tax Code in a current or meaningful way at the moment, but we can address a very fundamental issue right here this morning without changing the nature of this legislation.

We can, in fact, address the issue by linking inversion to the purpose of bonus depreciation, and through that, we can suggest that any company that moves offshore cannot take advantage of corporate inversion and bonus depreciation simultaneously. That is what we are proposing today.

Now, I have a history with bonus depreciation. Remember Nancy Johnson, a Republican Member; and Phil English, a Republican Member? I supported with them the use of bonus depreciation—as Mr. ROSKAM wanted to

hear me say, stimulus, stimulus, stimulus.

On a short-term basis, bonus depreciation makes some sense, but not to make it permanent at the cost of \$867 billion.

Friends, to do bonus depreciation separate from fundamental tax reform is economic nonsense. We need a comprehensive look at the Code and remind ourselves that bonus depreciation is but the following: a tool in the toolbox to make economic repairs.

Now, this proposal that our Republican friends have today with this cost attached to it is the least defensible of all of the extender proposals that they have offered.

Our own Congressional Research Service says that you do bonus depreciation for a short-term purpose to provide an economic stimulus during a recession. It is “a temporary investment subsidy that is expected to be more effective than a permanent one for short-term stimulus . . . Its temporary nature is critical to its effectiveness.”

Now, this is important to remember here today. Chairman CAMP repealed bonus depreciation, period. Now, we are bringing it back to be made permanent on a Friday morning, with no thoughtful or deliberative discussion other than the Speaker of the House saying, “Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.”

What I am suggesting here today is that we cannot afford to spend \$825 billion on this hit-or-miss chance that we are taking to do fundamental tax reform in this way.

Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the nub of what we are proposing. What this motion to recommit does is it keeps bonus depreciation as always intended, a temporary tool in our toolbox in an economic downturn.

This motion is a commonsense piece of legislation that extends bonus depreciation for 2 years—2 years—in a thoughtful and deliberative way, then we go back to fundamental tax reform, and then we take it up in a much more integrated way.

Now, lastly, if you voted yesterday for the DeLauro amendment, you need to be consistent today and vote for this motion to recommit which addresses the DeLauro amendment and puts behind us this conversation of ad hoc tax reform.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. CAMP. Well, I am pleased to hear that my colleague on the other side actually agrees with me that we need bonus depreciation because this motion to recommit extends that policy for 2 years.

The reason why I oppose this motion to recommit is because, again, this is temporary tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that allows impor-

tant tax provisions to expire. We are alone on that. Nobody else does that. That is why it is so important that we make this policy permanent.

Let me just say that the economy is contracting 2.9 percent in the last quarter. It is not growing. We are going the wrong direction. We have people whose real incomes are declining. People are out of work. More kids are living at home than ever before. We need to do something permanent to get this economy growing.

Look, families are struggling in America. Let's do something pro-growth, something permanent. Certainly, we agree on the policy. You just don't want to do it for as long as we do.

We would like to make this permanent. We have done it for 10 years, and for all practical purposes, with the uncertainty, we have agreed that the policy should be permanent. When you do it for that long, it should be.

Let me just say, look, temporary policy never works. We have more than 100 associations and businesses representing millions of workers that have come forward and said: Please make this policy permanent, we support what you are doing, and we need it, so that we can have the certainty that we need to make investments.

Look, the Tax Foundation has said that if we do this, if we make this permanent, we will grow the economy by 1 percent, that we will add \$182 billion to the economy, we will increase stock, we will increase wages by 1 percent, which is \$500 for an individual making \$50,000 a year.

Let's give America a raise. Let's vote for this bill. Let's vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, let me just also say a lot of Americans know that the country is going in the wrong direction, but what they are really concerned about is they don't see us doing anything to make it better.

We can restore the American Dream and not have it be some remnant of the past if we support permanent tax policy.

Reject the temporary nature of this. Vote “no” on the motion to recommit, and vote for final passage on the bill.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 229, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—229

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Amash       | Cantor        | Ellmers       |
| Amodei      | Capito        | Farenthold    |
| Bachmann    | Carter        | Fincher       |
| Bachus      | Cassidy       | Fitzpatrick   |
| Barber      | Chabot        | Fleischmann   |
| Barletta    | Chaffetz      | Fleming       |
| Barr        | Clawson (FL)  | Flores        |
| Barrow (GA) | Coble         | Forbes        |
| Barton      | Coffman       | Fortenberry   |
| Benishek    | Cole          | Fox           |
| Bentivolio  | Collins (GA)  | Franks (AZ)   |
| Bilirakis   | Collins (NY)  | Frelinghuysen |
| Bishop (UT) | Conaway       | Gardner       |
| Black       | Cook          | Garrett       |
| Blackburn   | Cotton        | Gerlach       |
| Boustany    | Cramer        | Gibbs         |
| Brady (TX)  | Crawford      | Gibson        |
| Bridenstine | Crenshaw      | Gingrey (GA)  |
| Brooks (AL) | Culberson     | Gohmert       |
| Brooks (IN) | Daines        | Goodlatte     |
| Broun (GA)  | Davis, Rodney | Gosar         |
| Buchanan    | Denham        | Gowdy         |
| Bucshon     | Dent          | Granger       |
| Burgess     | DeSantis      | Graves (GA)   |
| Byrne       | Diaz-Balart   | Griffin (AR)  |
| Calvert     | Duffy         | Griffith (VA) |
| Camp        | Duncan (SC)   | Grimm         |
| Campbell    | Duncan (TN)   | Guthrie       |

|                 |              |               |               |                 |               |                |                |                  |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Hall            | McKeon       | Salmon        | Brady (TX)    | Heck (NV)       | Posey         | Farr           | Levin          | Rangel           |
| Hanna           | McKinley     | Sanford       | Braley (IA)   | Hensarling      | Price (GA)    | Fattah         | Lewis          | Roybal-Allard    |
| Harper          | McMorris     | Scalise       | Bridenstine   | Herrera Beutler | Rahall        | Foster         | Lipinski       | Rush             |
| Harris          | Rodgers      | Schock        | Brooks (AL)   | Holding         | Reed          | Frankel (FL)   | Lofgren        | Ryan (OH)        |
| Hartzler        | Meehan       | Schweikert    | Brooks (IN)   | Horsford        | Fudge         | Reichert       | Lowenthal      | Sánchez, Linda   |
| Hastings (WA)   | Messer       | Scott, Austin | Broun (GA)    | Hudson          | Renacci       | Gabbard        | Lowey          | T.               |
| Heck (NV)       | Mica         | Sensenbrenner | Brownley (CA) | Huelskamp       | Ribble        | Grayson        | Lujan Grisham  | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Hensarling      | Miller (FL)  | Sessions      | Buchanan      | Huizenga (MI)   | Rice (SC)     | Green, Al      | (NM)           | Sarbanes         |
| Herrera Beutler | Miller (MI)  | Shimkus       | Bucshon       | Hultgren        | Rigell        | Green, Gene    | Luján, Ben Ray | Schakowsky       |
| Holding         | Miller, Gary | Shuster       | Burgess       | Hunter          | Roby          | Grijalva       | (NM)           | Schrader         |
| Hudson          | Mullin       | Simpson       | Bustos        | Hurt            | Roe (TN)      | Gutiérrez      | Maloney        | Schwartz         |
| Huelskamp       | Mulvaney     | Sinema        | Byrne         | Issa            | Rogers (AL)   | Hahn           | Carolyn        | Scott (VA)       |
| Huizenga (MI)   | Murphy (PA)  | Smith (MO)    | Calvert       | Jenkins         | Rogers (KY)   | Hastings (FL)  | Matsui         | Scott, David     |
| Hultgren        | Neugebauer   | Smith (NE)    | Camp          | Johnson (OH)    | Rogers (MI)   | Heck (WA)      | McCollum       | Serrano          |
| Hunter          | Noem         | Smith (NJ)    | Cantor        | Johnson, Sam    | Rohrabacher   | Higgins        | McDermott      | Sewell (AL)      |
| Hurt            | Nugent       | Smith (TX)    | Capito        | Jolly           | Rokita        | Himes          | McGovern       | Sherman          |
| Issa            | Nunes        | Southerland   | Carter        | Jordan          | Rooney        | Hinojosa       | McNerney       | Slaughter        |
| Jenkins         | Olson        | Stewart       | Cassidy       | Joyce           | Ros-Lehtinen  | Holt           | Meeks          | Smith (WA)       |
| Johnson (OH)    | Palazzo      | Stivers       | Chabot        | Kelly (PA)      | Roskam        | Honda          | Michaud        | Speier           |
| Johnson, Sam    | Paulsen      | Stockman      | Chaffetz      | King (IA)       | Ross          | Hoyer          | Miller, George | Swalwell (CA)    |
| Jolly           | Pearce       | Stutzman      | Clawson (FL)  | King (NY)       | Rothfus       | Huffman        | Moore          | Takano           |
| Jones           | Perry        | Terry         | Coble         | Kinzing (IL)    | Royce         | Israel         | Moran          | Thompson (CA)    |
| Jordan          | Petri        | Thompson (PA) | Coffman       | Kline           | Ruiz          | Jackson Lee    | Nadler         | Thompson (MS)    |
| Joyce           | Pittenger    | Thornberry    | Cole          | Kuster          | Runyan        | Jeffries       | Napolitano     | Tierney          |
| Kelly (PA)      | Pitts        | Tiberi        | Collins (GA)  | Labrador        | Ruppersberger | Johnson (GA)   | Neal           | Tonko            |
| King (IA)       | Poe (TX)     | Tipton        | Collins (NY)  | LaMalfa         | Ryan (WI)     | Johnson, E. B. | Negrete McLeod | Tsongas          |
| King (NY)       | Posey        | Turner        | Conaway       | Lamborn         | Salmon        | Jones          | O'Rourke       | Van Hollen       |
| Kinzing (IL)    | Price (GA)   | Upton         | Cook          | Lance           | Sanford       | Kaptur         | Owens          | Vargas           |
| Kline           | Reed         | Valadao       | Cotton        | Lankford        | Scalise       | Keating        | Pallone        | Veasey           |
| Labrador        | Reichert     | Wagner        | Cramer        | Latham          | Schneider     | Kelly (IL)     | Pascarell      | Vela             |
| LaMalfa         | Renacci      | Walberg       | Latta         | LoBiondo        | Schock        | Kennedy        | Pastor (AZ)    | Velázquez        |
| Lamborn         | Ribble       | Walden        | Loeb          | Loeb            | Schweikert    | Kildee         | Payne          | Visclosky        |
| Lance           | Rice (SC)    | Walorski      | Loeb          | Loeb            | Scott, Austin | Kilmer         | Pelosi         | Wasserman        |
| Lankford        | Rigell       | Webster (TX)  | Long          | Long            | Sensenbrenner | Kind           | Perlmutter     | Schultz          |
| Latham          | Roby         | Webster (FL)  | Daines        | Lucas           | Sessions      | Kirkpatrick    | Pingree (ME)   | Waters           |
| Latta           | Roe (TN)     | Wenstrup      | Davis, Rodney | Lummis          | Shea-Porter   | Langevin       | Pocan          | Waxman           |
| LoBiondo        | Rogers (AL)  | Westmoreland  | Denham        | Maffei          | Shimkus       | Larsen (WA)    | Polis          | Welch            |
| Long            | Rogers (KY)  | Whitfield     | Dent          | DeSantis        | Shuster       | Larson (CT)    | Price (NC)     | Wilson (FL)      |
| Lucas           | Rogers (MI)  | Williams      | DeSantis      | Diaz-Balart     | Sinema        | Lee (CA)       | Quigley        | Yarmuth          |
| Luetkemeyer     | Rohrabacher  | Wilson (SC)   | Duffy         | Marchant        | Sires         |                |                |                  |
| Lummis          | Rokita       | Wittman       | Duncan (SC)   | Marino          | Smith (MO)    |                |                |                  |
| Marchant        | Rooney       | Wolf          | Duncan (TN)   | Matheson        | Smith (NE)    |                |                |                  |
| Marino          | Ros-Lehtinen | Womack        | Ellmers       | McAllister      | Smith (NJ)    |                |                |                  |
| Massie          | Roskam       | Woodall       | Enyart        | McCarthy (CA)   | Smith (TX)    |                |                |                  |
| McAllister      | Ross         | Yoder         | Fincher       | McCaul          | Southerland   |                |                |                  |
| McCarthy (CA)   | Rothfus      | Yoho          | Fitzpatrick   | McClintock      | Stewart       |                |                |                  |
| McCaul          | Royce        | Young (AK)    | Fleischmann   | Fleming         | Stivers       |                |                |                  |
| McClintock      | Runyan       | Young (IN)    | Flores        | Forbes          | Stockman      |                |                |                  |
| McHenry         | Ryan (WI)    |               | Fortenberry   | Fox             | Stutzman      |                |                |                  |

## NOT VOTING—12

|             |               |          |
|-------------|---------------|----------|
| Aderholt    | Hanabusa      | Nunnelee |
| Carney      | Kingston      | Pompeo   |
| DesJarlais  | McCarthy (NY) | Richmond |
| Graves (MO) | Meadows       | Schiff   |

## □ 1049

Messrs. STEWART and MULVANEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Messrs. PETERS of California and FARR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to 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. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 160, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—258

|          |             |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Amash    | Barr        | Bilirakis   |
| Amodei   | Barrow (GA) | Bishop (GA) |
| Bachmann | Barton      | Bishop (UT) |
| Bachus   | Benishek    | Black       |
| Barber   | Bentivolio  | Blackburn   |
| Barletta | Bera (CA)   | Boustany    |

## NOES—160

|             |             |              |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Bass        | Castro (TX) | Davis (CA)   |
| Beatty      | Chu         | Davis, Danny |
| Becerra     | Cicilline   | DeFazio      |
| Bishop (NY) | Clark (MA)  | DeGette      |
| Blumenauer  | Clarke (NY) | Delaney      |
| Bonamici    | Clay        | DeLauro      |
| Brady (PA)  | Cleaver     | DelBene      |
| Brown (FL)  | Clyburn     | Deutch       |
| Butterfield | Cohen       | Dingell      |
| Campbell    | Connolly    | Doggett      |
| Capps       | Conyers     | Duckworth    |
| Capuano     | Cooper      | Edwards      |
| Cárdenas    | Costa       | Ellison      |
| Carson (IN) | Courtney    | Engel        |
| Cartwright  | Crowley     | Eshoo        |
| Castor (FL) | Cummings    | Esty         |

## NOT VOTING—14

|             |               |          |
|-------------|---------------|----------|
| Aderholt    | Hanabusa      | Nunnelee |
| Carney      | Kingston      | Pompeo   |
| DesJarlais  | Lynch         | Richmond |
| Doyle       | McCarthy (NY) | Schiff   |
| Graves (MO) | Meadows       |          |

## □ 1057

Mr. NEAL 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. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote 403: on Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 4923—I would have voted “nay”; rollcall vote 404: on Passage of H.R. 4923—I would have voted “aye.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today, the eleventh day of July 2014, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall Nos. 403 & 404 due to a personal matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted against rollcall No. 403 and in favor of the underlying legislation of rollcall No. 404, H.R. 4718, Making Bonus Depreciation Permanent, introduced by Representative PAT TIBERI of Ohio.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR THE STATE OF ISRAEL AS IT DEFENDS ITSELF AGAINST UNPROVOKED ROCKET ATTACKS FROM THE HAMAS TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution