

I would think that menu labeling, as a matter of course, is a marketing aspect. If you know that your restaurant is putting out food labeling that is accurate and upon which you can depend, great, as I may be more likely to go to such a facility; but, there, it is a voluntary choice. It goes from voluntary to compulsory under the language of the Affordable Care Act. Therein is the problem. That is the problem that Representative MCMORRIS RODGERS sought to correct of the inadvertent addition of a single food item in food that is prepared in a restaurant that has more than 20 facilities.

Think of a name brand pizza place. You may have a local franchise in your town. If you go there on a Friday night and if the calorie count is not identical to what has been posted on the menu board and someone checks, that chef could be imprisoned for a year. That is the reason that, indeed, constituents have written and that restaurant owners have written. They asked Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and she responded to their requests, and that is why we have a bill in front of us today.

The rule that is under consideration right now provides for the consideration of an important fix to a harmfully crafted law and to a poorly written regulation.

I applaud my fellow Energy and Commerce Committee member CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for her work and for doing all she could to bring all stakeholders together to craft a workable compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 611 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV,

resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3926.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644) "An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes."

DEBT MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL
RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3442.

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

□ 1326

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3442) to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility, with Mr. BYRNE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I would also like to thank Mr. MARCHANT of Texas for his leadership on this legislation.

H.R. 3442 was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in September of 2015, and it was passed with strong support. It is also highly relevant.

I have just come from our second hearing on the 2017 budget. Anything we can do to add clarity and stability to our budget and debt process is extremely helpful. The amount of debt this country currently owes is staggering—\$19 trillion and growing. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the debt will reach \$29 trillion in 2026.

Let's be clear about why this is happening. It is not because Americans aren't taxed enough; it is because Washington has a spending problem. As we look to the future, revenues will remain half a percentage point above their historical average as a share of the economy. Meanwhile, spending will rise from 21 percent of the share of the economy today to 23 percent in 2026, both of which are far above the historical average of 19.9 percent.

When Republicans took the House in 2010, this government borrowed 40 cents for every dollar it spent, and, today, it is 14 cents; but that is not good enough, because, under the current law baseline, it will go up to 21 cents per dollar in 2026. At this rate, if left unchecked, deficits will rise from over \$500 billion this year to nearly \$1.4 trillion in 2026. Congress needs to address this and consider real solutions to lowering the debt and bringing sustainability to our Federal Government. We can't do that if we don't have a debt management system that is consistent, transparent, and accountable.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act would create a system that allows Congress to make informed decisions about the debt ceiling and consider changes before it becomes a crisis.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress before the statutory debt limit ceiling is hit so that legislators have the information they need when considering the debt limit. That reporting would include the current State of the national debt as well as future debt projections and the administration's plans to meet future obligations.

The Secretary would also report proposals of the President's on how to reduce the debt in the short, medium, and long term and any proposals to improve the debt-to-GDP ratio.

Finally, the administration would have to submit a progress report if it requests multiple debt limit increases so that Congress and the American people can finally get information about the progress that is being made.

□ 1330

This legislation will also make the Secretary's reports available online so

everyone in America can access this important information.

We are at a time when serious decisions must be made about how to grow the economy and stop the increase in the national debt. We can't do that if we don't have the necessary information. So this means that we need to be on the same page about the drivers of our debt and to have an open discussion about our intention to reduce the debt.

This bill would take a process that has become, I think, chaotic and difficult for everyone and instead create a system—a good, smart, open system—that provides a consistent framework.

As others have said, the national debt is a shared responsibility, and we need to focus on ways to address it and move forward sensibly. The current path we are on just isn't sustainable. It will require all of us, both in the legislative and executive branch, to work together to find solutions.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act is an important step in improving this process. It not only provides clarity and transparency, but it also creates accountability and establishes a framework to discuss options and ideas on how to reduce this national debt.

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

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

The chairman said this bill came out with strong support and it is relevant. Now, the vote in the committee—this was many, many months ago—was strictly partisan, and this bill is really a diversion. It was marked up at the same time as that Pay China First Act. Does anybody remember that irresponsible legislation that came to the floor that was passed by the Republicans and died the death legislatively it deserved?

So here we are with this bill, part of a two-package bill, that also is going nowhere. It is worse than that, because it is really a diversion, a diversion from what we really should be talking about. It requires the Treasury Department to provide to Congress information on the debt limit that we already receive, distracting from Republicans' repeated recklessness about default and reinforcing the false belief that the debt limit is a tool for managing the debt.

House Republicans refused to invite OMB Director Shaun Donovan to Capitol Hill this week to testify on the President's budget—an unprecedented action. We asked this morning in the Ways and Means Committee: Why did neither the House nor the Senate controlled by Republicans invite the OMB Director? Well, the chairman of the Budget Committee was there at the time and said something like: We don't have time.

That is really shameful. We are debating this bill together, which would require the Treasury Secretary to provide a report and come testify before

Congress on the very debt reduction proposals they are refusing to hear about now, including from the Budget Director. If nothing else, Republicans are proving they are consistent with their inconsistency.

If we were to request from Treasury a new report related to the debt limit, it should focus on the dire consequences of default. It should provide detailed information on the veterans who would not get the benefits they earned. It should tell how many doctors and hospitals who treat Medicare patients won't be paid for care they already provided. It should enumerate the Pell grants we will not pay to students who rely on them to pay for college. And it should explain and enumerate the catastrophic consequences of default to our economy.

That is the kind of information Congress might need the next time we debate the debt limit if Republicans once again propose default instead of responsible action. Instead, Republicans are insisting on a report that would distract from the danger of default and do nothing to help reduce the debt.

If the real goal is debt reduction, as I said, Republicans should welcome OMB Director Donovan to explain the administration's ideas, and then they should sit down with Democrats and take bipartisan action now, as we did during the Clinton administration, when bipartisan legislation generated record budget surpluses.

So the Republicans, I guess, are trying to divert the focus from their inability to take action to reduce the deficit and instead blame Treasury and the administration.

The administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy. They indicate, if the President were presented with H.R. 3442, his advisers would recommend he veto this bill.

Let me close by just saying how unfortunate it is to bring up this effort to obscure the problem instead of acting on legislation that is so badly needed, including addressing inversions that are going on one after another in this country. This, I think, demonstrates the total failure of Republicans to face up to what we are now facing. We should be acting on that instead of this bill.

Well, this is going to have the same fate as the Pay China First Act, such a terrible mistake it was. It is going nowhere. It will be strictly partisan.

So I say to the Republicans in this House, you talk about common ground; instead you bring forth something that essentially is a sham, and you can't stand together on what is essentially a sham.

Mr. PASCRELL, a distinguished member of our committee, at this point will control the remainder of the time on our side.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the

chairman and, of course, my good friend from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This week, the President sent his fiscal year 2017 budget to Congress and released it to the American people. His budget included numerous proposals to reduce the deficit by \$2.9 trillion and grow our economy. In fact, under President Obama's leadership, we have seen deficits shrink to stark lows, the smallest it has been in 7 years.

However, the chairman of the House Budget Committee has refused to hold a hearing on the President's budget with the Office of Management and Budget. This is the first time in 40 years that the President's budget will not be granted a hearing. We separate the powers, but we never separate respect.

Ignoring the fact that the President just sent deficit reduction proposals to Congress, rebuffing the OMB Director's request to testify, the House has instead gone to consider legislation that requires the administration to submit deficit reduction proposals and come and testify about the debt limit and the deficit. Something doesn't quite add up here.

I have tremendous respect for the sponsor of this bill. I think he is acting in good faith—I think it is logical, but I don't think it is true; not everything logical is true, you know—the author of the bill and my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee. But I believe this legislation misses the forest for the trees.

When nearing the debt limit, the most important thing for Congress to know is the catastrophic consequences of a default, yet this bill makes no mention of such a report. Instead, the legislation before us today asks the Treasury Department to report to Congress on things that Congress is most equipped to know. So they are asking us to hear what we already should know.

The drivers and composition of future debt—that is us—and how the United States will meet its debt obligations, that is what is important to us and that is what is important to the American people.

Just a reminder of our constitutional roles: the Congress has the responsibility to enact spending and revenue measures; the Treasury Department, part of the executive branch, executes the laws that we enact—not vice versa. They can't spend money that we haven't authorized.

This bill would create new statutory requirements for the Treasury Department that are unnecessary and duplicative. The Secretary of the Treasury regularly corresponds with the Budget Committee about the debt limit and provides regular updates about the status of our ability to meet our debt obligations.

If I might add just at this point, we know what the Constitution says about the debt limit. The 14th Amendment is very clear, section 4:

“The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions . . . shall not be questioned.”

That is what the Constitution—you know, we refer to the “we,” constitutionalists, only when it suits our purpose and supports our arguments. I think we should look at the Constitution as a document which affects everybody at any time in any place within our borders.

Now, the Treasury provides us with the following: the budget, the Mid-Session Review—in fact, it is online; the Daily Treasury Statement, online; the Monthly Treasury Statement, online; the Monthly Statement of the Public Debt, online; the Schedule of Federal Debt and the Financial Report of the United States Government—all of which, I am saying again, are available on the Internet.

At the time this legislation was brought before the Ways and Means Committee in September of 2015, Republicans were considering a default on the full faith and credit of the United States. A default would have catastrophic consequences, including a collapse of world credit markets and a destruction of job markets.

Should Congress fail to raise the debt limit, the Treasury will not be able to pay veterans' benefits, pay doctors, pay hospitals, take care of Medicare patients, pay salaries to our troops or Pell grants to students who need them. These are expenditures that have already been authorized by the Congress, but if we don't act on the debt limit, we simply can't pay them. We can't.

Fortunately, we were able to come together. We worked together, believe it or not. We suspended the debt limit through March of 2017. The report triggered by this bill, H.R. 3442, will be wholly duplicative of information Congress has already received from the Treasury Department, the Office of Management and Budget. So much for government efficiency.

Well, I believe, my good friend from Texas, what we can and should do is come together in a bipartisan manner on a budget—what we can and we should do. But I believe that we will instead see a deeply partisan and ideological budget for my good friends on the other side that has no chance of garnering any Democratic support. I hope that is not the motivation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his consideration and his speaking on the bill today and commend my colleague from New Jersey. We had a very lively discussion about this bill in the Rules Committee. Over the years, my colleague and I have been able to disagree very agreeably, and I trust that today will continue in that spirit.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, I introduced the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act because Congress and the administration need to focus on finding debt reduction solutions.

There is rarely a time that I appear in my district at a townhall meeting or even a gathering of just a few people where the subject of the debt of the United States of America is not the focal point of the discussion. I never go through a public meeting where someone doesn't raise their hand and say: What is Congress doing about the national debt?

When we began to contemplate this bill a couple years ago, we began to think about how we could put into law a process where Congress would not solve the debt problem, but we would begin a process where the committees of jurisdiction would have a full report from the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury about where we were with the debt and the plans of the administration and what they would do to reduce that debt.

When this bill was passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means in September, the national debt was \$18.1 trillion. Now it is over \$19 trillion. Debt held by the public is now roughly 74 percent of the economy's annual output. It is also a higher percentage than at any point in American history except for a very brief period around World War II. If current law remains unchanged, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that Federal debt held by the public will exceed 100 percent of GDP in 25 years. This is unsustainable.

Everyone knows that the national debt is increasing, but the existing strategy for dealing with the debt limit only fuels conflict and fiscal irresponsibility. This creates disruption and uncertainty, and it erodes the confidence in the American leadership and economy.

Five times in the last 5 years, the Treasury Department has had to employ extraordinary measures to avoid reaching the debt limit. These maneuvers are supposed to be a last resort. They were only employed six other times between the 1980s and 2011. Extraordinary measures have become the new normal, just like record levels of debt.

The goal of H.R. 3442 is to establish a new debt limit process that is more transparent, accountable, and timely. This legislation would allow Congress and the American people to take an early and accurate look at the debt and the statutory debt limit before it is reached, not after the press release that it has been reached is released.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from Texas says he gets asked all the time about the national debt.

He can give a very simple answer—because the Congress keeps spending money and not paying for it. That is how you incur debt; you buy things and you don't pay for them. They can be all sorts of things. They can be Social Security, they can be Medicare, they can be battleships, they can be health care, they can be roads, they can be bridges. If you don't pay for them—it shouldn't be any surprise—you incur debt.

Who spends money in the United States of America? The Congress. Under the Constitution, we are the ones who spend money. I say to my friend from Texas, he might also say, Well, when you create \$800 billion-plus of new debt by cutting taxes and not paying for them, you have less revenue, but you don't cut buying stuff, you have more debt. \$800-plus billion in December. I didn't vote for that bill because we didn't pay for it.

Now, I have been in office a long time. It is easy and takes no courage to cut taxes, no courage whatsoever. What takes courage is buying things—and if people want them—saying, we need to pay for them. We need to pay for them so our children don't pay for them, so our grandchildren don't pay for them because, guess what, they are going to have their challenges in their time, national security challenges, natural disasters like Katrina or Sandy challenges, Ebola, AIDS, health crises. They are going to have to have resources, and we are spending them.

I have been here sometime, longer I think than the gentleman from Texas, longer than my friend from New Jersey. There is one person in America who can stop spending in its tracks. I have been here 36 years. No President in the 36 years that I have served has had a veto overridden of a bill that spent too much money. Not one. Not one Republican President, not one Democratic President. So a President can stop spending in its tracks.

Under Ronald Reagan, we increased the national debt 189 percent. It was less than a trillion dollars when I came to the Congress of the United States. It was increased under Ronald Reagan 189 percent, the largest of any President.

Under George Bush, in 4 years, it was increased 55 percent; under Bill Clinton, in 8 years, 36 percent. But guess what, during the last 4 years, we had a balanced budget, the only time in the lifetime of anybody in this body that we have had 4 years of balanced budgets.

Now, my Republican friends will say, well, we were in charge of the Congress. For the last 6 years you were. But you were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency under George W. Bush, and the budget deficit was increased 87 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCARELL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the President says he is going to veto this bill, but the irony is—and the chairman sits on

the floor—the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has submitted a budget on behalf of the administration to respond exactly to the questions that this bill wants to ask.

For the first time in 41 years, the administration has been refused the opportunity to testify, which The Washington Post called, gratuitously, contemptuous. And then my friends have the audacity to bring a bill on the floor in the same week and ask the Secretary of the Treasury to come down and testify, talk about the debt when we know darn well why the debt is what it is.

It is our responsibility, because we incur it, to make sure that we pay our debt. That is our moral responsibility, as well as our constitutional responsibility. This is politics at its most contemptuous level. It is to pretend that somehow the President is responsible.

My friends, we ought to reject this bill not because of the bill itself, but we get this information, as has been so often said. We already get this information. You don't need the Secretary of the Treasury to come down here and give it to us. He testifies before the Committee on Ways and Means; he testifies before other committees.

Let's reject this bill because it is phony, not because substantively we don't need this information. We have it. It is redundant. It does what my friends on the Republican side so often say, we ought to not have redundant things.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the fact that my time has expired. This bill ought to expire with it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, our Nation is \$19 trillion in debt. That is more than \$58,000 for every man, woman, and child. Now, Tennesseans know that mounting debt burden in Washington is not just an economic concern.

This is a national security issue and it is a moral issue, one that the President is willfully choosing to ignore. His latest budget would cause our debt to spike to more than \$27 trillion over the next 10 years, and when the government maxes out its credit cards to pay for this runaway spending, the Obama administration routinely insists on a so-called clean debt limit hike, a blank check with no strings attached.

Mr. Chair, our constituents deserve better than that. They expect the Congress would assert its role as a coequal branch of government and leverage these opportunities to demand real cuts and to engage the administration in an honest conversation about Washington's spending addiction.

And that is why I support the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. This commonsense piece of legislation would require that the adminis-

tration come to here—yes, the people's House—before any potential debt limit increase and testify about the drivers of our debt and a plan to fix it. The Treasury Department would then be required to post this information on their Web site so that the American people can see the facts for themselves. After all, it is their money that we are spending.

Mr. Chair, this is about injecting some basic accountability into a budgeting process. Taxpayers and the next generation of Americans who will inherit this debt burden that we are accumulating today are owed at least that much.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

Mr. PASCARELL. How much time is remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, I just want to remind the young lady from the other side of the aisle, my good friend, that everything she has asked for is pertinent and important, but it is already on the Internet.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Amnesia. Amnesia, Mr. Chair, once again pervades this Republican Conference. Where were these great deficit hawks 2 months ago when they had an opportunity to vote on increasing the national debt? They were there raising their hand "aye" in favor of hiking the national debt. Today, they come forward with the audacity to say let's solve the runaway national debt problem; we want another government report to do it.

Yes, at Christmastime, these deficit hawks went on a spending spree right here in this House. Not a spending spree to provide more educational opportunity for our children, not a spending spree to provide more medical research dollars for our scientists and physicians, not a spending spree to do something about our crumbling roads or to build a competitive infrastructure, but a spending spree with tax expenditures from the Tax Code to stuff every silk stocking they could find. Anyone who had a powerful lobby, they were here to get an expanded or extended tax cut.

Here is what was said 2 months ago, and I quote:

"Budgeting in this country has pretty much become a joke. Members of Congress give heartfelt speeches—the same kind we are hearing today—"about being responsible. . . . And then time and time again, they cast votes that add billions and even trillions of dollars to the debt. The rampant hypocrisy is quite galling."

"How can lawmakers claim that their budget will achieve balance when they just passed a deficit-financed tax deal that blows a big hole in the budget?"

Those weren't the words of a Democrat. Those weren't the words of a progressive institution. They were the words of Maya MacGuineas, the president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a bipartisan organization. On their board is Mitch Daniels, Alan Simpson, and a host of Republicans.

That final bill that they voted for 2 months ago added \$830 billion to the national debt over the next 10 years, as they borrowed money from abroad to give it to Wall Street and other special interests. It will cost us about \$2 trillion over the next two decades.

One of the biggest items in that budget was a giveaway to Wall Street banks, the same Wall Street banks that helped bring this country to its knees in the economic crisis. Yet they came in and they got a tax break in order to encourage shipping more jobs overseas, which is what that particular tax break does.

They come back to us today, having added to the debt so much. Never seeing a tax break for a special interest that they didn't like—to borrow from Will Rogers—they come to us today and say give us a report, give us another speech.

When we had the Treasury Secretary in front of our committee all morning, our Republican chairman was candid. He was cordial, but he was candid in saying that everything that the Treasury Secretary was offering was dead on arrival, would never see the light of day.

This is a wasted endeavor that ought to be rejected.

□ 1400

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, Mr. MARCHANT has gotten people's attention this afternoon. I am really surprised at how lively and engaged our friends are on the other side of the aisle.

So, it begs the question: What is so provocative about this bill? What is so provocative and incendiary? Apparently, having the administration come with a plan, as it relates to the debt, is a provocation.

I don't think our friends on the other side of the aisle have to take the bait. In fact, the ranking member said it came out with only Republican votes. If I were a Democrat, I wouldn't admit that it only came out with Republican votes. I would be trying to claim credit for this.

Why? Because I come from the State of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what happens when you avoid problems. The State of Illinois has avoided problems year after year after year. My home State now has a \$100 billion unfunded pension liability. That is a fact. Illinois has a crisis.

What Mr. MARCHANT is proposing is very simple and very clear. If this is

provocative, I don't know how to deal with it. It requires the administration to lay out a proposal to reduce the debt in the short term: 1 to 2 years.

The criticism of the administration's current budget is that it never balances. Ever. Think about that. Hello. Never. There is never a balance.

So, what he is saying is they have got to come in and show how they are going to deal with this. Short-term, medium-term, understanding its relationship debt to GDP; all of these things are so important.

We are told: Hey, go to the Internet. That is where your information is. No; what we need is for the administration to understand the information on the Internet—if that is where it is—and come in and present it in a cogent and clear way.

Yes, Congress has the primary responsibility. Yes, the House Republicans have articulated a view that says we can balance this, we can deal with these programs, and we can deal with these cost drivers. We have been met time again by a stiff arm from the President of the United States, who has now redefined the concept of balance. Balance used to mean one plus one equals two. Now the administration says that balance is—what was their latest vernacular—long-term fiscal sustainability. That is ridiculous.

Representative MARCHANT needs to be congratulated. This is a great idea. We ought to be celebrating this. If I were a Democrat, I wouldn't admit to voting against it.

I urge passage of the bill.

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

I just heard something from my good friend from Illinois that bears repeating, which is to have the administration come and testify on their deficit plan.

The President's budget includes \$2.9 trillion in deficit reduction. You have refused a visit from the administration to discuss it. How is that for provocation?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. MARCHANT, my good friend, for introducing this legislation.

Before I address the legislation, I want to talk very briefly about the President's budget.

The President has, indeed, introduced a budget. It raises over \$3 trillion over a 10-year period of time. It increases spending. It increases the interest payments on the debt so that they approach \$1 trillion at the end of 10 years.

We thought it was appropriate to save the President the embarrassment of bringing him before our committee, because when you put that budget on the floor, which we have done in the past, the President gets two votes from

his own party. Just two. So we thought it was appropriate to save the President that embarrassment.

I want to commend my friend, Mr. MARCHANT from Texas, for introducing this legislation, H.R. 3442, today. This is really a simple and straightforward piece of legislation. The bill enhances accountability, reduces potentially disruptive risks to our economy, and would help Congress reach real debt reduction solutions that the American people so clearly desire and deserve.

Under this act, as we approach any debt limit, the administration would have to appear before Congress and provide testimony on what is driving that national debt so that we know that they actually appreciate the drivers of that debt; relate a clear, unambiguous series of proposals on deficit and debt reduction, which they don't do—by the way, the President's budget never balances—and update Congress on progress being made toward debt reduction, which is a principle that we believe and the American people believe is important, but, apparently, this administration does not.

As Budget chairman, I can tell you there is nothing more troubling than the ever-increasing spending that happens around here, especially in the automatic programs. That is why I am heartened that this bill would require the administration to project the fiscal health and the long-term sustainability of major programs like Medicare and Social Security, that, by the way, are going broke unless something is done.

This bill will help further educate the American people on the dire need to save and strengthen and secure these programs. Our budget—the proposal that we put forward—has proposed positive solutions. We need the administration to be a cooperative partner in getting solutions enacted. Forcing them to confront these challenges will be helpful. This bill will do that.

It is pretty simple, Mr. Chairman. House Republicans have been proposing action our Nation needs to take in order to get spending under control and reduce our debt. It seems only fitting and proper that the administration should have to do the same. That is why I am urging a "yes" vote on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just heard something very interesting. When I hear things interesting, I like to repeat them.

So, we are going to save the President the embarrassment. The ranking member, SANDY LEVIN, mentioned that. He said today that is less than a lame excuse: to save the President embarrassment.

You should be embarrassed balancing the budget on the money from the Affordable Care Act, which you have recommended we destroy. How is that for embarrassment?

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the issue of the Nation's deficit is a real concern, but let's be honest: the issue of the country's deficits are of greater concern to our constituents at home than they appear to be to many people in this Chamber.

Our constituents understand and support some government spending is necessary to keep our country going strong. Our constituents understand that some debt is needed. Like government, they incur debts, too: a mortgage, a car loan, a student loan, credit card debt, a small business loan. They also get alarmed when they see deficits that are too high.

So, that is why it is the job of Congress and the President to develop a budget and raise and spend the necessary revenue to operate the government while also meeting the demands of our constituents.

This week, President Obama submitted his budget plan to the Congress for review. Within that budget is a plan to sensibly cut the Nation's deficit by \$2.9 trillion.

I think there are some good ideas in the budget. Maybe others disagree. But Congress should at least discuss it. Yet, earlier this week, they refused to allow the White House to come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit.

We are spending time and taxpayer money to debate a bill to mandate the White House come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit when, earlier this week, these same folks refused to allow the White House to come to Congress and discuss the budget and the deficit.

It is a telling action by my Republican colleagues, as they want to look like defenders of the taxpayers' money by demanding answers on how to reduce the deficit—which is a good thing—while blocking the ability for us to actually get any answers on how to reduce the deficit.

Because they refuse to invite the White House Budget Director to discuss the budget, let me share with you a few things that White House officials would have said if they were invited to speak before the Congress on the budget and the deficit.

Do you remember the \$800 billion TARP funds paid to the Nation's largest banks by the Bush administration? The banks have repaid the money—with interest—under President Obama.

Those trillion-dollar annual deficits that started under President Bush's administration, in part due to the TARP fund and in part due to the Republican recession of 2007–2009, are gone.

More Americans are working now than ever in the history of the United States, with private businesses adding over 14 million jobs under the policies of Democrats. One of those policies was supporting the U.S. auto industry.

When my Republican friends wanted to destroy and bankrupt Detroit, Democrats voted to save the U.S. auto industry. Today, the American car industry is on fire and has added over 645,000 American jobs since 2009.

Now, Republicans will argue they are pushing forward to eliminate annual deficits and not increase the debt. But that simply is not true. The Republican budget, while theoretically balancing in 10 years, increases the national debt by \$3 trillion in that time period, which necessitates an increase in the debt ceiling. Therefore, Republicans, despite their claims and their rhetoric, have to increase the debt ceiling or risk the U.S. being in default.

So, Republicans claiming they won't raise the debt ceiling are either not being honest about raising the debt ceiling, not being honest about their budget, or they want the U.S. to not pay its bills and be in default. Which is it?

Additionally, the Republican budget eliminates \$5.5 trillion in spending on programs like student loans, unemployment insurance, child support programs, as well as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. At least they detail these cuts, such as ending Medicare as you know it.

Even more sinister, their budget—which every one of them brags about supporting—includes \$1.1 trillion in spending cuts that are not even detailed, except to say they will go after retirement programs for Federal employees, military personnel, and veterans. They very cleverly hid those cuts in a footnote in their budget.

I am wondering on what page of their phony budget they create unicorns, because everything else in their so-called budget is one big, giant fairy tale.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's not fool the American people. They know what exactly is going on here.

They want to have it both ways: they want to call the White House on the carpet and say they want to discuss the Nation's deficit, and, at the same time, this very week, give the Budget Director an invitation to come before the Congress and talk about the budget and the deficit.

The American people are asking: What is going on? They know exactly what you are doing. Once again, you are using rhetoric, but not addressing the real problems of everyday Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get down to the American people's business and get the answers we need and that they demand.

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

I think a careful review of the bill will reflect that this bill's effective date will be 2017.

While I cannot say with any certainty who the President will be or which party it will be, I would remind the House that this bill puts the responsibility on the administration, regardless of which party holds the White House, and it is an ongoing responsibility that will further the discussion and collaborative nature of our solutions to this debt.

□ 1415

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. I thank the gentleman from Texas very much.

Mr. Chair, I had some prepared remarks, but the opposition just brought up rhetoric and unicorns in the same sentence, and so I feel obliged to respond with a couple of preliminary remarks. I will just make four.

The rhetoric is easy to come by in this city, but the facts are very clear. I have never seen a Democrat budget that has been smaller than a Republican budget. Every year they turn in a budget that is significantly bigger than ours. That is just fact number one.

Fact number two, our budget balances in 10 years. I have never seen, in my history here, a Democrat budget that balances in any time horizon—and we are talking about the debt.

Point number three, we are talking about the President and his commitment to fiscal sanity. I have never heard the current President mention our unfunded liability problem, which is in the \$100 trillion range. That is the most serious number and economic challenge our country faces. I have never heard our President bring that up as a problem to solve.

And finally, when it comes to fiscal restraint on the other side, the winner of the New Hampshire primary on the opposition side is calling for 90 percent tax rates and free everything.

So, when it comes to rhetoric, those are just four simple facts I offer to the other side when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

I want to move forward and commend Representative MARCHANT for putting this bill forward. This country desperately needs to have an honest conversation about our fiscal problems, the full range, from the debt of \$19 trillion to the unfunded liabilities at \$100 trillion. Total outstanding public debt exceeds \$19 trillion. We just passed that this week or so. The unfunded liabilities are multiples of that.

Deficits are exploding, in the \$500 billion range per year. Deficits by 2026 will be about \$1 trillion a year. That will bring the total debt to about \$30 trillion in a decade. All of this is on the back of our children. If we continue on the path of the status quo, we will end in a debt crisis as China is in now.

That is why I support this bill, because it advances the dialogue exactly when Presidential leadership is most needed, when the debt limit looms. Having leadership from a responsible President could make a world of difference.

Of course, talking isn't the end goal. Talk must spur action. These problems get harder to solve the longer we wait.

According to CBO's 2015 long-term budget outlook, if we wait 10 years, the costs will be nearly one-third greater as a percentage of GDP, and even larger in dollar terms. That is why it is so important we address this critical issue head-on now.

It is also getting harder to address the drivers of debt. Annual spending bills cover only 30 percent of Federal spending, and it will be 22 percent in 10 years.

The rest of Federal spending is on autopilot. Back in 1966, autopilot consumed 34 percent of Federal revenues. By 2026, autopilot spending is on track to be 98.7 percent of revenue in a vastly larger economy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BRAT. Some say it is all demographics. That is a narrow view. As society changes, our institutions have to keep up. That is what we are trying to do in this bill.

We cannot continue to ignore the looming fiscal debt crisis until it becomes catastrophic. Let's address it now while we can still make meaningful reforms. I thank Congressman MARCHANT for taking steps in that direction by proposing this bill.

Let's come together, pass this bill, and continue with the reforms that will make the economic outlook for our children and for future generations greater and brighter. Our fellow citizens expect no less.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is a member—a distinguished member, at that—of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3442, and I do so because the bill imposes burdens on Treasury that are totally unnecessary and will do absolutely nothing to improve our national debt.

It is Congress that makes spending and revenue decisions, and it is Congress' responsibility to raise the debt limit, when needed, to enable Treasury to fulfill the debt obligations that we have made. If you owe, you pay.

Rather than wasting our time on a redundant report by Treasury that does nothing to grow the economy, we should focus our time on creating jobs and strengthening families.

I can think of many things that we could be talking about: raising the minimum wage, creating summer jobs

for youth, creating jobs through infrastructure development, supporting businesses to hire more workers, and increasing grant aid to families so that they can afford college.

Although our economy has demonstrated some solid labor market trends, we know that there are still individuals who are not benefiting from the tremendous economic recovery that we are experiencing.

For example, the University of Illinois at Chicago just completed a study that showed that half the African American males in the city of Chicago between the ages of 20–24 are not working and not in school. And we could be using this time—our time—to figure out ways to bring these individuals into the labor market so that they become productive citizens, rather than reviewing another report that tells us nothing that we don't already know.

So I oppose the legislation not because it is such bad legislation, but it is just a waste of our time, energy, and effort. We need to be figuring out ways to solve problems.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), one of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015.

This bill isn't about budgets. I have listened today. It is about a process, a process to keep our eye on the debt by all Members of Congress. Americans want us paying attention to our national debt.

Our collective debt has now surpassed \$19 trillion, which is \$58,000 per American. Sadly, these numbers are only a tip of the iceberg as they don't include, as my colleague from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) indicated, tens of trillions of dollars of unfunded liabilities stemming from some of our entitlement programs.

To me, this is inexcusable. We need an accurate accounting of our country's financial health, and this legislation is a sorely needed first step only, a first step to start the dialogue in finding a solution to this growing problem.

H.R. 3442 will require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide a report to Congress prior to the debt reaching the statutory limit. The report must include historic, current, and projected levels of debt, the drivers and composition of future debt, and how the United States will meet the debt obligations if the debt limit is raised.

As someone who has spent nearly 30 years in the business world, I know the importance of leveraging debt to grow a business and, in this case, to move the government forward. I understand that sometimes we have to borrow. But if I showed up to a bank without an explanation and plan to repay my obliga-

tions, I would be laughed out of the building. If I told the bank, "The financial statements are on the Internet," "I have sent them to you already," or, "You already have them," the laughing would stop and the debt would be called.

Why should raising the national debt limit be any different? The Treasury should have to present a plan to Congress.

This straightforward legislation is not divisive. It will apply to both Democrat and Republican administrations. It will not even affect the current administration.

Let me be very clear. Our debt is not a Democrat or Republican problem. This is an American problem.

As I travel throughout my district in Ohio, I hear from my constituents regarding their concerns about the direction of our country and what we are leaving our children and grandchildren. Congress must work together to put our national debt back on a sustainable path. That is what this legislation starts the process of doing.

I would like to commend Mr. MARCHANT for his leadership on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Texas for bringing this bill to the House.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Budget Committee since I arrived in this House 5 years ago, and I have listened to testimony on every single budget the President has submitted to this Congress. Among all the calls of the redundancy of this legislation, I want to just encourage my colleagues to read the five short pages that are this bill. It says this:

Not more than 60 days and not less than 21 days before the debt ceiling is to be raised, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit the following: a detailed explanation of proposals of the President to reduce the public debt in the short-term, which is the next fiscal year; the medium term, the next 3 to 5 years; and the long term, the next 10 years.

Five years I have served in this institution; five budgets of this President I have looked at. Not one reduced the debt by one penny this year, next year, 10 years from now, or 100 years from now. This is not redundant.

What Mr. MARCHANT is asking of not this President, but the next President, whoever he or she may be, is to not promise the American people everything on their children's credit card, that if you are going to come to the American people and ask for a credit line increase on America's credit card, you ought to offer at least some semblance of a plan for paying the bill back.

I have heard the charge of hypocrisy here on the House floor. Again, I serve on the House Budget Committee. Every

single year, this House, Republicans and Democrats, pass budgets that balance. Every single year, this House, Republicans and Democrats, pass budgets that plan not just to pay back a penny of debt, but all of the debt.

We can't expect less from our next President. We have to expect more. Republican or Democrat, the next President, before coming to ask for the debt ceiling to be increased, should come with a plan for eventually paying that debt back.

Mr. Chairman, it is embarrassing to me that a clean debt ceiling increase is part of the national parlance. I have got seventh, eighth and ninth graders back home who know what a clean debt ceiling is.

We should never have a clean debt ceiling increase. We should never raise the American people's credit line without a plan for paying it back. Not once, Mr. Chairman, have we considered a bill on the floor of this House that has the requirement that Mr. MARCHANT is proposing today.

The burden will fall on us to implement it, but leadership falls to the White House as well. Don't come and ask the American people for more money until you come with a plan for eventually balancing the books. That is not too much to ask, Mr. Chairman. In fact, it is too little to ask, but it is a fantastic first start.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1430

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman on the other side has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, from a few speakers today on the other side, I have heard "Apocalypse Now." Both sides of the aisle, I think, want to get to a day when we balance the budget. We did it several years in a row at the end of the Clinton administration.

I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are well-intentioned in drafting this legislation. I believe they wanted to focus attention on the ways to address our debt and deficit. I agree. I believe that instead of toying with default—because that sends a horrible, horrible message to the world economy—we should do our job as Members and discuss real, long-term solutions to our budgetary challenges.

In fact, I think my good friend from Texas would agree we had an outstanding discussion in the Rules Committee because I never heard that discussion on the floor of the House. Maybe I missed it. I don't know; did I miss it?

Our discretionary spending, which we use to make critical investments in the infrastructure, education, and laying a foundation for our Nation's future for our kids and our grandkids' economic

growth, that discretionary spending is at the lowest level since 1940. Even the gentleman from Virginia, who started to refer to it anyway, said a few moments ago, only talked about 30 percent discretionary money. But it was wrong what he said. We have not done anything to our insurance programs or entitlements.

The Affordable Care Act here rears its head again, extending Medicare for 12 more years. I think that is a pretty big deal in talking about one of these mandatory costs that we have, 12 years more because of the Affordable Care Act.

By the way, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, what are you going to do with the people who don't have insurance anymore? What are you going to do about the 12 years we have extended for Medicare? Perhaps that is all in this phantom budget we have out there.

Cost increases moving forward will be driven by mandatory programs—you know it, and I know it—like Social Security and Medicare, mostly due to an aging population. We started to address this problem with the Affordable Care Act. We have a long ways to go.

Many Members of this body have reasonable proposals to address the growing cost of health care and Social Security on both sides of the aisle. So I believe we would be better served working together and debating together than sitting here today talking about another report that tells us what we already know.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the continued debate on the bill. This bill is very simple. The bill does not try to talk about the past. It doesn't try to address the Reagan administration or the Clinton administration or the Bush administration or the Obama administration.

It tries to look forward and say that the Secretary of the Treasury, 21 to 60 days before he announces that we will reach the debt ceiling—in this case, next year it will be March of 2017, so about this time next year—if this bill is made law, the Secretary of the Treasury will appear before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee—they could meet jointly—and give a plan from the administration on what the administration intends to do about the national debt.

It is important to know what the intentions of the current administration are about the national debt. The report will first provide a detailed accounting of the state of the national debt. It would include the composition and trajectory of the debt as well as the administration's plans to meet the obligations in the event that Congress agrees to raise the debt.

Second, it would just say here is the administration's proposal to reduce the

debt in the short term, the medium term, and the long term. The answer from the administration may very well be we have no intention whatsoever of addressing the debt in the short term, the medium term, or the long term. If that is what the Treasury Secretary wants to report to Congress, that could be his report.

Third, if the administration requests subsequent debt-limit increases, the Secretary would be required to provide a progress report on prior debt reduction proposals.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury to put all these documents online so the American people can read the report for themselves.

The Nation owes \$19 trillion. The debt is growing every second. Addressing the debt is a shared responsibility, and we should use all available tools to manage this responsibility.

This type of process is not new. In fact, today, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve is appearing before the Senate and earlier this week appeared before the House. Under the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, it required the Federal Reserve Chairman to appear before Congress to give a statement on monetary policy. I don't think it is too much to ask for one meeting a year for the Secretary of the Treasury to come to Congress and state his or her opinion and view about the national debt and the administration's plan on how it plans to reduce the debt.

In fact, this bill would be a simple, first step to addressing that problem. I urge the House to pass this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3442

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY REPORT TO CONGRESS BEFORE REACHING DEBT LIMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3131. Report before reaching debt limit

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not more than sixty days and not less than twenty-one days prior to any date on which the Secretary of the Treasury anticipates the public debt will reach the limit specified under section 3101, as modified by section 3101A, the Secretary shall appear before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to submit the information described under subsection (b).

“(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PRESENTED.—In an appearance described under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit the following:

“(1) DEBT REPORT.—A report on the state of the public debt, including—

“(A) the historical levels of the debt, current amount and composition of the debt, and future projections of the debt;

“(B) the drivers and composition of future debt; and

“(C) how, if the debt limit is raised, the United States will meet debt obligations, including principal and interest.

“(2) STATEMENT OF INTENT.—A detailed explanation of—

“(A) proposals of the President to reduce the public debt in the short term (the current and following fiscal year), medium term (approximately three to five fiscal years), and long term (approximately ten fiscal years), and proposals of the President to adjust the debt-to-gross domestic product ratio;

“(B) the impact an increased debt limit will have on future Government spending, debt service, and the position of the United States dollar as the international reserve currency; and

“(C) projections of fiscal health and sustainability of major direct-spending entitlement programs (including Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid).

“(3) PROGRESS REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A detailed report on the progress of implementing all proposals of the President described under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The report described under this paragraph shall only be submitted if a Secretary has already appeared at least once pursuant to this section during any term of office for a particular President.

“(c) PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall place on the homepage of the Department of the Treasury a link to a webpage that shall serve as a repository of information made available to the public for at least 6 months following the date of release of the relevant information, including:

“(1) The debt report submitted under subsection (b)(1).

“(2) The detailed explanation submitted under subsection (b)(2).

“(3) The progress report submitted under subsection (b)(3).

“(4) Such other information as the Secretary reasonably believes is necessary or helpful to the public in understanding the statutory debt limit, Government debt, and the reports and explanations described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of analysis for chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3130 the following:

“3131. Report before reaching debt limit.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-420. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 3, insert the following:

“(B) the historical levels of Federal revenue, including corporate and individual Federal income taxes as a percent of the gross domestic product;”.

Page 4, line 4, strike “(B)” and insert “(C)”.

Page 4, line 6, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply asks that, in the spirit of this bill and the context of examining the debt, we take a look at Federal revenue trends, which are a critical part of the conversation we are having. Specifically, this amendment asks Treasury to include in their report the historical levels of Federal revenue, including information on corporate and individual Federal income taxes.

While we may disagree on the merits of the underlying bill, I hope that we can agree that it is important to have a complete picture of the Federal budget when looking at debt and deficit issues. When we look closer at our current revenue policies, a fuller picture emerges. This picture could change our perspective on the need to cut programs that Americans hold so high and, instead, raise questions about the need to close loopholes that prevent us from investing in areas of the budget that support the middle class and working families.

Here are a few reasons that we may want to consider changes to this conversation:

Corporations used to contribute \$1 out of every \$3 in Federal revenue. Today, it is \$1 out of every \$10. At the same time, corporations are more profitable than almost ever before.

American taxpayers are losing about \$90 billion every year due to offshore tax loopholes.

In the 1950s, corporate taxes were about 6 percent of the economy. Today, they are 1.9 percent.

All in all, Federal revenue contributed by corporate taxes has dropped by two-thirds over the last six decades.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also allow Treasury to look at individual tax rates so that we can examine if the wealthy are really paying their fair share. Currently, many tax loopholes are reserved for wealthy Americans. These tax giveaways are leaving the middle class to pick up their tab.

Some multimillionaires and billionaires are paying a lower effective tax rate than the average American family. This is wrong. Hard work should never be taxed at a higher rate than making money off Wall Street.

Our Tax Code is full of tax loopholes and tax breaks benefiting big corporations and the rich. When they don't pay their fair share of the taxes, the rest of us pick up the tab. American families end up paying higher taxes or getting fewer services, and the country goes deeper into debt.

If corporations and the rich paid their fair share, then the economy will work better for everyone. Instead of making seniors pay more for Medicare or cutting Social Security benefits, we should close loopholes that allow large corporations to hide profits offshore. Instead of cutting funding for repairing our roads and bridges, we should end huge tax subsidies to oil and gas companies making record profits. Instead of cutting funding for teachers and firefighters, we should ask multimillionaires and billionaires to pay at least as high a tax rate as those public servants pay.

America's richest corporations should not be able to dodge fair taxes to pay lower rates than middle class families.

It is time to address corporate tax dodging and invest in America again. If we close these tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas and hide profits offshore, we can raise billions of dollars to invest in America. We could make our classrooms less crowded, improve roads and bridges, and provide more security for the American people.

Unfortunately, the bill we are voting on today leaves out this entire conversation and, instead, offers false choices of austerity or default.

Please, I hope my colleagues will join me in asking for a fuller picture of our tax policies by supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H.R. 3442 brings very valuable information and transparency to the debt-limit process. The amendment offered by Mr. GRIJALVA would strengthen the legislation by requiring the administration to report additional information on Federal taxes and revenue.

However, I will note that revenues are above their historical average as a share of GDP, so the problem surrounding the unsustainable trajectory of our national debt isn't that Americans are not taxed enough; it is that Washington spends too much.

With that said, I support the text of the gentleman's amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) any reduction measures the Secretary intends to take to fund Federal Government obligations if the debt limit is not raised, including—

"(i) notifying the Congress when the limit has been reached; and

"(ii) notifying the Congress when the Secretary has begun taking such measures and specifying which measures are currently being used.".

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) the plan of the President for each week that the debt of the United States Government is at the statutory limit, to publicly disclose, on the website of the Department of the Treasury, the following:

"(i) All reduction measures currently being used by the Secretary to avoid defaulting on obligations of the Government.

"(ii) With respect to each reduction measure, whether or not such measure is currently being used—

"(I) the total dollar amount of such measure that has been used; and

"(II) the total dollar amount of such measure that the Secretary estimates is still available for use.

"(iii) The date on which the Secretary estimates that all reduction measures will be exhausted, and the Government will begin defaulting on its obligations.".

Page 6, after line 2, insert the following:

"(d) REDUCTION MEASURES DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'reduction measures' means each of the following:

"(1) Directing or approving the issuance of debt by the Federal Financing Bank for the purpose of entering into an exchange transaction for debt that is subject to the limit under this section.

"(2) Suspending investments in the Government Securities Investment Fund of the Thrift Savings Fund.

"(3) Suspending investments in the stabilization fund established under section 5302 of title 31, United States Code.

"(4) Suspending new investments in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund or the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund.

"(5) Selling or redeeming securities, obligations, or other invested assets of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund or the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund before maturity.

"(6) Such other measures as the Secretary determines appropriate.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this

amendment on a very important bill, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Texas. I believe the bill is necessary. My amendment, hopefully, will provide some additional information.

As we know, Congress has the authority to set the debt limit. The President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, however, has the apparent authority to set the date to which all the cable networks peg their doomsday countdown clocks. We saw this firsthand in 2011 and 2013.

Even if receipts, expenditures, or use of extraordinary measures change their internal projections of the exhaustion date, Treasury is not required in any way to provide regular, independently verifiable updates to Congress or the American people. Instead, the elected officials charged with making the ultimate decision on increasing the Nation's maxed-out credit card are expected to simply take Treasury's word for it—sometimes months after an initial estimate.

My proposed amendment is very simple. It would require that Treasury provide a weekly reporting of the extraordinary measures and the projected exhaustion date per our Nation's debt limit.

□ 1445

It is a matter of transparency. But it is also exactly the information we need as Members of Congress to fulfill our constitutional responsibility on this issue.

Consider just how long the use of extraordinary measures lasted in 2015. They were originally utilized on March 15, yet the Treasury set November 3 as the date of exhaustion—over 7 months later. That creates, I believe, a lot of uncertainty, and Treasury continues to control the entire process. Transparency is always a better policy.

Mr. Chairman, to further illustrate why this is needed, just last week, a report was issued by the House Financial Services Committee that found that apparently the Department misled Congress regarding their capabilities and plans concerning debt payments back in 2011 and 2013.

Without going into too much detail, the findings of the report, I believe, are clear. The Treasury did not report to Congress the specific actions they could take once the debt limit is reached.

I urge the House to support my amendment to help ensure the American people and Congress are equipped to make informed judgments on this critical issue of the Federal debt limit.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats don't want to default. We believe we should get our deficits under

control now and not at the moment of default.

I believe my Republican colleagues continue to run from deadline to deadline, creating great anxiety. I don't know if you all noticed how the markets are reacting today with the situation in Europe and in China. We are not doing so well, yet we continue this notion of bringing back before the people, before the world, the notion that we will have a default someday and we will prioritize the payment of default, creating the notion or the idea that somehow the U.S. Government might even default on its bills someday. That in and of itself is very destabilizing, and we will have an amendment coming up a little later on this afternoon.

In fact, this President—our President—has a proposal in his budget to cut an additional \$3 trillion from our Nation's deficit on top of the \$4 trillion in deficit reduction that has already been enacted into law. In fact, this President—President Obama—cut the \$1 trillion Bush deficit in half—in more than half—in 4½ years.

America is moving forward. But the underlying issue is the Republicans are afraid that if they allow the White House to come here to the Hill in the form of a budget director to testify on the budget, these pesky little facts will become more commonly known to the American people.

I only have last year's Republican budget to go by—I wait with bated breath for the 2016 budget to come out—but all I have is the 2015 budget. Although there is some transparency that would make cuts in order to balance the budget—they make cuts in Social Security, they make cuts in Medicare, they make cuts in Medicaid and other health—they would entirely eliminate the Affordable Care Act. We all know what complications come with that—no pre-screening; if you are under 26, you would no longer have your parents' insurance; those who already have preexisting conditions would be discriminated against by insurance companies. We know all the bad things that you all want to see come to fruition.

But then you also have another less transparent line that says: other mandatory cuts, to the tune of \$1.1 trillion. You don't spell out what that means. But I would imagine—and I have to assume—it would mean making mandatory cuts to our veterans, to military personnel, and to Federal employees, just to name a few. To get \$1.1 trillion in additional cuts, those are where the cuts would come from.

That may be your platform—you want to make cuts in veterans, in military personnel, and in Federal employees. Those are cuts you are going to propose. You should just make it more transparent. The American people are looking for transparency. They want the debate. We know the cuts you are ready to propose right now in terms of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act.

Let's be honest, you want to cut military and Federal employee pensions, but you are not spelling it out here. I wonder how the folks nearby in Virginia or in Maryland feel about the cuts you want to make in Federal employee pensions. You don't actually spell it out in your budget. You call it "other mandatory cuts."

The American people should assume what that means. We are just trying to give a little more transparency to what your cuts actually mean. They mean cuts to military and Federal employee pensions. Just a little honesty, just a little transparency. That is what the American people are looking for.

Democrats oppose the GOP plans of threatening default or the Pay China First Act bill, which means no Social Security checks, if that were to go into effect, no doctor reimbursements from serving Medicare patients, and it calls into question the paying of our troops. What it really does, though, is it calls into question what we have prided ourselves on as Americans, and that is that we pay our debts. We don't even create the suspicion.

Alexander Hamilton is rolling in his grave today because you are even creating the suspicion that you would not pay the American people's debts. We have an obligation to do our work, to do our business, not for shenanigans, but to get the people's work done. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this bill doesn't really further or advance getting the people's work done. It is just creating more bureaucracy and more time on the floor taking up more precious time in debate, but that is where we are at.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This amendment that Mr. HUELSKAMP has offered requires the administration to report on extraordinary measures on a weekly basis so that Congress will have the most up-to-date information available.

I can tell you that at the very heart of this bill, as I began to put it together a couple of years ago, was the very fact that through a press release the Secretary of Treasury could come out and pick some date out of midair and say we were going to reach the debt ceiling. Then we would go month after month after month not knowing whether he would come out again with another press release that says: Well, it will be next week.

It is my opinion—and I agree with Mr. HUELSKAMP—that the Secretary of Treasury needs to inform Congress what extraordinary measures he or she is using that week to extend the debt limit deadline.

It is a great amendment, and it adds to the bill.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate support from the gentleman

from Texas, I appreciate support from the Ways and Means Committee, and I certainly appreciate the comments across the aisle of the need for transparency.

We are an information vacuum on this issue as Members of Congress and the American people. This simply requires a weekly report so folks outside of the Department of Treasury know what is happening with our Nation's credit line.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) if the President recommends that Congress adopt, in general, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States to help control the accumulation of future debt."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, it is very fitting today that we are considering this bill. It is the same week that the President released the final budget of his administration—a budget that would add nearly \$2.6 trillion to our national debt over the next 5 years. In fact, this President has never submitted a budget to Congress that would balance.

Few Americans may realize this, but just last week, our national debt reached \$19 trillion—Mr. Chairman, \$19 trillion. When the President came into office in 2009, the debt stood at \$10.6 trillion. That is nearly doubling our national debt in just 7 years' time.

Mr. Chairman, we are on a high-speed train, careening towards a fiscal cliff. Soon it may be too late to slow this train down.

If I could, in the name of all that is fiscally sane, I would enact an amendment to the Constitution right now requiring us to balance our budget. But, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, our Constitution requires two-thirds of our colleagues here in Congress to approve that amendment, which history and previous votes on constitutional amendments have shown is a very difficult bar to reach. While this measure may not be the balanced budget

amendment that our country desperately needs and deserves, it will help draw a very clear line of distinction in the sand.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that my colleagues from Virginia and Ohio and Alabama and I are offering would simply require the President to tell the American people whether or not they support a balanced budget amendment when he or she asks for a debt ceiling increase. It is as simple as that. This is about transparency and about being open with the American people about where you stand on this very critical issue.

It would provide a very clear contrast if the President asked to raise the debt ceiling by trillions of dollars in this case, but offers no support for a measure that would put an end to our Nation's debt problems for good.

Make no mistake, time is quickly coming when our Nation will have to make the decision if we want to restore the fiscal health of our Nation to a state of stability and prosperity for future generations, or go down the same road of nations like Greece that have been shattered by their debt woes. When that day comes, the American people deserve to know who is standing where.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have three children. I hate it when they come to me on Sunday night and say: Dad, I have a paper due tomorrow, can you help me out with it? In many respects that is how I feel my Republican colleagues are treating government today. They are like children that need to be forced to do their homework, forced to do their job, and they are doing it always at the last minute.

In many respects, some of the amendments we are talking about today are memorializing the notion of running government from deadline to deadline. We really shouldn't be doing that. You don't make good judgments. I dare say that my children's papers aren't as good when they wait until the last minute to do them, and I suspect that maybe we don't run government when we go from deadline to deadline. We shouldn't run our government this way.

Democrats have taken the action to lower the deficit and restore the economy. Democrats don't want to default. I believe we should get our deficit under control now and not the moment of default. I know I may sound a little bit like the gentleman running for President, Mr. RUBIO, because I am going to be repeating myself a little bit here, but I think some of the facts bear repeating.

That is where the President again has proposed \$3 trillion in deficit reduction on top of the \$4 trillion in deficit reduction that has already been enacted into law. Again, this President

cut the \$1 trillion Bush deficits by more than half in just 4½ years.

America is moving forward. America doesn't need to be great again. We already are great. We have the ability to deal with our fiscal problems if we stop doing it from deadline to deadline and address them in a smart and healthy way.

The underlying issue is Republicans are afraid that if they are allowed to bring the White House again here before us today to testify on their budget that they have proposed, that again pesky facts will get in the way. I will just point them out again.

□ 1500

We have a little yellow line going through it here.

Other mandatory cuts in the Republican budget are to the tune of \$1.1 trillion. Again, I don't know exactly what they are, but I can only assume that those cuts are to the military personnel's and veterans' pensions and to Federal employees' pensions.

I don't know how many fellow employees who live in the Virginia area, for instance, are paying attention to the debate today or how many of those who live in Maryland are paying attention to the debate today. I suspect, if they are, they are a little concerned about this one line that is highlighted, because it would include, under the Republican budget for 2016, mandatory cuts to veterans', to military personnel's, and to Federal employees' pensions. I just think we need to be more open about what those cuts would be to balance the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing personal against the person who is offering the amendment. Again, I just think it further moves forward this notion that we are going to continue to operate the government deadline to deadline. The American people are sick and tired of the government's operating in this way. They want a more thoughtful government. This is not an answer to that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by Mr. NEWHOUSE would absolutely strengthen H.R. 3442.

By requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress information on the debt ceiling, the President recommends that the Congress adopt a balanced budget amendment. This would add more clarity to the process. Therefore, I recommend to the Members that they vote "yes."

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, once again, I would suggest that my Republican colleagues need to be more clear, more transparent.

The gentleman just mentioned transparency. The Republican budget is begging for transparency. The American people want to know exactly what is meant by "other mandatory cuts to the tune of \$1.1 trillion." Where do those cuts end up being made? Again, I can only suggest it is to veterans', to military personnel's, and to Federal employees' pensions.

People living in the greater Metropolitan Washington, D.C., area, those who live down by Norfolk, Virginia, and other heavy military as well as governmental personnel areas, have to question—and I hope they are questioning—what the Republicans mean by those mandatory cuts. I believe it means veterans', military personnel's, and Federal employees' pensions will be cut if the Republican budget is enacted into law.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, this is a very simple amendment that just requires the administration to state whether or not it would recommend that Congress adopt a balanced budget when it asks for a debt ceiling increase. Our national debt is one of the biggest threats that exists to our Nation. The American people need to know where the administration is and where Congress is on this important issue.

When the President ran in 2008, he promised that his administration would be the most transparent administration yet. This helps him keep that promise. Today, it is all about transparency—letting people know where we stand.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, line 8, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 8, insert the following:

"(D) an economic forecast of the negative consequences of failing to raise the debt limit, including costs associated with public health and safety."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It merely ex-

pands the report the Treasury Secretary must submit per the underlying bill to include an analysis of the economic costs of failing to raise the debt limit, especially with regard to the costs to our Nation's public health and safety.

I agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle that misguided deficit spending poses a serious risk to our Nation's long-term financial stability. It is crucial that we get our fiscal house in order. Simply raising the debt limit without discussing strategic ways to increase revenues and cut costs is unacceptable. Equally unacceptable is not acknowledging the serious short- and long-term costs of failing to raise the debt limit, causing the country to enter into default.

Federal tax dollars fund a variety of programs in every single one of our congressional districts, programs that are essential to the continued well-being of our constituents. Seniors rely on Social Security checks and on Medicare reimbursements. Veterans depend on their much-needed VA benefits. State and municipal police forces receive funding through Department of Justice grants. Our Nation's hospitals receive Federal tax dollars.

It is not an exaggeration to say, if the United States of America defaulted on its loan obligations and if it could not pay its bills for expenses already incurred, the health and safety of its citizens would be put at risk. If America were to enter into default, what would happen? Would the Social Security Administration be able to cut checks? How many Americans would be unable to obtain essential medications? Would the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the TSA, or State and local police units furlough agents and officers? How many fewer cops would be on the beat to keep our communities safe?

All too often, our debates in Washington about the national debt and deficit are not grounded in reality. We simply analyze economic concepts in the abstract, but our decisions and our debates have real, immediate, and lasting impacts on the daily lives of our constituents.

If we are going to engage in a discussion on the pros and cons of raising the debt ceiling, let's keep in mind the real, on-the-ground consequences that the decisions will have on everyday Americans.

If we are going to require the Treasury Secretary to report on the costs of the growing national debt, let's be fair and require that the report discuss the immediate and lasting costs of failing to raise the debt ceiling on our Nation's public health and safety.

The bill's author, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT), stated his goal was to have a comprehensive discussion of the debt ceiling. A comprehensive discussion must include not only the long-term costs of continued deficit spending, but the short-term costs of default, as well as its far-reaching ripple effects.

This amendment is one of common sense and is intellectually honest and fair. It would have zero budgetary impact, and it would ensure the report is as meaningful as possible; so I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require the administration to speculate on the impact of default on our Federal debt. It doesn't call for any specific report. It doesn't call for any specific numbers.

It is not the point of H.R. 3442 to speculate. H.R. 3442 is a sensible step in creating a process to consider the debt limit with information and transparency. I do not feel like this amendment gives any support to that priority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, add the following:

"(D) whether the Administration acknowledges that it is technologically capable of paying only principal and interest on the national debt, as opposed to other obligations, in the event that the debt limit, as specified under section 3101, is reached."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for all of his good work on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as all of us know in this institution and around the country, we are \$19 trillion in debt. We borrow around \$3.8 billion a day, and we spend about \$250 billion a year to service our debt. One of the tools that we have in this Congress is the debt limit in order to get the administration to help reform the way we spend.

In 2011, Congress challenged President Obama. When he asked to have an increase in the debt limit, we said let's have a decrease in how much money we spend. As a political fight played out, the administration promised that chaos would ensue across the global markets if the debt limit were reached, and it also said that any proposal that would prioritize payments through the Treasury for principal and interest on our debt could not be taken seriously. Mr. McCLINTOCK had a bill that would have done just that.

The Committee on Financial Services, the committee on which I serve, did an investigation, and we found that, though they said Mr. McCLINTOCK's bill could not be taken seriously, they actually had a plan to do just what Mr. McCLINTOCK had recommended, which is, if the debt limit is reached, prioritize payments. They weren't being honest with the American people, because what they wanted to do was to use the argument of chaos to put pressure on Republicans to cave and not demand that we reform the way that we spend.

My amendment here today is very simple. All it says is let's make sure that the Treasury comes clean and tells the American people whether it can pay principal and interest before other obligations so that America does not default on its debt. It is very simple. No one here wants to hit the debt limit, and no one wants us to be the next Greece or Puerto Rico, but that is going to take working together in order to make sure we have budgets that balance at some point in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, as I read it, this amendment requires the Treasury to notify Congress about which obligations it would be able to pay were Congress to choose to default and prioritize debt as a vision in the Pay China First bill, which the House has twice passed on a party-line vote.

First, a bill that plans for default sends a very disturbing signal to the world economy. Here is what we have with us: the gentleman, apparently, through the Speaker and the sponsor of this bill, in good faith, wants to pay China first before vets, before Medicare payments, before salaries for our troops, et cetera. The gentleman wants to pay China first. Of all of the people lined up who are going to get paid, the gentleman wants to pay China first. Excuse me for repeating myself.

The intent of the amendment is to accuse the Treasury of deceiving Congress about its ability to prioritize debt payments. The Treasury does not currently have the capability to prioritize between types of payments in the event it does not have enough cash

on hand to pay all of the bills due on a particular date. That is how it works.

□ 1515

In such an event, Treasury would likely hold all of its bills until it has enough cash on hand to pay those bills. This would repeat daily in a cascading fashion. The result would be disastrous, a first-time immediate default on U.S. credit.

Let me repeat the 14th Amendment. It is clear, simple, and concise. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution, section 4, says:

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law"—that is us—"including debts incurred for payment of pensions . . . shall not be questioned."

I think that to even entertain the idea of default is counterproductive. To entertain the idea sends a real message to the financial markets all over the world, including our own. I think that is a disturbing thing. I don't think you want it, and I don't think we want it.

Now, when you look at how the debt was incurred, when you look at that graph about what contributed to this \$19 trillion, zillion, gabillion dollars, you are talking about, it could be very interesting in case of history—history is important here. History 101—what contributed to that debt: two wars unpaid for, two tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 unpaid for, plan B Medicare prescription drugs unpaid for.

Look, we passed legislation on this floor. We are all culpable here, Democrats and Republicans. So when you stand up and pontificate—you don't have to be in a Presidential election either—and you pontificate about those guys simply want to tax and spend, you have short memories. You have selective memories. We have that at times, too, ourselves on our side.

Well, you are talking about something pretty darn fundamental, and that is the budget, and that is the deficit of this country. This is an absolutely unnecessary amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I remind the gentleman from New Jersey that there is no such thing as a gazillion dollars. Having said that, we are talking real money here. We are talking trillions of dollars in debt, no doubt.

I think the gentleman made reference, as well, to the Constitution and spelled out that we shouldn't even hint at the notion of not paying our debt; yet that is exactly what this amendment would do, similar to legislation that passed here last year and the year before that that would suggest that maybe the United States won't pay its bills. That is not going to happen.

Even in your own budget, you would raise the debt ceiling by \$3 trillion in order to pass your budget. So you know you are going to raise—if you had your druthers, you would raise the debt ceiling as well.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin also had to understand that these are debts that are already owed, not future debts. They are debts we already owe that we have to pay back to make sure the world understands the U.S. pays its debts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that this bill guarantees that we pay our debt. That is exactly what this bill does. So I would note that the Democrats are making the argument for me.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the law that established the Treasury Department already instructs it to manage the revenue to support the public credit. This already includes prioritizing payments to assure the national debt is always honored, as the Constitution commands. Without this, a stalemate on the debt could endanger the Nation's credit.

Well, during recent debates over raising the debt limit, the Treasury Department denied that it can prioritize to preserve the Nation's credit. Thanks to the Financial Services Committee's investigation, we now know this was a deliberate and calculated lie told to increase pressure on Congress. Emails revealed that Federal Reserve officials were incredulous and appalled that the administration would make such statements because they ran a severe risk of panicking credit markets.

This amendment simply requires that, when we approach the debt limit, the Treasury Department tells Congress and the public what it is actually preparing to do to assure this Nation's creditors that their loans to this government are completely secure.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), someone who has worked very hard on this issue as well.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important amendment.

Frankly, the opposition to this amendment is baffling. During the debt ceiling debate last year, the administration repeatedly told Congress and the American people that, if we don't raise the debt ceiling, we would default on our Nation's bills, that the seniors would miss their Social Security checks, that interest on the debt would go unpaid, and that it would all bring the U.S. economy to its knees. This, as it turns out, wasn't true.

Contrary to their posturing, recently exposed documents have shown that the administration was planning to prioritize payments in the event the debt ceiling was reached, the very thing they told us they couldn't do. This is beyond partisan politics. It is fear-mongering.

Very simply, my colleague's amendment requires this administration and future administrations to acknowledge

their ability to prioritize payments after hitting the debt limit. It is a good idea.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DUFFY. May I ask the chairman how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 seconds remaining.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that \$800 billion from ObamaCare to Medicare came from Democrats; \$250 billion a year in interest goes to China.

Let's balance the budget. I would love to see the Democrats' plan to balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) any extraordinary measures the Secretary intends to take to fund Federal government obligations if the debt limit is not raised, a projection of how long such extraordinary measures will fund the Federal government, and a projection of the administrative cost of taking such extraordinary measures."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) for his great work on this important bill, a bill that seeks to make the administration accountable for the out-of-control national debt which others have said just hit a staggering \$19 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, like the underlying legislation, the amendment I am offering today holds this administration and future administrations accountable, too. Many don't realize the enormous power Congress has given to the Treasury Department to use so-called extraordinary measures when we are about to hit the debt ceiling.

To pay our bills and delay hitting the debt limit, Treasury has the authority

to take more than \$350 billion out of government accounts, including government worker pension and retirement accounts. This is an incredible power, shifting around hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars and dodging the limit Congress has placed on borrowing.

Our Constitution says that Congress, not the administration, has the power of the purse. So these extraordinary measures, which in effect enable the Department to run up bills or IOUs beyond the debt limit, should be transparent. Congress and the American people have the right to know what Treasury is doing with our money. At present, it is astonishing how little transparency the Department is statutorily obligated to provide.

Very simply, my amendment requires the Treasury to report on what extraordinary measures it intends to use if the debt limit is not lifted. It requires them to project how long such measures will fund the Federal Government so Congress and the American people know well before we near the limit how long those measures will last.

It requires the Treasury Department to estimate the administrative costs associated with taking any extraordinary measures. If moving all this money around costs additional money, we should all know about it.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about brinksmanship once again. I think this is a very unhealthy debate we are having because this is the not the way we should be running government anyway, from deadline to deadline.

As I mentioned earlier, we should be sitting down and working these issues out and not having the world on the precipice of seeing the Nation default. No good will come of it, and absolutely no good comes from talking about it because it will never happen. We will not do it. We will not allow our country to default.

They continue to talk this way because it is the way they are running government, whether it is the government shutdown or the debt limit or the highway trust fund or the Export-Import Bank or the FAA, which we are going to be taking up soon. I am sure that that will go to the last second before we will ever actually act. They will probably do a delay and do it a little later on in the year because that is the way we operate around here. It is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I point out there is a reason why the President has proposed a \$3 trillion cut in the deficit on top of the \$4 trillion that has already been enacted into law. It is to lower the national debt. We are working toward it.

In fact, this President cut the trillion-dollar Bush deficit in half in less than 4½ years.

One last time, I want to point out that we see the Republican budget. We understand the clarity in terms of the cuts you would make to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act.

There is one portion here, “other mandatory cuts,” and I suspect we know what they are as well. They are cuts to veterans’, military personnel’s, and Federal employees’ pensions—veterans’ pensions, military personnel’s pensions, and Federal employees’ pensions.

I suspect people who live around Richmond, Virginia, or down by Norfolk would be very concerned about those cuts you may propose, as well as those folks who live in Virginia and Maryland surrounding Washington, D.C. A lot of Federal employees work around here. I know there are a lot of military employees as well. I think they are concerned about their pensions, the ones that you want to cut in the Federal Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am just looking for a little more transparency.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for introducing the amendment. I know it is in good faith.

I am looking at my favorite chart since I have been here about what causes the public debt. I hear all of these folks talking about it—in both parties running for President—about the public debt, and I don’t know what public debt they are talking about, to be very frank with you.

Let me tell you what the public debt is all about that we are talking about: \$19 trillion and rising. Most of the debt that we carry from year to year—and we have to pay interest on that debt, as you well know—comes from either the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 combined with the two wars we never paid for. I mean, those are the facts. I didn’t make them up.

So we have very little in the discretionary part of the budget. It is only 30 percent of the total budget. We do have a solution to part of the problem in that we extended Medicare for one of those mandatory costs for 12 years. That is what the ACA did.

I am telling you we ought to learn what the facts are, and then maybe we would reduce the number of bills as well as the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their arguments seem to be summarized this way: that somehow if we just would all go bury

our head in the sand that we would be better off.

I mean, the reality is this: our Nation does have a \$19 trillion debt. The reality is that every time this Congress had set a debt limit for our spending, we have breached that debt limit and had to raise another one. The reality is, as we have approached these debt limits in recent years, the Department of the Treasury has taken what they call extraordinary measures, doing it under the law to try to lengthen the amount of time until we hit that debt limit.

This amendment is really a very modest one. All the amendment says is, if the Department of the Treasury is going to take extraordinary measures to avoid the limit on debt that has been set by Congress, that they ought to tell us all what they are doing. They ought to define what it is. They ought to define how much time we are going to buy with these extraordinary measures, and they ought to tell us what it costs as we juggle all this money around. Because when you start juggling money around, as everybody knows in their own life and in their own bills they have to pay, it costs money. That is all this amendment does.

□ 1530

That is all this amendment does. All this amendment does is make sure that as we approach the next debt limit and the Department of the Treasury takes the next extraordinary measures—we can bury our head in the sand and say it won’t happen, but our entire Nation’s history says it will—that we ought to define what they are going to do. They ought to tell us, tell the American people. They ought to explain how much time that buys, and they ought to say how much it costs. I hope my colleagues can support that.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of burying one’s head in the sand. I think an example of that is not asking the OMB Director to come up to the Hill to talk to the Congress about the President’s budget.

As I mentioned before, the President’s budget proposed \$3 trillion in additional cuts to the Federal deficit. I may not agree with all the cuts the President is proposing, but I think it is a healthy thing for the President’s representative, the Director of the OMB, to come before the Congress and speak about that; yet the other side of the aisle has refused to allow the OMB Director to come speak to the Congress to talk about these issues.

So there is hypocrisy and then there is hypocrisy. Talk about putting your head in the sand. There is not enough sand for you all to put your heads in.

The facts are the facts. Reductions are taking place. Accept it. They may not be pretty. The President is proposing them. At least listen to him before you totally disregard it before he

has an opportunity to speak to you all. That is what has happened.

Again, I know what the Republican budget says. It says cuts to veterans’ pensions, military pensions, as well as to Federal employee pensions. That is what your budget does. Be honest about it. You talk about Social Security cuts. You make a lot of cuts, but at least talk about the other miscellaneous mandatory cuts, which really hurt people. I am not going to support that. You all may. It is in your budget. I am not going to support that. Democrats are not going to support that. You all may support that, but you have to respond to your constituents when you force these cuts down their throats.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded that all remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining on my side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, this debate is a remarkable one. There is only one group here that has a budget that balances. For the fifth or sixth or seventh year in a row, we will be submitting a budget that balances.

The gentleman speaks of the President’s budget. The President is going to have the unique historical legacy of having never offered a budget that balances, ever. This one doesn’t. His others haven’t. The truth is that, when the President’s prior budgets have been put on this floor, they have received virtually no votes, like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is the truth.

Again, back to this very simple amendment. All it does is say, when the Department of Treasury uses extraordinary measures, they should be clear with the American people about what they are doing, how much time that buys us, and what it costs. It is a commonsense amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike “and”.

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

“(D) projections of earnings of individuals, including salary and wages by decile, and
“(E) projections of consumer spending and the impacts of such projections on gross domestic product.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Treasury Secretary's report to also include individual salary and wage information as well as projections of consumer spending and the impact of spending cuts on the gross domestic product.

Stagnant American wages in recent decades are, without a question, the country's most central economic challenge, and the issue of wealth and income inequality continues to be a persistent strain on our economy and, indeed, our society. Raising wages is the key in strengthening the middle class, reducing income inequality, and moving families out of poverty.

I am offering this amendment because we have to start getting realistic about the priorities of the American people.

When Americans sit around their dinner tables, their number one discussion is not about the national debt. Their number one concern and discussion is providing for their families and how they are managing their own budgets. Many are seeing that, while costs are rising, their paychecks are not. Everyday items are becoming unaffordable, and workers are sick and tired of working full time and still struggling to get by.

Since 1979, the vast majority of American workers have seen their hourly wages stagnate or, indeed, decline. From 1973 to 2013, hourly compensation of a typical production worker rose just 9 percent, while productivity increased 74 percent. In short, people are working harder and harder, and their paychecks are getting smaller and smaller.

America now has more wealth and income inequality than any major developed country on Earth, and the gap between the very rich and everyone else is wider than at anytime since the 1920s. Shrinking American paychecks are the root cause of rising income inequality, and a host of issues have come with that.

Wages drive our economy and consumer spending amounts to more than two-thirds of U.S. economic activity. A rise in consumer spending would provide a needed boost to the U.S. GDP. It is time to stop suppressing wages through policy choices that are slanted toward helping the wealthy. It is time to recognize that our decisions have a direct impact on a person's paycheck.

Any report attempting to look at long-term fiscal issues of this country must examine why 58 percent of all new income since the Wall Street crash has gone to the top 1 percent. We should be considering how every decision will impact a family's income, and the fact that the underlying bill does not include information on wages is an injustice to struggling American families.

I urge you to support this amendment and show the American people that the Members of Congress are not just fighting for policies that protect the wealthy but, indeed, for policies that protect us all.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, the goal of the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act is to create a sound process for considering the Federal debt limit. This amendment is not focused on that goal and, instead, asks for the administration to speculate about unrelated and impractical issues such as projection of wages at various percentiles. Instead, we should be spending our time focused on the drivers of our debt and how to come up with a credible solution to slow the trajectory of our debt.

I oppose this amendment and ask that Members vote "no."

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the bill overall is a push to continue to deal only with austerity as a plausible budgetary policy for this country. We can see what that austerity only has done to our country so far. This is how we ended up with sequestration. This is how we stifled GDP growth and harmed our overall economic recovery.

The best way to address our long-term debt is to maximize our economic potential. We can't cut our way to prosperity. Instead, we should focus on protecting American workers and families so that they have the wealth necessary to make our economy grow and prosper again.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 114-420.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 25, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following:

"(D) how delayed action by Congress to raise the debt limit and the threat of default impacts the economy, including, but not limited to, the impact on the gross domestic product (GDP), interest rates, employment, household wealth, and retirement assets."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to help Congress better understand how the mere threat of default would impact our economy.

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act gathers information from the Treasury about our Nation's debt but omits critical details; namely, the consequences for the country when my friends in the majority play a game of chicken with the full faith and credit of the United States.

When the majority threatened the default in 2011, it was American families who paid the price. Household wealth fell by \$2.4 trillion. Consumer and business confidence plunged. The S&P 500 dropped 17 percent, \$800 billion in retirement assets were wiped out, and our credit rating was downgraded, all thanks to Republicans threatening to force an unprecedented default on America's debt.

If the extreme wing of the Republican Party is going to hold the economy hostage over the debt limit, they should at least understand the damage they are causing. My amendment requires the Treasury to include in its report to Congress the impact that the threat of default and congressional delay would have on the economy.

The report would include the estimated effect on the gross domestic product, interest rates, employment, household wealth, and retirement assets. Honestly, I hope we never have to see this impact assessment produced. I hope we never again have to convince Republicans that raising the debt limit is a basic responsibility of Congress, not a bargaining chip. But their record says otherwise.

The next time Republicans seek to score political points and push a radical agenda by threatening not to pay America's bills, I want the public to understand the cost of that threat. I think we will find pretty quickly that the American people have no appetite for petty politics when it comes to the debt limit. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chairman, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act focuses on creating a process of transparency and accountability to

deal with the debt ceiling. This bill gets Congress, the administration, and the public on the same page about why we continually find ourselves in this position. Raising the debt limit without any plan to get our debt under control in the future is not a plan.

This amendment does not advance that goal. Instead, it goes in the opposite direction and attempts to focus our attention on the potential effects of brinksmanship.

I urge Members to vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does address the issue at hand. It does address the threat, just the mere threat of brinksmanship with paying our Nation’s bills. History has shown that just the mere threat of defaulting on our bills has brought about damaging consequences to our economy and to the welfare of our people.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-420 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 234, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moulton

NOES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Bartletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

NOT VOTING—15

Bonomaci
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Pallone
Pocan
Reed
Smith (WA)
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1605

Messrs. GOHMERT and HUELSKAMP changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. KATKO, MCNERNEY, and DOGGETT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 176, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—240

Abraham Griffith Pearce
 Aderholt Grothman Perry
 Allen Guinta Pittenger
 Amash Guthrie Pitts
 Amodei Hanna Poe (TX)
 Ashford Hardy Poliquin
 Babin Harper Pompeo
 Barletta Harris Posey
 Barr Hartzler Price, Tom
 Barton Heck (NV) Ratcliffe
 Benishek Hensarling Reichert
 Bilirakis Hice, Jody B. Renacci
 Bishop (MI) Hill Ribble
 Bishop (UT) Holding Rice (SC)
 Black Huelskamp Rigell
 Blackburn Hultgren Roby
 Blum Hunter Roe (TN)
 Bost Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)
 Boustany Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)
 Brady (TX) Issa Rohrabacher
 Bridenstine Jenkins (KS) Rokita
 Brooks (AL) Jenkins (WV) Rooney (FL)
 Brooks (IN) Johnson (OH) Roese-Lehtinen
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam Roskam
 Buck Jolly Jones
 Bucshon Jones Jordan
 Burgess Joyce
 Byrne Katko
 Calvert Carter (GA) Kelly (MS)
 Carter (TX) Kelly (PA)
 Chabot King (IA)
 Chaffetz King (NY)
 Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL)
 Coffman Kline
 Cole Knight
 Collins (GA) Labrador
 Collins (NY) LaHood
 Comstock LaMalfa
 Conaway Lamborn
 Cook Lance
 Costello (PA) Latta
 Cramer LoBiondo
 Crawford Long
 Crenshaw Loudermilk
 Culberson Love
 Curbelo (FL) Lucas
 Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer
 Denham Lummis
 Dent MacArthur
 DeSantis Marchant
 DesJarlais Marino
 Diaz-Balart Massie
 Dold McCarthy
 Donovan McCaul
 Duffy McClintock
 Duncan (SC) McHenry
 Duncan (TN) McKinley
 Ellmers (NC) McMorris
 Emmer (MN) Rodgers
 Farenthold McSally
 Fitzpatrick Meadows
 Fleischmann Meehan
 Fleming Messer
 Flores Mica
 Forbes Miller (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller (MI)
 Foxx Moolenaar
 Franks (AZ) Mooney (WV)
 Frelinghuysen Mullin
 Garrett Mulvaney
 Gibbs Murphy (PA)
 Gibson Neugebauer
 Gohmert Newhouse
 Goodlatte Noem
 Gosar Nugent
 Gowdy Nunes
 Granger Olson
 Graves (GA) Palazzo
 Graves (LA) Palmer
 Graves (MO) Paulsen

NOES—176

Adams Boyle, Brendan
 Aguilar F.
 Bass Brady (PA)
 Beatty Brown (FL)
 Becerra Brownley (CA)
 Bera Bustos
 Beyer Butterfield
 Bishop (GA) Capps
 Blumenauer Capuano

Clay Huffman
 Cleaver Israel
 Clyburn Jackson Lee
 Connolly Jeffries
 Conyers Johnson (GA)
 Cooper Johnson, E. B.
 Costa Kaptur
 Courtney Keating
 Crowley Kelly (IL)
 Cuellar Kennedy
 Cummings Kildee
 Davis (CA) Kilmer
 Davis, Danny Kind
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick
 DeGette Kuster
 Delaney Langevin
 DeLauro Larsen (WA)
 DeBene Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lee
 Dingell Levin
 Doggett Lewis
 Doyle, Michael Lipinski
 F. Loebsack
 Duckworth Lofgren
 Edwards Lowenthal
 Ellison Lowey
 Engel Lujan Grisham
 Eshoo (NM)
 Esty Lujan, Ben Ray
 Farr (NM)
 Fattah Lynch
 Foster Maloney,
 Frankel (FL) Carolyn
 Fudge Maloney, Sean
 Gabbard Matsui
 Gallego McCollum
 Garamendi McDermott
 Graham McGovern
 Grayson McNeerney
 Green, Al Meeks
 Green, Gene Meng
 Grijalva Moulton
 Gutierrez Murphy (FL)
 Hahn Nadler
 Hastings Napolitano
 Heck (WA) Neal
 Higgins Nolan
 Himes Norcross
 Hinojosa O'Rourke
 Honda Payne
 Hoyer Pelosi

NOT VOTING—17

Bonamici Hudson
 Brat Pocan
 Castro (TX) Reed
 Cohen Smith (WA)
 Fincher Wasserman
 Herrera Beutler Pallone
 Pascrell Schultz
 Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1610

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

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

Stated for:
 Mr. BRAT. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 72, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:
 Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, during the rollcall vote No. 72 on the Duffy Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 245, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—171

Adams Gabbard Moulton
 Aguilar Gallego Murphy (FL)
 Ashford Garamendi Nadler
 Bass Graham Napolitano
 Beatty Grayson Neal
 Becerra Green, Al Nolan
 Bera Green, Gene Norcross
 Beyer Grijalva O'Rourke
 Bishop (GA) Gutierrez
 Blumenauer Hahn Payne
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings
 F. Heck (WA) Peters
 Brady (PA) Higgins
 Brown (FL) Himes
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa
 Bustos Honda
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Huffman
 Capuano Israel
 Cardenas Jackson Lee
 Carney Ruiz
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kind
 Connolly Kirkpatrick
 Conyers Kuster
 Courtney Langevin
 Crowley Larsen (WA)
 Cuellar Larson (CT)
 Cummings Lawrence
 Davis (CA) Lee
 DeFazio Levin
 DeGette Lewis
 Delaney Lipinski
 DeLauro Loebsack
 DeBene Lofgren
 DeSaulnier Lowenthal
 Deutch Lowey
 Dingell Lujan Grisham
 Doggett (NM)
 Doyle, Michael Lujan, Ben Ray
 F. (NM)
 Duckworth Lynch
 Edwards Maloney,
 Ellison Carolyn
 Engel Maloney, Sean
 Eshoo Matsui
 Esty McCollum
 Farr McDermott
 Fattah McGovern
 Foster McNeerney
 Frankel (FL) Meeks
 Fudge Meng

NOES—245

Abraham Buchanan Crawford
 Aderholt Buck Crenshaw
 Allen Bucshon Culberson
 Amash Burgess Curbelo (FL)
 Amodei Byrne Davis, Rodney
 Babin Calvert Denham
 Barletta Carson (IN) Dent
 Barr Carter (GA) DeSantis
 Barton Carter (TX) DesJarlais
 Benishek Chabot Diaz-Balart
 Bilirakis Chaffetz
 Bishop (MI) Clawson (FL) Donovan
 Bishop (UT) Coffman Duffy
 Black Cole
 Blackburn Collins (GA)
 Blum Collins (NY)
 Bost Comstock
 Boustany Conaway
 Brady (TX) Cook
 Brat Cooper
 Bridenstine Costa
 Brooks (AL) Costello (PA)
 Brooks (IN) Cramer
 Flores
 Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long

NOT VOTING—17

Bonamici
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Davis, Danny
Fincher
Herrera Beutler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1613

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 227, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lummi
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam

NOT VOTING—16

Bonamici
Castro (TX)
Cohen
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hudson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1618

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3442) to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility, and, pursuant to House Resolution 609, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3442 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 4, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 25 and insert the following:

“(C) an analysis of the following:

“(i) Long-term revenue lost from tax avoidance and evasion resulting from tax loopholes exploited by businesses, including corporate inversions, base erosion, unlimited deferral of foreign earnings, and loopholes that encourage the offshoring of jobs and profits.

“(ii) Long-term revenue lost from tax avoidance and evasion resulting from tax loopholes abused by the wealthy, including carried interest, estate tax rules, capital gains rates, and deductions and exemptions that widen income and wealth inequality among individuals.

“(iii) Long-term revenue lost due to unfair policies in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including those specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), which contribute to growing tax avoidance and evasion by American businesses and individuals who are increasingly more discouraged by corporations and wealthy individuals not being required to pay their fair share of taxes.

“(iv) Long-term revenue lost due to unfair policies in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which harm middle-class workers and families and the long-term revenue effect of a shrinking middle class.”

Page 5, line 16, strike “information, including” and all that follows through line 2 on page 6 and insert “information.”

Mr. MARCHANT (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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to address a problem that has impacted our country for generations, some of our problem-solving colleagues have devised a surefire remedy. They are demanding another government report. Instead of actually voting to prevent more debt when they had the opportunity, they want a report.

Approval of this motion will not kill the report, it will not kill the bill, nor

will it send it back to committee. Rather, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended, but it will be a more complete report that more completely describes the problem with which we are dealing.

Some of my Republican colleagues have a near insatiable desire for tax cuts that don't pay for themselves. They don't mind borrowing from foreign sources to provide more tax preferences to Wall Street or the privileged few. This motion would simply expose the cost of this false ideology. It would add a requirement that the public just find out how much these special-interest tax loopholes cost.

Specifically, this report would be expanded to include inversions. These are schemes by which some multinational corporations are renouncing their American charter, their American citizenship, in order to dodge taxes, while continuing to remain in America and claim the benefits of being American, paid for by their business competitors and other taxpayers. We have had a recent string of these inversions, which are really perversions of our Tax Code by those who refuse to pay their fair share of the cost of national security and other vital services.

American corporation Johnson Controls, for example, has announced its intent to merge with Tyco. Tyco was once an American citizen, before it became a citizen of Bermuda, before it switched to become a citizen of Ireland—all the while being managed in New Jersey. And Pfizer, the largest pharmaceutical company, is seeking the luck of the Irish—the Irish taxes, that is—but it certainly refuses to charge Americans lower, more reasonable Irish pharmaceutical costs.

These are the same companies that are insulted by the notion that they ought to pay a higher rate on their earnings than the people who clean up the boardroom at night.

The Republican chairman of a Houston oil services company wrote me a long time ago rejecting this notion as unfair and unpatriotic.

He said:

We are proud of our country, and we are willing to pay U.S. taxes to receive the wonderful benefits of U.S. citizenship. My strongly held view is that if companies want to be headquartered in some tax haven, then the management should give up their U.S. citizenship and move there.

I agree. But that is not what happens. With our current tax loopholes, they don't have to move much more than a mailbox and few staff members.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court thinks that corporations are people for many other purposes, I agree with former Secretary Hillary Clinton's proposal to treat these charter-changing corporations as individuals like the super rich individuals who turn in passports and leave America. Apply an exit tax to previous profits that these corporations want to take out of the country.

There is much more that the Treasury Department can and should do

now, since what it has done so far under existing legal authority has not accomplished very much.

Today, let's just get a report about it, about a giant rip-off of America. Corporations which are shipping their jobs and profits overseas while paying their lobbyists and their chief executive officers more than they pay the United States Treasury in taxes in any given year have made a pretty good investment for themselves, but it is not too great for the rest of us. They could not do it without enablers in this Congress.

American companies who stay in America and contribute to building American manufacturing in America deserve to have a level playing field. They help keep us secure at home and abroad, and they deserve to be treated fairly. In order to create more opportunity for all, we need more responsibility from all. Let's at least get a report about it.

That is all that this motion to recommit does is to ask for a report to go along with the report that they are seeking from the Treasury Department to tell us what is happening, how our middle class—our working Americans—are having to pay more because some others won't pay their fair share.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to reject this motion to recommit and adopt the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. It is a commonsense solution to Washington's debt-crisis mentality.

H.R. 3442 creates a process to bring transparency, responsibility, and consistency to the debt management process. Regardless of whether a person supports raising the debt ceiling or not, everyone should support a process that gives us more information to make an educated decision.

□ 1630

The Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act requires the administration to report on the state of the national debt before the debt ceiling is reached. It also requires the administration to make recommendations and report information about how to reduce the debt and how America can meet its future obligations.

This accountability will give Congress the information it needs when considering the debt limit. All of this information will be made public online.

H.R. 3442 is a strong first step to move government away from its current crisis approach and changes the focus into coming up with solutions for our debt problem. I am a firm believer in H.R. 3442.

I urge all Members to reject this motion to recommit, and support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3442, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 611; and adoption of the House Resolution 611, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 238, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—179

Adams Fudge Adams (IN) Gabbard Adams (TX) Gallego Bass Garamendi Beatty Graham Becerra Grayson Bera Green, Al Beyer Green, Gene Bishop (GA) Grijalva Blumenauer Gutierrez Boyle, Brendan Hahn F. Hastings Brady (PA) Heck (WA) Brown (FL) Higgins Brownley (CA) Himes Bustos Hinojosa Butterfield Honda Capps Hoyer Capuano Huffman Cárdenas Israel Carney Jackson Lee Carson (IN) Jeffries Cartwright Johnson (GA) Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B. Chu, Judy Jones Cicilline Kaptur Clark (MA) Keating Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL) Clay Kennedy Cleaver Kildee Clyburn Kilmer Connolly Kind Conyers Kirkpatrick Cooper Kuster Costa Langevin Courtney Larsen (WA) Crowley Larson (CT) Cuellar Lawrence Cummings Lee Davis (CA) Levin Davis, Danny Lewis DeFazio Lipinski DeGette Loeb sack Delaney Lofgren DeLauro Lowenthal DelBene Lowey DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham (NM) Deutch Lujan, Ben Ray (NM) Dingell Lujan, Ben Ray Doggett (NM) Doyle, Michael F. Lynch Duckworth Maloney Edwards Carolyn Ellison Maloney, Sean Engel Matsui Eshoo McCollum Esty McDermott Farr McGovern McNeerney Fattah McNeerney Foster Meng Frankel (FL) Moulton

Abraham Graves (MO) Aderholt Griffith Allen Grothman Amash Guinta Amodei Guthrie Babin Hanna Barletta Hardy Harper Barr Harris Hartzler Benishek Heck (NV) Bilirakis Hensarling Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B. Bishop (UT) Hill Black Blackburn Holding Blum Huelskamp Bost Hunter Boustany Hurd (TX) Brady (TX) Hurd (VA) Brat Issa Bridenstine Jenkins (KS) Brooks (AL) Jenkins (WV) Brooks (IN) Johnson (OH) Buchanan Johnson (OH) Buck Johnson, Sam Bucshon Jolly Burgess Jordan Byrne Joyce Calvert Katko Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Chabot King (IA) Chaffetz King (NY) Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Coffman Kline Cole Knight Collins (GA) Labrador Collins (NY) LaHood Comstock LaMalfa Conaway Lamborn Cook Lance Costello (PA) Latta Cramer LoBiondo Crawford Long Crenshaw Loudermilk Love Curbelo (FL) Lucas Curbelo (FL) Luetkemeyer Dent Lummis DeSantis MacArthur Marchant DesJarlais Marino Diaz-Balart Massie Dold McCarthy Donovan Duffey McClintock Duncan (SC) McHenry Duncan (TN) McKinley Ellmers (NC) McMorris Emmer (MN) Rodgers Farenthold McSally Fitzpatrick Meadows Fleischmann Meehan Fleming Messer Flores Mica Forbes Miller (FL) Fortenberry Miller (MI) Schiff Miller (MI) Scott (VA) Franks (AZ) Mooney (WV) Frelinghuysen Mullin Garrett Mulvaney Gibbs Murphy (PA) Gibson Neugebauer Gibson Neugebauer Gohmert Newhouse Goodlatte Noem Gosar Nugent Gowdy Nunes Granger Heck (NV) Graves (GA) Palazzo Olson Granger Palazzo Graves (GA) Palazzo Graves (LA) Palmer

NOES—238
Graves (MO) Paulsen Griffith Pearce Grothman Perry Guinta Pittenger Guthrie Pitts Hanna Poe (TX) Hardy Poliquin Harper Pompeo Posey Hartzler Price, Tom Heck (NV) Ratcliffe Hensarling Reichert Renacci Hill Ribble Rice (SC) Rice (SC) Rigell Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce Russell Salmon Sanford Scalise Schrader Schweikert Scott, Austin Sensenbrenner Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Upton Valadao Wagner Walden Walberg Walker Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Whitfield Williams Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Young (AK) Young (IA) Young (IN) Zeldin Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Bonamici Huizenga (MI) Castro (TX) Lieu, Ted Cohen Moore Fincher Pallone Herrera Beutler Pocan Hudson Reed

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 151, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—267

Abraham Esty Love Aderholt Farenthold Lucas Aguilar Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer Allen Fleischmann Lummis Amash Fleming MacArthur Amodei Flores Marchant Ashford Forbes Marino Babin Fortenberry Massie Barletta Foxx McCarthy Barr Franks (AZ) McCaul Barton Frelinghuysen McClintock Benishek Garamendi McHenry Bera Garrett McKinley Bilirakis Gibbs McMorris Bishop (GA) Gibson Rodgers Bishop (MI) Gohmert McSally Bishop (UT) Goodlatte Meadows Black Gosar Meehan Blackburn Gowdy Messer Blum Graham Mica Blumenauer Granger Miller (FL) Bost Graves (GA) Miller (MI) Boustany Graves (LA) Moolenaar Brady (TX) Graves (MO) Mooney (WV) Brat Griffith Mullin Bridenstine Grothman Mulvaney Brooks (AL) Guinta Murphy (PA) Brooks (IN) Guthrie Neugebauer Brownley (CA) Hanna Newhouse Buchanan Hardy Noem Buck Harper Nugent Bucshon Harris Nunes Burgess Hartzler O'Rourke Bustos Heck (NV) Olson Byrnie Hensarling Palazzo Calvert Hice, Jody B. Palmer Carney Hill Paulsen Carter (GA) Himes Pearce Carter (TX) Holding Perry Chabot Huelskamp Peters Chaffetz Hultgren Peterson Clawson (FL) Hunter Pittenger Coffman Hurd (TX) Pitts Cole Hurd (VA) Poe (TX) Collins (GA) Issa Poliquin Collins (NY) Jenkins (KS) Pompeo Comstock Jenkins (WV) Posey Conaway Johnson (OH) Price, Tom Cook Johnson, Sam Ratcliffe Cooper Jolly Reichert Costa Jones Renacci Costello (PA) Jordan Ribble Cramer Joyce Rice (SC) Crawford Katko Rigell Crenshaw Kelly (MS) Roby Cuellar Kelly (PA) Roe (TN) Culberson Kind Rogers (AL) Curbelo (FL) King (IA) Rogers (KY) Davis, Rodney King (NY) Rohrabacher Delaney Kinzinger (IL) Rokita Denham Kline Rooney (FL) Dent Knight Ros-Lehtinen DeSantis Kuster Roskam DesJarlais Labrador Ross Diaz-Balart LaHood Rothfus Dold LaMalfa Rouzer Donovan Lamborn Royce Duckworth Lance Ruiz Duffy Latta Russell Duncan (SC) Lipinski Salmon Duncan (TN) LoBiondo Sanford Ellmers (NC) Long Scalise Emmer (MN) Loudermilk Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1636

Mr. POMPEO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Schweikert Thornberry
 Scott, Austin Tiberi
 Sensenbrenner Tipton
 Sessions Torres
 Shimkus Trotter
 Shuster Turner
 Simpson Upton
 Sinema Valadao
 Smith (MO) Vela
 Smith (NE) Wagner
 Smith (NJ) Walberg
 Smith (TX) Walden
 Stefanik Walker
 Stewart Walorski
 Stivers Walters, Mimi
 Stutzman Weber (TX)
 Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)

NOES—151

Adams Green, Gene
 Bass Grijalva
 Beatty Gutiérrez
 Becerra Hahn
 Beyer Hastings
 Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA)
 F. Higgins
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa
 Brown (FL) Honda
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Huffman
 Capuano Israel
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick
 Connolly Langevin
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Courtney Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lawrence
 Cummings Lee
 Davis (CA) Levin
 Davis, Danny Lewis
 DeFazio Loeb sack
 DeGette Lofgren
 DeLauro Lowenthal
 DelBene Lowey
 DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham
 Deutch (NM)
 Dingell Luján, Ben Ray
 Doggett (NM)
 Doyle, Michael Lynch
 F. Maloney,
 Edwards Carolyn
 Ellison Maloney, Sean
 Engel Matsui
 Eshoo McCollum
 Farr McDermott
 Fattah McGovern
 Foster McNerney
 Frankel (FL) Meeks
 Fudge Meng
 Gabbard Moulton
 Gallego Murphy (FL)
 Grayson Nadler
 Green, Al Napolitano

NOT VOTING—15

Bonamici Huizenga (MI) Smith (WA)
 Castro (TX) Lieu, Ted Wasserman
 Cohen Moore Schultz
 Fincher Pallone Westmoreland
 Herrera Beutler Pocan
 Hudson Reed

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1642

Mr. DOGGETT 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1017, COMMON SENSE NUTRITION DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2016, THROUGH FEBRUARY 22, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 611) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1017) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A, and providing for proceedings during the period from February 15, 2016, through February 22, 2016, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 178, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—237

Abraham Duncan (TN) Kline
 Aderholt Ellmers (NC) Knight
 Allen Emmer (MN) Labrador
 Amash Farenthold LaHood
 Amodei Fitzpatrick LaMalfa
 Babin Fleischmann Lamborn
 Barletta Fleming Lance
 Barr Flores Latta
 Barton Forbes LoBiondo
 Benishek Poxx Long
 Bilirakis Franks (AZ) Loudermilk
 Bishop (MI) Frelinghuysen Love
 Bishop (UT) Garrett Lucas
 Black Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Blackburn Gibson Lummis
 Blum Gohmert MacArthur
 Blum Goodlatte Marchant
 Bost Gosar Marino
 Boustany Gowdy Massie
 Brady (TX) Brat Granger McCarthy
 Bratenstein Graves (GA) McCaul
 Brooks (AL) Graves (LA) McClintock
 Brooks (IN) Graves (MO) McHenry
 Buck Griffith McKinley
 Bucshon Grothman McMorris
 Burgess Guinta Rodgers
 Byrne Guthrie McSally
 Calvert Hanna Meadows
 Carter (GA) Hardy Meehan
 Carter (TX) Harper Messer
 Chabot Harris Mica
 Chaffetz Hartzler Miller (FL)
 Clawson (FL) Heck (NV) Miller (MI)
 Coffman Hensarling Moolenaar
 Cole Hice, Jody B. Mooney (WV)
 Collins (GA) Hill Mullin
 Collins (NY) Holding Mulvaney
 Comstock Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Conaway Hultgren Neugebauer
 Cook Hunter Newhouse
 Costello (PA) Hurd (TX) Noem
 Cramer Hurt (VA) Nugent
 Crawford Issa Nunes
 Crenshaw Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Culberson Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (OH) Palmer
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam Paulsen
 Denham Jolly Pearce
 Dent Jones Perry
 DeSantis Jordan Peterson
 DesJarlais Katko Pittenger
 Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS) Pitts
 Dold Kelly (PA) Poe (TX)
 Donovan King (IA) Poliquin
 Duffy King (NY) Pompeo
 Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL) Posey

Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise

NAYS—178

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)

Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neale
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bonamici
 Buchanan
 Castro (TX)
 Cohen
 Fincher
 Fortenberry
 Herrera Beutler
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Joyce
 Lieu, Ted
 Moore
 Pallone
 Pocan
 Reed
 Smith (WA)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Westmoreland