

question the need for the civil rights bill.

Dr. King's dream is still just that, a dream. Many of us share that dream. One day, all of us will wake up and see reality, that the dream must be fulfilled. I hope that day comes soon.

In Memphis, it is a holiday for Dr. King. It should be a holiday for everyone, and we remember a great man and his great works.

#### CONGRATULATING WOMEN VETERANS CHAMPIONS OF CHANGE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an inspiring leader from Illinois' 14th District. For her exemplary service last month, Erica Borggren was named one of only 10 of the White House's Women Veterans Champions of Change.

Since August 2011, Erica has served as director for Illinois' Department of Veterans Affairs. Under her leadership, IDVA has launched, among other successful programs, the nationally acclaimed Illinois Joining Forces, which connects veterans with more than 200 veterans-serving organization.

She is a Rhodes scholar, Truman scholar, and was valedictorian at West Point. Her military service spans from South Korea, as an Army Medical Service Corps officer, to Iraq, as commanding General David Petraeus' trusted speech writer.

General Petraeus calls her:

One of the most talented officers with whom I have ever served and exemplary in every respect.

Erica's strong leadership and record of excellence ensures a bright future for Illinois' military servicemembers and veterans.

#### REMEMBERING THE PASSAGE OF THE BRADY HANDGUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACT

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, February of this year marked the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act. Since becoming law, it is credited with stopping more than 2.1 million gun sales to prohibited purchasers, including convicted felons, domestic abusers, and fugitives.

The recent tragedy of 2 days ago at Fort Hood brings to light again the issues of PTSD, mental illness, and what our men and women in uniform have suffered throughout all of our wars, and I mean all of our wars.

We cannot continue to ignore Virginia Tech; Fort Hood; what our colleagues Gabby Gifford and RON BARBER endured; Aurora, Colorado; Sandy Hook; Washington Navy Yard; Little-

ton; and Fort Hood again, just to name a few. These incidents—the families, communities, the friends—cry for action.

Mr. Speaker, let us act by at least bringing H.R. 1565, the King-Thompson bill, to this floor.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1874, PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1871, BASELINE REFORM ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1872, BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 539 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 539

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1874) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation. 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 the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill and the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1871) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment recommended by

the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1872) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 0915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a big day for me down here on the House floor. I don't know if you were catching every word of the rule as it was being read, but what you've got here in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, is a rule that makes in order absolutely every germane amendment that was offered, not to one budget reform bill, not to two budget reform bills, but to three budget process reform bills.

We talk so much about numbers in this institution, Mr. Speaker. We talk about baselines. We talk about CBO scores. We also talk a lot about people. We talk a lot about families. We talk about why what we do here matters in the lives of folks back home.

Father Conroy prayed this morning, Mr. Speaker, that we could get out of some of our old habits that the inertia leads us to disagree and find those things around on which we do agree. There is one thing that is undisputed in this Chamber—in fact, on Capitol

Hill; in fact, in this entire town—Mr. Speaker, when it comes to budget process, and that is that every time we decide we are going to spend money today, we get a little boost in the economy, and that boost comes from a mortgaged future. We can get a little today at the expense of a little tomorrow, or, conversely, we can lose a little bit today in exchange for gaining a little bit tomorrow.

There is no free lunch when it comes to budgeting, Mr. Speaker. I only get to spend each dollar once in this institution, and I can either raise that dollar from today's taxpayers or I can borrow that dollar from tomorrow's taxpayers. There are arguments on both sides. Daniel Patrick Moynihan was fond of saying: Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

What these three budget process bills before us today, Mr. Speaker, will do is make sure we are working from the same shared set of facts. Now, again, this rule, Mr. Speaker, provides for these three bills. It is H. Res. 539. It is a structured rule for H.R. 1874, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. That is going to be on the floor today immediately following this rule. If we are able to secure passage, and I certainly hope that we can, we will be debating H.R. 1874.

H.R. 1874 will instruct the Congressional Budget Office to calculate, when we make these decisions, whether we are going to spend a little today and mortgage tomorrow or whether we are going to save a little bit today in exchange for growth tomorrow, to calculate that impact. It is not enough to spend the dollar, it is not enough to save the dollar. We have to explain, not just to our colleagues, but to the American people, what the benefit or the burden of that decision is going to be. H.R. 1874 brings some clarity to that decision.

One of my personal favorite bills, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 1871. H.R. 1871 and H.R. 1872 are also made in order by this bill. H.R. 1871 happens to be the Woodall bill, Mr. Speaker. It is the Baseline Reform bill. Candidly, I can't claim credit for it. I want to, pride of authorship and all. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth is it is the gentleman from the great State of Texas. Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT has been fighting for this bill long before I arrived in this institution. I happened to get a seat on the Budget Committee; he happens to serve elsewhere; so I am carrying this language. I couldn't be prouder to do it, but I want to give credit where credit is due.

The fight that the gentleman from Texas has been making over the years—and it is not a fight against one another; it is a fight against inertia, as Father Conroy talked about this morning—is to say that it is just crazy in today's tight economic environment to assume that if the government spent X dollars this year, we are going to give them X plus 3 percent next year, that irrespective of what your mission is, ir-

respective of what your productivity is, irrespective of what your success is, we are just going to assume that your agency is going to get more money next year than it got this year. That is not the way anybody operates at home. That is not what we do around the dinner table. That is not what any business in America does. That is not what we should be doing.

So H.R. 1871 says we are going to assume you are going to get next year what you got this year, with absolutely no inflation whatsoever.

Now, this is not an area of wide agreement. I would argue what you get next year ought to be less than what you get this year, because we ought to expect some productivity increases from you. It is fair in the industrious society in which we live that we expect you to do more with less next year. But we are not trying to achieve all of that today. We are just saying that what you get next year is going to be what you get this year. Eliminate those automatic inflators that bias us towards less productivity and more cost.

Finally, H.R. 1872, Mr. Speaker, that is a bill from my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT). That bill says we ought to have accurate accounting, fair cost accounting, of government loan programs.

We are in the business of guaranteeing a whole lot of loans in this institution, Mr. Speaker, loans for all sorts of meritorious activities that we would agree on both sides of the aisle are worthy of being carried on, but the question is how do we account for that in the budget process.

Today we assume that those loans will never go bad—that those loans will never go bad—and that we will only reflect a cost of the American taxpayer guaranteeing those loans when and if those loans do go bad. But that is not what happens in the real world. That is not what we ask of our bankers down on Main Street. That is not what we ask of any financial institution. We would run you right out of town if you tried to do your accounting that way in the real world, Mr. Speaker.

So what Mr. GARRETT says is: Why can't we apply real world accounting to this institution? Why can't we hold ourselves to the same high standard that we hold folks back home? I applaud him for that. I think that is something, again, that brings us together rather than divides us.

What I like most about this rule, though, Mr. Speaker, is that when the amendments were offered—and that is the way the process goes, for folks who don't watch the Rules Committee as closely as my friend from Florida and I do. Members of Congress come; they submit their amendments to the Rules Committee; and the Rules Committee decides what is made in order. But we do that in consultation with the Parliamentarians. We need to make sure that amendments are germane. We want to make sure that the conversation is on the topic that the bill is on.

We don't allow nongermane amendments most of the time, but sometimes Members submit amendments in good faith that don't comply with the rules as they were submitted, but they can be worked on to make them better.

What I am particularly proud of, Mr. Speaker, is that, when we received some amendments that were not quite within the four corners of the rules, rather than just rejecting those amendments out of hand, which would have been a perfectly appropriate response, we didn't do what was appropriate; we did what was right. And that was to go and work with those Members to improve those amendments, get them within the four corners of the parliamentary process, and make those in order today.

So, again, every single germane amendment that was submitted to the Rules Committee on each of these three bills was made in order for debate under the bill. We will do the first of those bills today. If this rule passes, we will do the remaining two next week, and all done in the name of transparency and accurate information for the American people.

It is perfectly legitimate to have your own opinion about what the Federal budget ought to look like, but you are not entitled to your own facts about what the impact of those decisions will be.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and underlying bills.

In my friend's commentary, I perceived him as being very reasonable, particularly when he gets to the part of the rule that deals with those amendments that were made in order that are germane. It is a particular concern that he has demonstrated in the period that he has been on the Rules Committee. He also is an advocate for open rules.

That said, one of the down sides to our process, in my judgment, is that I would imagine that at least a significant portion of this body—not the majority—don't even know what we are debating today and won't know until they come here to vote. For that reason, we should make open rules; whereas, ideas that germinate during the course of the debate could be put forward by Members under our rules process.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of three bills. Before getting into it, normally when people leave our offices or when we complete the process of debating a measure and want to give kudos to the staff, we do so at the end of the process. But today I want to recognize the rather extraordinary staff on both sides of the Rules

Committee, and particularly the young man seated next to me, Ian Wolf, who labors actively to help me put words together to come here with, and two young men that are working in the office with me: Tom Carnes, who recently came to me as a Phi Beta Kappa graduate from Maine, and Mike Sykes, a wounded warrior. Many of the words that I will speak henceforth are from those three gentlemen, and I thank them for that.

Normally, like my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), we both are, in my judgment, good extemporaneous speakers. But today, I am going to stick to the script because of these two young men. Then, if I am provoked by my friend from Georgia, I will speak extemporaneously.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of three bills, all of which impose tortuous new rules on an already convoluted budget process and attempt to embed Republican dogma into what is intended to be an objective analysis based on reality, not fantasy.

The bouquet of imagery to explain this latest budgetary behavior is certainly painful: Yogi Berra and déjà vu all over again; Groundhog Day with Bill Murray's character, Phil Connors, doomed to repeat the same day over and over again; Sisyphus sentenced for his hubris to push a boulder up a mountain only to see it careen to the bottom and have to start all over again.

We have seen these proposals before, Mr. Speaker. Yet, once again, my friends across the aisle try their best to throw up smokescreens right and further right. Once again, my friends, led by Chairman PAUL RYAN, present reforms that are not common sense but that are actually nonsense. Once again, Republicans propose budget process changes that are nothing more than gimmicks to eliminate the spending on essential government services and to dress up tax cuts for the wealthy. Once again, we have to waste time considering budgetary gimmicks like "dynamic scoring" and whether we should factor in inflation when accounting for future spending instead of dealing with the important issues of the day.

The need for immigration reform isn't going anywhere, friends. The need for investment in our infrastructure isn't going anywhere. The need to provide health care for our veterans is not going anywhere, and will I tell you that your budget gimmicks aren't going anywhere either, and you know it. You can pass these gimmicks all day long. You are in the majority. You can pass them all day—24 hours a day—and twice and three times on Sunday, but you know that they are dead on arrival in the Senate.

So let's turn to serious business, business the American people would like us to take up, rather than wasting our time and the time of millions of Americans. The changes envisioned within these bills tie Congress and the

Congressional Budget Office up in knots in an effort to prove that conservative ideology about taxes and spending is going to grow our Nation's economy—not create more jobs, not stimulate demand, not invest in infrastructure or in education or in any of the many endeavors that are critical to improving the lives of all Americans.

In H.R. 1871—Mr. WOODALL's favorite bill and for good reason as he is the author of this iteration of it, and he gave attribution to the person who has struggled to put this measure forward—it is proposed that the Congressional Budget Office not include annual inflation when making its budget baselines. This seems like a rather mundane, technical change, but it isn't.

I would be pleased to support this, Mr. Speaker, because it means that, in making my own personal budget projections, I can simply ignore the fact that the costs for everyday items and activities tend to go up every year. I can just assume that what I am paying today I can keep paying 10 years from now and still expect the exact same number of goods and services. But, of course, we all know that isn't true. Simply wishing away inflation won't make it so. Fuzzy math, as it has been described by some, does not equal fiscal responsibility.

By eliminating inflation adjustments from discretionary spending projections, Republicans are actually reducing the funding for a Federal program. Since the dollar amount would stay the same every year, the number of services that could be covered would decrease. I hasten to add that I agree with my friend Mr. WOODALL that accountability ought to be factored in and that these programs should be able to perform in a way that is accountable to the public. When they do not, they should be dispensed with, and that is a prerogative that we can exercise, but it doesn't have to be done the way that it is put forward. It is our responsibility to have the oversight of these structures in our government.

Over the long term, this results in a massive decrease in essential services that millions of Americans rely on. This technical change then is actually a backdoor effort to slowly starve necessary government programs. Rather than be up front about which programs my friends on the other side want to eliminate, they would rather put sneaky rules into place to guarantee the outcome they want without having to have an open debate.

Through H.R. 1874, Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to introduce dynamic scoring into the CBO's projection process. Dynamic scoring? Take a closer look. It is more like dynamic stealing. By implementing this fantasy math, the Republicans artificially inflate the costs of important programs as a way to steal them out from underneath those who are most in need of them. They tweak the CBO's analysis so that tax cuts for the wealthy seem like they grow the economy while investments

in programs that help everyday Americans do not. Let me repeat that. They tweak the CBO's analysis so that tax cuts for the wealthy seem like they grow the economy while investments in programs that help everyday Americans do not. I have lived here long enough to see "trickle down" fail repeatedly. Republicans make it easier to cut taxes for the rich rather than to build bridges and schools for the rest of us.

This bill specifically instructs the CBO to ignore the positive economic effects that would come about from investments in things like infrastructure and education. I want to underscore the word "infrastructure." We talk about it all the time around here, and a decade ago, one of our colleagues spent a portion of his career here asking us to spend money on bridges. When I came here in 1992, we had 14,000 bridges in this Nation that were in need of repair, and we have not addressed the circumstances surrounding that, and we need to and we can. It is as if dealing with infrastructure and education—as if spending on things that Americans want and need—won't boost the economy, which is the way their approach suggests.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are at it again with H.R. 1872. This proposal seeks to significantly change how the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office calculate the costs of government loans and loan guarantees. This bill would just add an extra price tag to programs based on what an individual would pay for a loan in the private market. Never mind the fact that the United States Government is not an individual acting in a private credit market.

What this bill really represents is another attempt by the Republicans to make important programs for the poor and middle class families appear too expensive to be continued—programs meant to help young people get an education, programs that help struggling families afford homes, programs that help the elderly in their need of security in their failing health, programs that help farmers and small businesses grow this economy. By artificially inflating the costs of these programs, the Republicans hope to fool us into thinking that we can't afford them.

But as far as I know, April Fool's Day started and ended on Tuesday. I will tell you this: I am not going to be fooled; my constituents aren't going to be fooled; and the American people aren't going to be fooled by your gimmicks—and these budget bills are only the appetizers.

The entree was served up by Chairman RYAN when he recently introduced his next budget, which he dubbed—and I was reading it last night—the Path to Prosperity, but it would be more accurately called a path to poverty. As much as I had hoped for the opportunity to turn down a path where we consider meaningful legislation, we are again forced to battle against Chairman RYAN's latest march down his

path to poverty, and since we have already adopted top-line numbers for the next two budget cycles, there is no reason for this budget beyond feeding the political base of my friends on the other side.

We will see the bumper stickers. We will hear the talk. We will hear the echo chamber recite the mantra of those who would feed their base. I suppose this budget is a solid start for a 10-minute standup set at your local yuck-yucks, but that is about the best that I can say for it.

I mean, you are going to cut spending by \$966 billion over the next 10 years by cutting funding for food stamps, by cutting funding for income assistance to help needy families, by cutting Pell grants for kids to go to college. You can't be serious. You are going to implement draconian cuts to programs millions of Americans rely upon, but you make sure that we increase defense spending. You can't be serious.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans are really showing us here is their blueprint for America's future. You don't even have to look that closely to see that this blueprint creates nothing but structural integrity problems for our economy. The Republicans' blueprint lays bare their full frontal assault on middle class families and the poor. Their blueprint calls for turning Medicare into a voucher program. They will describe it differently, but it comes out to nothing more than a voucher program. Their blueprint calls for non-defense discretionary spending to be cut to the tune of \$791 billion. This will result in draconian cuts to education, public works, medical research, and the list continues. It goes on and on.

Do you want to better yourself by obtaining a college degree? RYAN's road to ruin is going to make sure that there is no money there for you to do so.

Do you want to help grow our economy by shipping your goods on our roads and bridges? Good luck, since your goods will undoubtedly be held up at one of the many Ryan roadblocks to prosperity that will strip the budget of much-needed infrastructure investments.

Are you or is any member of your family suffering from a disease, the cure for which would certainly be furthered by Federal medical research dollars? Sorry, but with this Republican budget proposed by Mr. RYAN, you have found yourself on Mr. RYAN's fast track to despair.

Rather than using the budget process to lead this country into a new era of economic growth, Republicans want to cut taxes for the rich, cut programs for everyone else, and then feel like they have set this country on the right track. This is no way to run an economy, no way to run a budget process, and it is no way to stick up for the millions of struggling Americans, as my friends on the Democratic side are doing and have done for years, who

need us to focus on improving the economy.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I thank Mike and Tim and Ian and the Rules Committee staff who are working with me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to thank my friend from Florida for laying out exactly what the case is that needs to be made today.

It just so happens all of those spending priorities that the gentleman from Florida mentioned are spending priorities I share—investments in education; investments in roads and bridges; investments in cutting-edge research that makes a difference in people's lives, not just in terms of treatments, but in terms of cures.

In the absence of crystal-clear budgeting, in the absence of the reforms that we have proposed here today, the \$5 trillion that the Budget Committee passed that proposes to reduce Federal spending over the next 10 years is exactly the same as the interest that that very same budget proposes to pay over the next 10 years.

I want you to hear that, Mr. Speaker. Every single reduction in spending that the gentleman just laid out is necessitated because, dollar for dollar, we are wasting those same amounts on paying the debts that previous Congresses have racked up.

That is a Budget Committee-passed budget. The President's budget, Mr. Speaker, proposes to spend \$6 trillion over the next 10 years on interest alone—interest alone.

Mr. Speaker, by not taking responsibility today, not only are we mortgaging our children's future by piling these debts on them, we are trading away opportunities to make a difference in their future.

Because those dollars that we are sending to the Chinese and Germans who loan us money and the money that we are spending to pay our debts is money that we could be spending on those shared investment priorities that the gentleman from Florida and I have in common.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. NUGENT), one of the great members of the Rules Committee, a former sheriff.

Mr. NUGENT. Thank you, Mr. WOODALL. I certainly do appreciate it; and to my colleague from Florida on the other side of the aisle, once again, it is always a pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, only in Washington can politicians pat themselves on the back for cutting spending while actually increasing spending. That is a novel idea.

Say, for example, we spent \$100 on a program 1 year. The next year, we automatically assume that we are going to spend \$103 on that same program, due to inflation. If we only end up spending \$102 versus the \$103, ac-

counting to official government accounting, we have cut spending, but we increased spending by \$2.

In the real world—at least back home—you can't simultaneously cut spending while increasing spending and then say you cut spending. You can't do both. It is one or the other.

Families don't budget this way. Businesses don't budget this way. It would have made my life a whole lot easier as sheriff if my budget automatically increased 3 percent because of inflation that may or may not exist within the program.

If you change the baseline every year by inflation, no one has to justify what their increase is; but then, again, we live in this fantasy world called Washington, D.C. This is where we live today.

The fantasy is that we can spend more money than you take in, and it will all work out in the end. We can be \$17 trillion in debt today, but don't worry about it because it will get better on its own.

How does it work? It doesn't work that way. Mr. Speaker, our current budget process is broken. By assuming automatic increases in spending, our system favors more and more spending without any accountability.

Under this scenario, programs don't receive a real examination as to whether or not they deserve the increases. They just get it anyway. Just because they exist, they get more money; not that they need it, not that they can show folks that they absolutely have to have it, we just get it.

As Chairman RYAN pointed out last night in the Rules Committee, our current budget process has not been significantly reformed since the Budget Control Act of 1974. That is 40 years ago. We haven't done a thing. Given our fiscal situation, it is about time we do something to try to get this on the right track.

I appreciate the committee's work, and I particularly appreciate Mr. WOODALL's bill today. These are important steps to refine and reform the budget process.

You hear folks from the other side of the aisle say that these are gimmicks. Well, I will tell you that, back home, it is not a gimmick when I stand there and have to justify why I need more money in my budget as sheriff.

I had to stand there with the appropriators and say: Here are the reasons why I need more money; and by the way, here is what we have done with the money.

So we show that we have actually earned it, and the taxpayers can see that there was a reward at the end of the day and that they got what they paid for.

There is none of that up here. I sit in committee meetings, day in and day out, in regards to seeing money being spent by government. Nobody is held accountable. We give people five-digit bonuses, Mr. Speaker, for doing a lousy job, but that is the way government works. We reward mediocrity.

This budget idea, if enacted, actually reins that in and makes people accountable for the dollars they are given from the American public so they can say: Listen, we are not talking about it; we are doing it.

So to Mr. WOODALL and to Mr. RYAN, I do appreciate all their hard work and what they have done and where they are trying to move this process forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, I turn to the extemporaneous side. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening of next week, my friend Mr. WOODALL and I will be in the Rules Committee, and we will be taking up the Ryan budget. I might add that we use the names of individuals.

I have great respect for PAUL RYAN. I think he is a brilliant young man; and clearly, ideologically, he and I have our differences.

I remember being on the floor and hearing the two best speeches in the 21 years I have been here that were made pertaining to issues of the moment. One was made by Ron Dellums, chairman of Armed Services at the time, and the other by John Kasich, who is now the Governor of Ohio.

I still consider those two speeches to be the best that I have heard in the time that I am here, mine and Mr. WOODALL's notwithstanding.

On that night that Mr. Kasich made his remarks, I listened very intently to him. I forget the exact numbers that the budget was proposing, but after he finished his remarks, I went up to him and congratulated him on his remarks.

I then said to him what I will say to Mr. RYAN at some point in the future: I understand what it is that you want to spend, and I believe that we would probably spend right at or about the same amount of money. The difference is what you want to spend it on and what I want to spend it on.

That is what I said to John that night. I find myself in that situation repeatedly through the years. I myself, and certainly many others, am a champion of those who are less fortunate in our society, and I don't believe that my friends are unmindful of the great need that our constituents have, be they Republican, Democrat, Independent, or otherwise situated politically.

The simple fact of the matter is that there are people in this country who are not as well off as some others in the country. There should be nothing to decry the fact that there are some in our society who have done exceedingly well, even during recessions.

I have a friend that is a billionaire. He told me he made money during the Depression, he made money before the Second World War, after the Second World War, and made money after every recession, largely for the reason that he knows how to make money; and I don't begrudge him that.

But that same individual told me that any amount of taxes that he paid,

he would prefer to see that it goes to educating our children appropriately, and if it required him to pay more taxes, he would have no problem doing so, and toward that end, I feel the same way.

People think that those of us up here in Congress live a life of luxury with a high salary of \$174,000 a year. Well, the simple fact of the matter is—and rightly, perhaps—we have not had a raise for Congress Members for 5 years.

At the very same time, if I use myself as an example, my rent here in this town has gone up \$600 during that period of time. My salary didn't go up. So where was I supposed to meet these needs?

The simple fact is that, when we talk about a household budget, that is an entirely different set of circumstances than a Federal budget or a State budget or a city budget. They do not operate the same, and we should stop making that analogy.

It is not like I sit down and fill out my budget. This is an extremely complex process. The Congressional Budget Office only gives us the numbers that we tell them that the policy is going to be, and they tell us what the numbers are going to look like. They don't provide the numbers. They don't do the oversight on the programs that we make here.

We don't have to just give them the money, but if we set a baseline and if we do allow for inflation, when those programs have failed or those that are sunset—and more of them should sunset and too many of them have failed—then that is our responsibility.

When we cut poor people, when we cut middle class people in this country—that is the base of this country, that is the bedrock of this country. It has been and will continue to be.

If we go the path that my friends want us to pass through, what we will do is allow for those people that are better off in our society—who could afford to help more the poor and the middle class—to get richer, and it will cause more middle class people to become poorer; and then the needs will be greater. If we don't see ourselves as a better society than that, then something is drastically wrong with us.

I don't begrudge a single rich person on Earth, but I do feel strongly responsible for those that are poor and not poor necessarily by virtue of their circumstances.

What we tend to do to poor people here is, rather than ask them what we can do with them to lift them out of poverty, we do things to them. That is why most of us know that they won't vote at voting time, largely for the reason that they have the most reasons to vote and, at the same time, have the relative least reasons to vote.

The insufferable triumvirate of inadequate jobs, inadequate housing, inadequate educational opportunity persists in this country, and the fact of the matter is that we can do better—and we should do better—by those that

are poor. We should do something meaningful to create jobs.

After Monday of next week, when we talk about this budget, I defy my friends to tell me that they are going to put that budget on the floor. When we vote on it Wednesday, I say let's go into debate Thursday and debate it until its conclusion and then vote on it.

I guarantee you we are not going to vote on the Ryan budget, everybody knows that, and I challenge my friends to bring it forth any day after next Monday when we do the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

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

It never surprises me how much I have in common with my friend from Florida. We come from very different parts of the world, Mr. Speaker. If you go to many events in this town, they will generally have a Southeastern State section and a Florida section. Florida is a little bit different from the rest of those Southeastern States. Our constituencies may not look the same demographically, may not look the same on paper, but when it comes to caring about one another, I have no doubt that our communities are incredibly similar, as the gentleman from Florida and I are very similar.

The debate is not about whether or not we have an obligation to our neighbors. We do. The question is are we meeting our obligation to our neighbors, and I will tell you that we are not. The pathway up in this country is what our obligation is here. I would say to my friends that providing a safety net that has no ladder out is a cruel and unsatisfactory path for this House.

I was talking with a gentleman down in southeast D.C., Mr. Speaker, and he runs a project that takes folks from homelessness and drug addiction to employment. He said: The problem with you Republicans is all you do is offer people hope: pick yourself up by your bootstraps; tomorrow will be better than today. He said hope in the absence of access is futile. He said: But Democrats offer help. If you are naked, I will clothe you. If you are hungry, I will feed you. If you are in prison, I will visit you. But he said help in the absence of a pathway out is to condemn someone to a life of poverty. He said: What you all have to do is to come together. You have to provide that help to meet people's immediate needs, but you have to provide that pathway out.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care if you are rich today; I care whether or not the

opportunity exists in America for you to be rich tomorrow. And I don't mean rich by having six figures or seven figures or eight figures; I mean rich because you have got a roof over your head and you can feed your family.

The American Dream, Mr. Speaker, is not to be the next Bill Gates. I don't know where that ever got started. The American Dream is to be able, by the sweat of your brow and the power of your ideas, to be your own man or woman, to make your own decisions.

I listened deeply to the words of my friend and I looked for where we might find that common ground, because, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Florida, if you go into any public housing facility in my district, they will tell you that the Federal Government prevents them from succeeding. The residents would say: You have got to let us kick the bad actors out. The residents would say: We have got folks here who are trying to make a difference, and we have got folks here who are bringing us down. You have got to give us the ability to keep our kids safe. You have got to give us the ability to keep our community safe. You have got to give us the ability to run our lives.

But Federal law says no, Mr. Speaker. Federal law says we know what is fair; we know what is best.

But I know the gentleman from Florida and I share a heart for letting folks in these communities take control of their lives, make those choices that will enable tomorrow to be better than today.

Mr. Speaker, with this budget—again, I can't make this point sharply enough—the President proposes to spend \$6 trillion on interest alone over the next 10 years—\$6 trillion. Now, at the President's spending levels, Mr. Speaker, that is almost 18 months of running this country. Understand that because of the borrowing patterns of past Congresses and administrations, we are losing 18 months of the very services the gentleman from Florida proposes that we provide. Eighteen months are eroded out of the next 10 years with interest alone.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act does, for example, is say you have got to project out over 40 years.

You will remember, when the President proposed his health care bill, no question, his intention was to help folks; no question, his intention was to make life better for folks. We can absolutely debate whether or not those were successes or failures, but this is the way that budget sorted itself out. He said: I am not going to spend more than \$1 trillion on this program.

Now, I don't know when in the world, Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion became the low number that we decided would be tolerable as a program, but he said: I don't want to spend more than \$1 trillion on this program.

So, instead of creating a 10-year program, he created a 6-year program, put

the implementation off for 4 years. Critical health care services, absolutely necessary we provide these services to the American people, but they can wait 4 years. We have got families in need, families that don't have options, families that don't have choices, but I am not going to help them get choices for another 4 years. Six-year program, \$1 trillion.

The Pro-Growth Budgeting Act says we need to look at programs over 40 years because that \$1 trillion, 6-year program explodes in years 7 and 8 and 9 and 10. And it may be money well spent. I hope that is what the gentleman from Florida believes because I know he supported the program. I don't believe it is money well spent. I think we are losing trillions of dollars in health care costs that could be better controlled. I think we are losing trillions of dollars in care that could have been provided to folks but, instead, is being lost in an inefficient health care system.

But we don't have those answers when those bills come to the floor of this House for a vote. Who is it that opposes that, Mr. Speaker? Who is it that opposes, when we make trillion-dollar decisions that are multigenerational, that we don't have access to long-term data?

The gentleman from Florida says it seems disingenuous for us to pretend inflation does not exist. That is not what I am proposing, but disingenuous to pretend that it does. I think it is similarly odd to pretend that the program stops after 10 years instead of it continuing on in perpetuity, as these programs do. These bills do nothing but provide us with other information.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. My experience in this House with a voting card began in 2011. And while the gentleman is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, when he talks about inflation and how services can be eroded, my experience in this House, your experience in this House, Mr. Speaker, is that we spent less in 2011 than we did in 2010, not more. Inflation was there, but we spent less. My experience, Mr. Speaker, is that we spent less in 2012 than we did in 2011, less in 2013 than we did in 2012, less in 2014 than we did in 2013. Every year I have been here we have spent less. I think that is what our constituency expects from us, not to cut critical service programs, but to increase our productivity and prioritize their dollars, prioritize their dollars to those places where they can do the most good.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire and ask the Speaker to inquire if my colleague is prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to my friend from Florida, Mr. Speaker, I, too, am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes re-

maining. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My colleague just concluded his remarks by saying in 2011, 2012, 2013 they spent less, and he is correct. But in 2011, more people needed food stamps; in 2012, more people needed housing; in 2013, more people needed to get across safe bridges and safe roads. So I am not sure where the twain meets.

I agree with my colleague that he and I have more in common than we do differences, but I hearken back to my earlier comment. He wants to spend or not spend on what he wants to spend or not spend, and I want to spend or not spend on what I want to spend or not spend.

I want to spend on roads. I want to spend on children's education. I want to spend on people who are hungry. And I believe he does as well, but you cannot do that if you keep cutting everything all the time.

Mr. Speaker, these bills and Chairman RYAN's budget are nothing more than base attempts to rally the fringe of the Republican Party, and I stand steadfastly against each one of these attempts to drag us down a Ryan road to ruin.

To quote the great American poet, Robert Frost:

I shall be telling this with a sigh somewhere ages and ages hence. Two roads diverged in a wood and I took the one less traveled, and that has made all the difference.

Mr. Speaker, friends, today we stand before two roads: one, a road to ruin paved with pummeling cuts to hurt the poor and attack middle class families, simply put, to protect the better off in our society, the real rich; the other road, a road that helps the poor ascend out from poverty, not a ladder out that has its ladder rungs with holes in it, as my friend discussed that ladder out, a road that helps middle class families more fully achieve their dreams, a road that helps our businesses and economy grow, a road that embraces our veterans and fights for them as vigorously as they fought for us. And if Fort Hood doesn't teach us anything about the mental health of our soldiers and our society, then I don't know what will.

Unfortunately, I believe this latter road traveled by my fellow Democrats and by me today will be the road less traveled, and this fact will certainly make a significant difference for the millions of Americans trying to fully realize their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1010, our bill to raise the Federal minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question, vote “no” on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Two paths diverged in the wood, and I took the path less traveled, and that has made all the difference.

Mr. Speaker, this is Washington, D.C. There is a term called “Washington, D.C., math,” which, as my friend from Florida, the sheriff, described earlier in when you can raise spending by \$5 and call it a cut. That is Washington, D.C., math.

The path less traveled in this town is the path of fiscal responsibility; the path less traveled in this town is the path of accountability; the path less traveled in this town is the path of transparency, and that is what these three measures before us today propose, Mr. Speaker.

I held a townhall meeting, Mr. Speaker, about 12 months ago. They asked if I was going to support the congressional pay raise. I said: Well, we are not going to do a congressional pay raise this year, but I hope one day to come home and tell you that I have earned it.

I do. I want to show up back home, Mr. Speaker, and tell folks that, dadgummit: I have earned it. Be proud of what we have done in Washington, D.C. I have earned it.

I think that is true of every dime of spending the Federal Government does. I don't think we ought to assume, as the current baseline does, that every single Federal agency is going to have their budget increase next year by the cost of inflation. I think those agencies should come to this institution, as they do in an annual appropriation process, and say: I have earned it. I have earned it.

I am not just talking about making a difference in people's lives; here are the results. I am not just talking about lifting people up; here are the results.

The hardest thing to end in this town, Mr. Speaker, is a Federal program. Once they get started, they seem to last forever. Mission creep. If they solve one mission, they are going to adopt a new mission, roll right on down the line. Nobody wants to work themselves out of a job.

Is it so outrageous, is it the role only of the fringe, as my friend from Florida proposed, to suggest that, if we are going to borrow and spend more of our children's money, we should come and justify it?

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, that kind of budget transparency has become relevant only to the fringe of America. It is not the America I know.

I tell the young people—and I try to start every day back home with young people, Mr. Speaker. I say, listen, just tell me what you want in terms of sup-

port for higher education because the only dollars I am going to spend, I am going to borrow from you. I am borrowing it from you.

We all love our children. We all want our children to succeed. But we are borrowing from them. Every decision we make. These three bills ask for three things, and three things only before we make the decision to borrow from our children:

Number one, the Pro-Growth Budgeting Act. It asks that for those programs that are going to have a big impact on our economy, that we look not just at what the 1-year impact is, not just at what the 10-year impact is, but that we look at a generation of impact.

Before we start down that road less traveled, Mr. Speaker, we should know what it is going to cost us and how it is going to benefit us. We don't get that information today, as the gentleman from Florida, the sheriff, noted. We have not reformed the Congressional Budget Act since 1974. That kind of multigenerational information is worthy of this body. This bill would provide it to us for the very first time.

The Budget and Accounting Transparency Act. If you are going to lend money, you ought to account for it; you ought to evaluate it.

We often talk about our \$17.5 trillion debt, Mr. Speaker. That comes from Washington math because if we were anywhere else other than this town, we would have to evaluate all the promises that we have made. I mean, you know how Social Security is funded, for example, Mr. Speaker. It is today's workers that are paying for today's retirees. There is not a dime set aside for today's workers when they retire.

The true cost of government, the true national debt, as recently calculated by Dr. Larry Kotlikoff of Boston University, not a conservative by any stretch of the imagination, is over \$200 trillion—\$200 trillion. “Trillion”—we throw these words around as if they are nothing—that is 1 million millions. We have not had 1 million days since the birth of Christ, Mr. Speaker. We won't for another 730 years. Mr. Speaker, 1 million millions is 1 trillion. We have borrowed and promised on behalf of our children \$200 trillion.

The fair value accounting request is only that we be honest with the American people. I am prepared to live by whatever decision the American people make. I believe in our Republic. But we cannot ask people to make decisions without providing people with good information. This bill does that.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill, again, sponsored by my good friend from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT, a long champion that I have the privilege of serving with in this Congress, the Baseline Reform Act. The Baseline Reform Act says, if you are going to raise spending by \$1, you are actually raising spending by \$1.

I know it sounds radical, Mr. Speaker. I know it sounds like the province of the fringe, but it is not. If you are

going to raise spending by \$1, you should say you are going to raise spending by \$1. Dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, I can't even have a town hall meeting these days and talk about budget numbers—because I am a budget guy—I can't talk about budget numbers without someone raising their hand and saying, now, ROB, when you talk about spending reductions, is that really a spending reduction, or is that just a reduction in the rate of growth? That is how it has become.

For 4 years in this institution, we have spent less each and every succeeding year. Now, I would argue, contrary to what my friend from Florida suggested, that we are prioritizing spending on shared goals, and we are deprioritizing spending on which we do not have those shared goals. It seems fair in these difficult economic times, as we are taking those dollars from hardworking American taxpayers across the country, that we identify high-priority spending and low-priority spending.

I will take the work at NIH, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker. That is high-priority spending. That is basic research that is going to make a difference in people's lives and not a difference in something minor, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps a life-and-death difference. It is a goal that we share. It is a goal that the Appropriations Committee shares. It is a goal that we are going to be able to realize.

But I don't think there is a single man or woman at NIH, I don't think there is a single professor at NIH, I don't think there is a single Ph.D. candidate at NIH who is embarrassed to come up here and say, I have done well. I am a good steward of the taxpayers' money. Trust me again.

Mr. Speaker, that is where I want to take us with these budget bills. I want to have folks proud of how they are spending the dollars, proud to come and share that with us here in this Congress and have the American people proud to get onboard with renewing those dollars once again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this rule. This rule has made in order every amendment that was germane to these three bills. I ask them to support this rule so that we can begin voting these bills this very day.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 539 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. 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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 recommit 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

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. WOODALL. With that, 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 193, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—222

Aderholt  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishak  
Bentivolio  
Billirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham

Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson

Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (MI)

Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ryunan  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman

Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

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

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

Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schraeder  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth



NOT VOTING—16

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

□ 1047

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—220

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

Sanford	Stewart
Scalise	Stivers
Schock	Stockman
Schweikert	Stutzman
Scott, Austin	Terry
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)
Sessions	Thornberry
Shimkus	Tiberi
Shuster	Tipton
Simpson	Turner
Smith (MO)	Upton
Smith (NE)	Valadao
Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Smith (TX)	Walberg
Southerland	Walden

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—17

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1054

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRO-GROWTH BUDGETING ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1057

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

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

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

□ 1100

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