2002. Downward pressure on wages is what we should be discussing.

In addition, a company located not far from where I live submitted a tax form last year of 19,000 pages. They have 11 full-time Internal Revenue agents on site daily. If this isn't a reason to go back to the table and negotiate tax reform, I don't know what is.

The chairman kind of cleverly suggested here this morning that, if we were to accept what is being proposed by the Democratic minority, might that be a path forward? It is a path forward. We are offering a 2-year extension of these provisions.

I hope Mr. REICHERT or Mr. CAMP returns and says: indeed, Mr. NEAL has voted for these repeatedly. We are counting on you, Mr. Chairman, to point out how many times I voted for them.

Guess what? You are right, and we are going to vote for them again in November. This exercise in futility ill-serves the American people, other than to perhaps get to some messaging points.

I don't disagree with these. I disagree with the idea of breaking the budget to make them permanent this morning, but I, more importantly, disagree with the whole notion that we are giving up on tax reform if we make these permanent.

Some of the provisions in the Code need to be discarded. Mr. Chairman, I would remind you and the Republican staff that you removed 300 provisions, exclusions, deductions, and preferences from the Code. So we come back here this morning in this ill-conceived effort to embrace a couple of favorites?

The Tax Code in America has not been touched since 1986. I would remind you this morning, for all of you out here today, that was before the Internet was invented.

That is the question before us. A Tax Code for a modern economy, or do we go back to, well, Mr. NEAL voted for this 8 times? Yes, he did. In fact, Mr. NEAL has been on the Ways and Means Committee longer than the three previous speakers, so you can probably say Mr. NEAL has voted for them 11 times because I think many of them work, in the absence of fundamental reform.

The last point, the chairman said he was going to 25 percent. The Democrats said go to 28 percent on the corporate side. We could have done all of this, had we gone to 28 percent, but ideology reigns, so we go to 25 percent. Even President Obama was at 28 percent.

This is not the way this institution is supposed to function, Mr. Speaker. The Ways and Means Committee is a privileged perspective on complicated issues. You don't do them like this when it comes to items in the Code.

So accept the notion that everybody dislikes the Code. Specificity in terms of what we are going to wean out becomes the problem.

□ 1015

Here is our last position—a 2-year extension.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to seeing you after the elections. You and I are going to shake hands, and as much as we all like to say, ''I hate to say, 'I told you so,' '' I am going to say, ''As much as I hate telling you this, I told you so.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, frankly, this motion to recommit is absurd. It is absurd in this economy to threaten small business with higher taxes.

The gentleman referred to favorites. Yes, I do have favorites. Those are the small businesses all across America that hire and to which people go to work every day. The margins are tight. You know the testimony we have had before the Ways and Means Committee. We need growth in this economy, certainty, and long-term tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that allows its tax policy to expire.

Instead of threatening small businesses with higher taxes, we should give confidence to small businesses—confidence to know what the tax policy is. Look, it has been extended so many times it may as well be permanent. This is the point—so that they will grow, so that they will invest, so that they will hire workers. People will have higher wages as a result of a stronger, growing economy because families and middle class Americans will have jobs.

Reject this threat of higher taxes, particularly on small businesses. Reject this motion to recommit.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 616, I call up the bill (H.R. 4457) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–472, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4457

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 ''America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXPENSING CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $500,000.''.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds—'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $2,000,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking '', to which section 167 applies, and which is placed in service in a taxable year beginning after 2002 and before 2014'' and inserting ''and to which section 167 applies''.

(c) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''may not be revoked'' and all that follows through ''and before 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''IRREVOCABLE'' in the heading thereof.

(d) AIR CONDITIONING AND HEATING UNITS.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''and shall not include air conditioning or heating units''.

(e) QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—Subsection (f) of section 179 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' in paragraph (1), and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(c)(2)(A) for such calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 2012' in clause (ii) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under subparagraph (A) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4457.

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

There was no objection.

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

The tax burden that small businesses, farmers, ranchers, and their workers face is too high. Every dollar Washington takes from small businesses is a dollar that they don't have to invest in equipment, to start a new production line, to hire a new employee, or to provide more in wages and benefits. Businesses aren't growing, and hardworking Americans are seeing stagnant wages and fewer work hours. This is unacceptable.

These days, it seems that Congress can rarely agree on much, so when we can find some common ground to help grow the economy and get businesses to invest and hire new workers, we should act immediately. The legislation we have before us today, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, would do just that by providing a permanent extension of section 179 expensing at a level of $500,000. Section 179 is a bipartisan provision that has been in place since the 1950s, but businesses, farmers, and ranchers cannot reap the full benefits when they have no idea if this provision is going to be around the next year or what it may look like. This hurts their ability to plan for the future and expand their businesses.

The Farm Bureau recently stated:

> This practice makes it very difficult for farmers and ranchers to plan, and it adds immense confusion and complexity to the Tax Code.

It is time to make section 179 permanent at an expensing level of $500,000 so American farmers, ranchers, and small businesses can invest in new equipment, grow their businesses, and plan for the future.

Sure, House Democrats, many who have sponsored this legislation before, are now demanding that we pay for an extension of these policies despite voting year after year to extend these job-creating policies without their being paid for. Frankly, the millions of Americans searching for jobs or for a few extra dollars in their paychecks know that pro-growth policies like this pay for themselves in the form of new investments, new jobs, and higher wages. I think we can all agree this is the right policy, and we should set the rhetoric aside so we can have an America that works, with a strong and vibrant economy.

By supporting permanent policies, Washington can promote certainty for American businesses and generate additional economic growth. We have become too accustomed to poor jobs reports, anemic growth, and just accepting things as they are. Small business expensing has been a bipartisan policy for decades, and it is time to make it a permanent part of the Tax Code. Washington needs to wake up, to start listening to the American people, and to act on real policies that strengthen the economy and help hardworking taxpayers. Today's legislation will do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Small business can have full confidence that this provision will be extended—period. Indeed, the fact that I have voted for it many times in the past, as pointed out, is confidence that it will be continued. As to the suggestion that we have made to continue it for 2 years, we are already well into the first year, and if we don't act until the end of the year and extend it for 2 years, that would be another one not even for another full year, but there would be a 2-year extension. So small business can be fully confident this will be extended. There is no threat to it. There is zero threat to its extension.

When it was said earlier by the chairman that small business can have no idea as to whether this will be extended next year, that simply is not correct. The Senate has before it a bill to extend it for 2 years. At some point, that will pass, and that is the bill that will be taken up in the House.

The chairman did extend permanently this provision—not many others. He paid for that. The chairman extolled the fact that he paid for it, and now they have gone in reverse and now suggest that we proceed unpaid for permanently. The cost of this is far different than a 2-year extension, as I have mentioned—far different. We are talking about over $70 billion compared to a few billion dollars.

Let me just say that everybody has to be mystified as to why in the world the Republicans are doing this when it violates their budget, when it violates the chairman's and the Republicans' Ways and Means tax proposal, and when, if this is done, it is going to be part of a ratcheting up of the deficit of $614 billion and will have major ramifications for so many programs.

Essentially, what they are doing is, on the one hand, increasing this deficit dramatically—through the ceiling. Then they are going to come back on the other hand and say, ah, the deficit went through the ceiling, so we need to take away, with the other, education programs, health programs—all kinds of programs that are necessary—transportation programs. They are going to say, well, we just don't have the money when, essentially, the reason is that they have tried to pass a bill that throws money out the window.

We are going to extend the small business tax cut. We are going to do that—Democrats will stand together to make sure that that happens—but not in a way that is part of a reckless, irresponsible approach. That is a major, major reason we simply have to say: extend it for 2 years. Then let's sit down and talk about what we are going to do with these provisions as part of a tax reform effort that is serious and is bipartisan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership on the Ways and Means Committee. It has been an honor and a privilege to work with you. You have been a great leader, and we look forward to allowing you to lead us the rest of this year on our committee as we continue the debate on the extenders and making some permanent.

H.R. 4457 would permanently extend the small business expensing for equipment and property outlined in section 179 of the Tax Code.

As many of you know, section 179 first came into existence in 1958. I wasn't yet born. My parents were not yet married. They got married in 1958, so they didn't see the debate here in Washington. It may not have been quite like the debate today, though, I would say, because, ladies and gentlemen, Members of Congress, this is a mystifying debate. This shouldn't be this difficult. No wonder Congress has a low approval rating.

Section 179 of our Tax Code is very simple, and as the chairman said, it has been very bipartisan over the years. It allows businessowners to immediately deduct the cost of the investments of property and computer software rather than depreciating such cost over time.

In fact, on January 1, what had been an extender that allowed for the maximum expensing of $500,000 and the deduction phased out of investments exceeding $2 million went back to what is current law today. That is why this is so important. It is the essence of this debate, and it is the essence of what my bill does because it went down. The limit went down to $25,000 and up to $200,000 of investments.

If you talk to Tom and Judy Price, who are from my district, they think that what we do here is just crazy and mystifying because they have to make real decisions in real time and with real money, not make-believe, not theory. They have to make decisions that impact real lives and real costs and real jobs. This is a jobs bill. That is what this is about. If you ask Tom and Judy Price, we have had expensing, and

we have had higher limits than $25,000. We don't today. We had them before, but they weren't paid for. We have had them for the 10 years since I have been here, and they haven't been paid for.

But do you know what? Here is the reality of life.

In Delaware County, Ohio, I talked to Tom Price this morning. He has a mulching business. He needs to buy a loader. Is Congress going to provide certainty? Oh, 2 years is fine. Retroactivity is fine. That is the narrative around here, Mr. Speaker. We've done it before. Let's do it again this way.

□ 1030

The Senate won't accept it. Let's surrender our card today. Let's surrender my voting card, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhere here. Let me give it to the Senate.

My daughter, going into sixth grade, understands there are two Houses. We shouldn't be surrendering this card, Mr. Speaker, to the Senate because, oh, the Senate is going to do it their way; have always done it that way.

Ladies and gentlemen, a bill becomes a law this way. The House passes a bill. That is what we are trying to do today, Mr. Speaker, add permanency.

Tom and Judy Price, in their mulching business, they would like certainty to plan, not oh, we will make it retroactive and we will go out a year. Oh, by the way, Mr. Price, we are going to do it in November. We are going to make it retroactive to January.

Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me?

You guys couldn't survive running a business in Washington, D.C. You couldn't survive.

That is what this debate is all about. It is about reality.

My daughter knows that the Senate has the right to do anything they want, but we have our right with our card. Guess what?

There is supposed to be a conference committee. There is supposed to be a real debate and oh, my God, compromise between the House and the Senate. That is what this is supposed to be about. That is what I tell my daughter who is going into sixth grade.

But no, let's surrender to the Senate right now. Let's just surrender. We have surrendered before.

And oh my goodness, these deficits. These businesses pay taxes. You all want to raise taxes on them.

When we had a debate on this floor, and I was here in 2009, we passed a $1 trillion stimulus bill. $1 trillion. Nobody cared about the deficit then.

But Mr. Price and Mrs. Price are trying to buy a loader for $200,000, and we are debating over the deficit and temporary Tax Code and retroactivity and surrendering to the Senate. That is what this debate is about. That is what this has come to.

And you wonder why, Mr. Speaker, Americans think Washington is broken; because we don't understand what real-life Americans who are trying to run a business and hire employees and raise their wages, they don't understand why we are having these mystical debates because they are living in the real world, the real world.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, but I am constrained to respond to the remarks, the emotional remarks, the perplexed remarks of the gentleman who preceded me.

I have a voting card too. And I don't know whether either Tom or Judy Price have been unemployed, or whether their brother or their sister have run out of unemployment insurance and have been left twisting in the wind. But this voting card could give them extended unemployment insurance.

I don't know whether Tom and Judy Price have employees who are making the minimum wage and living in poverty. This card could change that and up the minimum wage, but it hasn't been brought to the floor.

I tell my friend from Ohio, this card could fix what everybody agrees is a broken immigration system, but we are not using this card, I tell my friend from Ohio, because we are dabbling in the unrealistic.

This card, this card could pass export-import. He wants to grow jobs. Export-import is absolutely critical, and it phases out, and you will not bring it to this floor.

This card, and your card, joined together with 216 other cards, could pass all of those pieces of legislation. This card could make sure that Tom and Judy Price have an economy that is more resilient.

And this card—my friend from Ohio is distracted, but I tell my friend from Ohio, this card helped pass the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, without which Tom and Judy Price might not be in business today because your tax policies of 2001 and 2003, unpaid for, which were supposed to grow this economy, resulted in more loss of jobs than any policy since Herbert Hoover.

This card ought to be used today for fiscal responsibility. This card ought to be used to say to your chairman that you praised, DAVID CAMP, yes, we want to do comprehensive tax reform, not just little item by little item by little item, which destroys tax reform, which exacerbates our deficit, and will destroy investment in education, infrastructure, and growing our economy.

This card, I urge my colleagues to use responsibly this day.

All of us here support helping small businesses expand operations so they can hire more workers, all of us. Our Tax Code ought to encourage small businesses to do so.

But the Republican majority's approach to tax policy, evidenced by the two bills on the floor today, is simply the wrong path.

Do not use your card, given to you by the American people, trusting that you will do the responsible, commonsense thing, don't use this card irresponsibly today.

The bills we are considering today are the latest examples of Republican hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, hypocrisy on deficits, as their approach would raise deficits by hundreds of billions of dollars.

There is no free lunch. This pretends there is a free lunch.

Hypocrisy on tax policy is a representative rejection of the comprehensive approach to tax reform Republicans' own Ways and Means Chairman, DAVID CAMP, that the gentleman from Ohio just praised, put on this floor, or at least put on the table, not on the floor.

And the response of the Speaker of this House was, and I quote, ''Blah, blah, blah, blah.''

What a shame. How unserious.

While I have serious concerns about some of the policy changes that Chairman CAMP's proposal contains, it made the difficult choices and it was paid for. It was responsible.

Republicans and Democrats all say we want a comprehensive tax reform. This undermines tax reform. So if you say you are for comprehensive tax reform, don't do little, itty-bitty pieces that are unpaid for, exacerbate the deficit, and undermine tax reform.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. These bills today reject that approach and, instead, take the easy way out by irresponsibly adding their cost to the deficit, a deficit that my friends on the other side of the aisle, with whom I join, lament on a daily basis but, somehow, disconnect their policies from their lamentations.

In doing so, these bills will put even more pressure on a discretionary budget facing the return of sequester next year, undermining our ability to invest in critical priorities like veterans care, highways, education, bills to make sure that we grow our economy and create jobs.

Democrats are ready to make the hard choices so that we leave America a better country, not a poorer country, not a deeper in debt country, but a better country for our children and our grandchildren.

Rather than waste our time on these individual bills, Congress ought to debate and amend comprehensive tax reform, allowing us to face up to our responsibility to make the tough decisions the American people expect from their representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I don't live in a perfect Congress, none of us do, or in a country that always makes the right decisions. So I will vote for an MTR which says we are not going to permanently exacerbate our deficit, but we will make sure that business does have the opportunity to have these tax benefits, as we

have in a bipartisan basis done in the past.

So I will vote for the MTR. I will vote to make sure that we extend these for 2 years, as the Senate suggests. I don't think that is the best policy. It is not the policy I would choose. The policy I would choose is comprehensively giving permanent, long-term R&D, paid for so that we don't exacerbate the deficit, but we do give confidence so businesses can grow.

So I tell my friend from Ohio, we both have a card. The responsible step for us to take is to vote ''no'' on temporary and come with fiscally responsible legislation to this floor.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Hoosier State, Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a great member of the Ways and Means Committee and a member of the Select Revenue Subcommittee. He has provided great leadership on the subcommittee, and I appreciate his work.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act.

I want to thank my colleague, PAT TIBERI, for his hard work on this initiative, which is vital to the small businesses and farmers across my district.

I would be remiss if I didn't respond to the last speaker's comments, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland who, with a straight face, indicated that this card, his card, was a vehicle for fiscal responsibility when, consistently he has confused this card with this card, a credit card.

We have continued to rack up debts, over and over again, and we have not engaged in growth-oriented public policy, and that is what this bill is intended to do.

This bill increases the amount a small business taxpayer may immediately deduct when she buys operating materials for her business.

The ability of small businesses to immediately deduct the cost of qualified investment in the year purchased, rather than having to recover the cost through depreciation over several years, has been essential to the survival of thousands of firms over the past decade.

Higher expensing limits will encourage businesses to invest in new computers, tractors, and other types of business equipment and grow.

Such investment will have, of course, important second-order effects—economists tell us this—on the economy as these purchases are magnified throughout the nation.

The version of section 179 we are considering today expired at the end of 2012, and since then, back home I have heard from a parade of constituents, businessowners and workers alike, about the need to restore the provision.

I have heard from Indiana NFIB, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Manufacturers Association, Indiana Farm Bureau, and countless individual businesses and workers, and I am glad we are working in the House, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, to help unleash the ability of our Nation's small businesses to grow.

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

Mr. TIBERI. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. These small businesses are the engine of American job creation. They create roughly three out of five American jobs that have been created over recent years. And one critical means of supporting American small businesses and working Americans is through business tax incentives like section 179.

This is a proven success. It has proven itself over the last several years. And it is evident that these small businesses are one bright spot of job creation, personal opportunity, and upward mobility during these troubled times.

I support this commonsensical bill that is going to help small businesses grow and restore a measure of hope and opportunity to rank-and-file Americans during these troubled times.

I would like to thank Chairman TIBERI for his important work in offering this legislation.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their partisan reservations to supporting this measure.

□ 1045

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 1 minute and yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Indiana raised his credit card. He apparently is going to use his vote as you would use a credit card, to incur an additional $73 billion in unpaid for debt.

Mr. LEVIN. The whip is so correct.

The gentleman from Indiana is very confused. He is using his voting card as a credit card. $73 billion on this bill. Our voting card is not a credit card, but the Republicans are turning this into a credit card, with calamitous results.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Republicans would dig our country into another trillion dollars of debt, borrowing from the Chinese, the Saudis, whoever will lend it to us.

They have already approved borrowing $614 billion for business tax breaks, and they have told us that there are more on the way, more tax privileges, more tax exceptions, more tax advantages.

This bill today is just another chapter in their ledger of accounts payable for the American taxpayers. Such fiscal irresponsibility doesn't represent a plan for genuine tax relief for small businesses or for anyone else.

I will say that I agree with them, that small businesses have every reason to complain, as do individual taxpayers, because the Tax Code that they have done so much to write is riddled with special treatment for those who pay more to their lobbyists here in Washington than they do to the U.S. Treasury.

It has been a wise investment for them, but a pretty sorry outcome for small business and individual taxpayers. We have some multinational companies who have set up hundreds of offshore subsidiaries to shift their profits out of America and into a place where they don't pay a dime.

I can tell you that the cleaning crew at the headquarters of General Electric pays a higher tax rate than General Electric does. That is not fair. They pay a higher tax rate than Joe's Bakery or Patty's Taco House down in San Antonio.

That is not fair. It ought to be corrected; but instead, they have added almost another $100 billion in tax loopholes that they have proposed and have approved in committee to help those folks continue dodging their taxes.

At the same time, the proponents of today's bills tell us that America simply cannot afford more to educate its children. Only the day before yesterday, the Senate refused to address the problem of soaring student debt, now bigger than credit card debt, exceeded only by the giant debt they want to incur for more tax breaks.

They tell us: we can't afford to do the research necessary to cure Alzheimer's or to find new solutions to cancer and AIDS and other dreaded diseases.

This is not about borrowing to raise small business up. This is just an excuse to reduce the government investment that we need to grow our economy.

Apparently, to the Republicans, deficits only matter when asking seniors and students and others to sacrifice, but not when it comes to adding one tax break after another.

Now, how did we get to the situation that we are in today? Well, there has been a convenient amnesia about the history of tax reform in this Congress. Last January, the gentleman from Ohio—the Speaker—and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) came to this floor and they said: America, have we got a deal for you.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. We have got a great deal for you. This big old fat Tax Code that is bigger than the Bible many times over, that we helped expand to resolve the needs of our special interest supporters, we are going to put it on a diet. We are going to thin it down.

We are going to give you a simple Tax Code that is easy to comply with. In addition to that, we are going to lower your rate; and you know what, we are going to do all that, and we are not going to add a penny to the national debt, and we will keep the rates relatively the same for everybody.

They reserved H.R. 1. They said: it is so important, we are going to make it the number one priority here. Where are we on that bill, I would ask the gentleman today; and I can tell you it is still reserved for the Speaker.

They have never brought it out, put it on this table, and given the American people a chance to vote on it because what happened was they went through a long process, they produced their draft bill, and the lobby went wild against it. They could not stand up to the very people that helped them write the complex, unfair Tax Code that we have today.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. They couldn't stand up to those special interests, so that bill, 18 months later—not the result of anything the Democrats did, not the result of anything the President did—they couldn't agree among themselves about how to respond to all those special interest pressures.

So they are back today, going one little bill at a time to add a few hundred billion here, a few hundred billion dollars there, and not provide the comprehensive tax reform they told us, themselves, they would be providing, and that is why we find ourselves in the predicament we are in today.

I agree with the gentleman, people in Ohio, across America, in Texas, and elsewhere, that they have reason to question this Congress, because a promise is just like that.

Promises to bring reform, to work together in a bipartisan fashion left on the cutting room floor because special interests, the people that don't pay their fair share of taxes today, they want to keep it that way. They want to continue to disadvantage small business and individual taxpayers.

Today, we need to say ''no'' to this measure and ''no'' to their other temporary measures and demand real reform.

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

Just for the record, the gentleman from Texas has voted for the policy of either increasing or extending section 179, without offsets, six times on a temporary basis for a total of 8 years.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBERI. The gentleman from Michigan has time to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The motion to recommit that the minority keeps talking about today will add billions to the deficit as well, and as I explained earlier, the problem with the narrative of We have done it this way, we are going to do it again, and the problem with surrender, as was talked about by the gentleman from Massachusetts, who I have a great deal of respect for, is the fact that we are missing the point of what is happening in the real America.

Real Americans see that we, on this floor, get a stimulus bill by the other side, in 2009—and I was here—jammed down our throats that added $1 trillion to the deficit.

Today, the minority is concerned about the deficit, and I assume they want those same small business owners who are trying so hard to create jobs with additional regulations—like Tom and Judy Price face—and they want them to pay more taxes, that is the bottom line; but when they have increased the debt before—whether it is for temporary tax policy or additional spending—there was no concern about the deficit and the debt.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary Lew, in a speech at the Economic Club in New York, said, ''The U.S. could face a permanent downturn in economic growth without increased business investment.''

How timely—because if you go to my district and talk to Tom Price or talk to Gary Skinner, who owns a farm—and I had the privilege of being in his combine, that combine costs $250,000—guess what: it is about this provision today.

The reality with our unpermanent extender policy, with respect to the investments that Mr. Lew talked about yesterday, is that real job creators who are trying to grow their businesses, hire more people—so people like my dad, when I was in high school—wouldn't have to get unemployment, like he did or my dad—who was an immigrant, so I understand a little bit about immigration—despite the fact that the gentleman from Maryland might not think so—and mom, another immigrant—could get jobs. That is what this is all about.

All you have to do is go talk to these job creators who are looking at us with a whole lot of perplexed looks as to: Why can't we change the narrative? Why can't the House have a position to negotiate with the Senate? Why does it have to always be, well, this is the way we have done it retroactively for 2 years, this is the way we will do it again?

That gives no certainty to these job creators, to these farmers. That is what this debate is all about, ladies and gentlemen.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Ohio talk about his concern for small businesses and the economy. I am reflecting on the thousands of businesses that were represented here on Capitol Hill this week, calling on Congress to get its act together, dealing with transportation funding.

We are facing a crisis in transportation in this country. The majority, because they couldn't put together a transportation bill last year, drove the highway trust fund down to zero. They milked every single dime to be able to get a 27-month extension.

What has happened? Well, actually, what has happened is that it is not even going to last until October 1. All across the country, States are cutting back on funding contracts now because the Department of Transportation is going to run out of money late this summer.

These people were rallying on Capitol Hill, large business, small business, environment, unions, from all across America, saying: Congress, get your act together.

I will note, with some small amount of irony, that my friends on the Ways and Means Committee have approved over $600 billion of tax breaks added to the deficit that would have fully funded not one 6-year transportation bill, but two robust transportation bills.

Did you listen to those small businesses? Did you listen to the contractors? Did you listen to the equipment rental people, the asphalt, the gravel, the concrete? To those people, we have turned a deaf ear.

The Ways and Means Committee, in 42 months, has not had a single hearing on transportation finance. We had one misguided work session on a bill that had never had the benefit of a hearing that collapsed. They passed it out of committee, but they couldn't even bring it to the floor, so we got this 27-month extension.

We are facing, this summer, losing 700,000 construction jobs because Congress refuses to act. My friends on Ways and Means won't even have a hearing on transportation, will approve $600 billion worth of tax cuts; but we are not dealing with a crisis for your State, for my State, red States, blue States, union and nonunion, big business, small business, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the building trades. Let's get a grip.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If you care about small business, if you care about the health and welfare of your community, if you care about the future of the economy, read the Standard & Poor's report that pointed out that the investments we make will pay for themselves many times over.

It is not just saving those 700,000 jobs. It is an opportunity to grow the economy in the future in something that doesn't have to be conservative, liberal, red State, blue State. It is an opportunity to bring America together to rebuild and renew our economy.

That is what we should be focusing on, rather than this sideshow today that is going to make long-term tax reform harder, add to the deficit, and not deal with the fundamental problems that our constituents were asking us to deal with this week.

There were thousands of them here rallying before the Congress. We turned a deaf ear. Is this really the best we could come up with?

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter addressed to me and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative RON KIND, dated June 9, from many employers. In fact, it represents millions of job creators throughout America and their support for making permanent this provision of section 179 of our Tax Code.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
June 10, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, introduced by Reps. Pat Tiberi (R–OH) and Ron Kind (D–WI). This bipartisan legislation restores and makes permanent the enhanced Section 179 expensing provisions that expired at the end of 2013.

Enhanced Section 179 expensing allows small and medium-sized manufacturers to immediately write off up to $500,000 of investments in new property and equipment in the year purchased, rather than depreciating the cost of the investment overtime. Making this provision a permanent part of the tax code will provide these job creators with the certainty needed for effective business planning. In reducing the after-tax cost of investments, the legislation will help spur much-needed investments in new property and sales of capital equipment. Since 2003, Congress has steadily increased the amount of investment that small businesses can expense, from $25,000 to $500,000.

Capital investment is key to economic growth, job creation and competitiveness. Thus, NAM members strongly support H.R. 4457 and urge Congress to pass this important legislation.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on H.R. 4457 may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 113th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

JUNE 9, 2014.

Hon. PAT TIBERI,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON KIND,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TIBERI AND KIND: The undersigned organizations, representing millions of businesses from every state and from every industry sector, are writing in strong support of H.R. 4457, the America's Small Business Tar Relief Act of 2014. This vital legislation would restore the small business expensing—sometimes called Section 179 expensing—level to $500,000, including limited improvements to real property and permanently index the level to inflation.

Small business expensing allows business owners to immediately deduct the cost of a qualified investment in the year that it is purchased, rather than being forced to depreciate the cost of the investment over time. Since 2003, Congress has steadily increased the amount of investment that small businesses can expense from $25,000 to $500,000. Support for this expansion has been longstanding, bipartisan and widespread. Legislation expanding and/or extending small business expensing has been enacted eight times, across two Presidential Administrations and six Congresses, under both Democratic and Republican leadership. These higher expensing limits were temporary, however, and beginning in 2014 they reverted to $25,000 and will remain there unless Congress acts.

While expensing provides important relief to small business owners, it is not a ''tax cut'' or a ''tax loophole.'' Small business expensing simply gives companies the ability to recover the cost of investing in their own businesses more quickly than if they use depreciation. Expensing does not lead to a loss of revenue to the government over the lifetime of an investment—it is not a matter of if revenue is collected, but when. Additionally, small business expensing is available to all small businesses that purchase less than a specified amount of equipment each year.

Small business expensing gives business owners the ability to maximize investment in their companies during years when they have positive cash flow. This provides an incentive for small business owners to reinvest in their businesses, which fuels expansion, growth and jobs. This is particularly important for small businesses because they are more sensitive than larger firms to problems related to cash flow and are more reliant on earnings to finance new investment.

Additionally, small business expensing simplifies record-keeping and paperwork. Under standard depreciation, small business owners must keep records of, and file tax paperwork associated with, eligible investments for up to 39 years. According to a 2007 Internal Revenue Service (IRS) study, each small business devotes, on average, about 240 hours complying with the tax code, and spends over $2,000 in tax compliance costs each year. An overwhelming share of the time burden is due to record-keeping. Furthermore, high tax compliance costs consistently rank as a top concern of small business owners, and act as a drag on investment, growth and innovation. Small business expensing, as the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) notes, reduces the compliance burden for many taxpayers, freeing up time and resources to better devote to their businesses.

The roller-coaster, ad-hoc changes in the level of small business expensing, which have often been enacted retroactively in recent years, has greatly contributed to uncertainty and prevented long-term planning. Making the higher small business expensing limits permanent and predictable would greatly reduce uncertainty and reduce the incidence of tax policy driving business decisions.

Passage of legislation permanently maintaining small business expensing at $500,000 will increase investment and jobs, reduce complexity and paperwork and alleviate uncertainty. These are critical issues for small businesses, which continue to experience a challenging business climate in the face of a stagnant economic recovery. We thank you for introducing H.R. 4457, the America's Small Business Tar Relief Act of 2014 and urge all Members of Congress to support this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Academy of General Dentistry, Advanced Medical Technology Association's Emerging Growth Company Council, Aeronautical Repair Station Association, Agricultural Retailers Association, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, American Apparel & Footwear Association, American Association of Small Property Owners, American Composites Manufacturers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Dental Association, American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Foundry Society, American Loggers Council, American Moving & Storage Association, American Rental Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Travel Agents, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Supply Association, American Truck Dealers, Americans for Tax Reform, AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology, Arizona Small Business Association.

Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Builders and Contractors—Greater Tennessee Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors Florida East Coast Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors, Rocky Mountain Chapter, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors, Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc., Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Pool & Spa Professionals, Association of the Wall and Ceiling Industry.

Auto Care Association, Aviation Suppliers Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, Carolinas Food Industry Council, CCIM Institute, Chamber of Commerce Southern, New Jersey, Clean Water Construction Coalition, Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Marketers Association, Construction Industry Round Table, Cotton Warehouse Association of America, Delaware Retail Council.

Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, Foodservice Equipment Distributors Association, Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association, Hearth, Patio & Barbecue Association, Heating, Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Independent Electrical Contractors, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Manufacturers Association, Industrial Supply Association, Inland Pacific Chapter Associated Builders & Contractors, Institute of Real Estate Management.

International Association of Plastics Distribution (IAPD), International Cemetery, Cremation and Funeral Association, International Council of Shopping Centers, International Dairy Foods Association, International Franchise Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Irrigation Association, ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Louisiana Logging Council, Metals Service Center Institute, Michigan Association of Timbermen, Michigan Grocers Association.

Missouri Forest Products Association, Modification and Replacement Parts Association, Montana Equipment Dealers Association, Montana Restaurant Association, Montana Retail Association, Montana Tire Dealers Association, National Apartment Association, National Association of Chemical Distributers, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders.

National Association of REALTORS°, National Association of Shell Marketers, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Automobile Dealers Association, National Beer Wholesalers Association (NBWA), National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Confectioners Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council.

National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Manufacturers Representatives Association, National Fastener Distributors Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Funeral Directors Association, National Golf Course Owners Association, National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Distributors Association, National Multifamily Housing Council.

National Pork Producers Council, National Potato Council, National Propane Gas Association, National Restaurant Association,

National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Small Business Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, National Utility Contractors Association (NUCA), NATSO, Representing America's Truckstops and Travel Plazas, New Jersey Business & Industry Association.

Non-Ferrous Founders' Society, North Carolina Retail Merchants Association, North Country Chamber of Commerce, North-American Association of Uniform Manufacturers & Distributors, Northern Arizona Loggers Association, NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Converting Technologies, NTEA—The Association for the Work Truck Industry, Ohio Grocers Association, Outdoor Power Equipment and Engine Service Association, Pacific-West Fastener Association, Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry.

Petroleum Marketers & Convenience Stores of Iowa, Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association of Kansas, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors' National Association, Printing Industries of America, Professional Logging Contractors of Maine, S Corporation Association, SC Timber Producers Association, Selected Independent Funeral Homes, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council.

Small Business Legislative Counsel, Society of American Florists, South Carolina Retail Association, SouthWestern Association, Specialty Equipment Market Association, SP1: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Tennessee Hospitality & Tourism Association, Textile Care Allied Trades Association.

The Outdoor Power Equipment and Engine Service Association (OPEESA), Tire Industry Association, Truck Renting and Leasing Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United Egg Producers, United Producers, Inc., USA Rice Federation.

Utility & Transportation Contractors Association of New Jersey, Western Growers Association, Western United Dairymen, Wichita Independent Business Association, Wisconsin Grocers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce, Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Woodworking Machinery Industry Association.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the letter that I received from the National Association of Manufacturers. Having certainty over the tax treatment of critical investments will make planning for future investments significantly easier.

Capital investment is key to economic growth, job creation, and competitiveness.

Consequently, enactment of this policy would amount to a major step towards a Tax Code that will promote investment.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, again, this is all about jobs. Whether it is on a family farm, whether it is in a mulch business, whether it is a small manufacturer, this is about increasing jobs. Even Mr. Lew said we have a significant problem that we are facing about capital investments. This is, over the last 50 years, a tried-and-true provision that we know creates jobs. And to provide certainty is so critical. If we talk to those job creators—I have talked to them, Mr. Speaker. This is so important to give them certainty over time, not retroactivity like the narrative that we fall into.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished gentleman of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I was proud earlier this year to introduce the America's Small Business Tax Relief Act with my good friend and colleague from the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. TIBERI, the small business expensing provision that is before us.

I get the feeling that during today's debate we are talking past each other because I fully support the policy goals behind the small business expensing bill. It is important that we find a way to get this done. It is important that we establish permanency in the Tax Code, just as I was supportive of introducing legislation on the S Corporation Modernization bill earlier this year with my friend, DAVE REICHERT, on the committee. Many of those provisions were addressed earlier this morning.

But the difference in today's debate, and really the difference in our party's approach to this policy change, comes down to one simple idea: whether we are going to have the fiscal discipline to pay for these permanent changes in the Tax Code or whether we are going to continue to wrack up the debt and leave a legacy of debt for these children, our children and grandchildren, throughout the country.

That is the only difference that we have in today's debate, not about the policy behind it and the permanent nature and the importance to small businesses and family farmers, but whether we are going to exercise the fiscal discipline to do this the right way rather than continuing to dig this deficit hole deeper and leaving this for future generations to contend with. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' and continue focusing on comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I give the chairman of our committee, DAVE CAMP, credit for introducing a draft discussion proposal on comprehensive reform because we have been guided in the last few years under a simple rule of proposition that if we are going to reduce tax rates, if we are going to broaden the base, and if we are going to simplify the Code and make it more competitive, then we have to find offsets in it so we are not blowing holes in the deficit in the future. And Chairman CAMP stayed true to that discipline.

What is ironic is that now, just a few short weeks after the introduction of that, we are right back into these old bad habits of introducing tax cuts with no pay-fors—with no offsets—just to increase the debt for future generations. And what is especially ironic today is this comes just a few short weeks after they passed their own Republican budget resolution that has specifically stated in it that if we are going to do permanent change to the Tax Code, they have to be offset. They have to be paid for.

So which is it? A few weeks ago when you were singing the praises of fiscal discipline supporting that budget resolution and talking about how you are going to make the tough choices? Or today, with permanently changing with no offsets? And there is a difference, I tell my friend from Ohio, between some of the short-term extensions that are meant to keep the pressure on permanent changes versus what is being attempted today.

Because he knows, as I do, and as everyone else knows, that the number of times that this Congress has taken a vote for a permanent change in the Tax Code with no pay-for and no offset has been zero. It has been zero.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KIND. But what we also know around here is what does work. And what does work is pay-as-you-go budgetary rules. That was something that was in place during the 1990s with the support of President George H. W. Bush at the time and President Clinton at the time. And because of a strong, growing, robust economy that created 24 million jobs during that time, and along with pay-as-you-go budgeting discipline, we ended up with 4 years of budget surpluses that we were paying down the national debt rather than adding to it. And that soon was replaced by the next administration and a Republican Congress that supported two wars with no pay-fors, supported two large tax cuts with no pay-fors, and supported the largest increase in Medicare spending—the part D prescription drug bill—without a nickel of it being paid for and supported the largest increase in discretionary spending since the Great Society without paying for any of it.

So when President Obama took office, he inherited—he inherited—a $1.5 trillion budget deficit. And if the people are wondering how we dig a hole like that, they need only look at bills that are on the floor today. We are talking about permanent changes to the Tax Code with no pay-fors.

We can do better. I know it is hard work to do comprehensive tax reform. It means our having to stand up and saying no to a lot of powerful special interests in this town, but it is exactly what we have to have the courage to do to do it the right way so we are not leaving this legacy of debt to these children and to future generations to wrestle with.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. TIBERI. I have no further speakers, sir, and I am prepared to close.

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

The fact of the matter is that this provision is going to be extended. And

you can vote for Mr. NEAL's motion to recommit. I guess it is against your creed to vote for it, so you can vote ''no.'' But you will vote later. And it may be a few months from now, it may not be until after the election. I think it would be better to do it now, if not now then in the next month.

So don't scare, Mr. TIBERI, the small business people in your district. Tell them what the reality is. We are going to extend this. But we are not going to make it permanent unpaid for. It hasn't been done before for good reason, including the need to review it now and then, and also to take into account the cost. I think what the Republicans are doing, to kind of use an old slogan, an old way of saying it, you are giving hypocrisy a bad name.

This is contrary to your budget that you voted for. It is contrary to the Republican Ways and Means tax provisions put together under the leadership of Mr. DAVE CAMP. What is going to happen is, when you add all this together, you have an astronomical addition to the debt—$614 billion, climbing, if you follow this path, to $1 trillion.

So, I think there is no choice here to avoid hypocrisy, or if you want to continue the hypocrisy on your side, vote for this. We are not going to do that. This is a bad idea to proceed this way. We support continuation of this provision, in a responsible, not an irresponsible way, and in a way that isn't reckless.

So I strongly urge all the Democrats to look at the full picture here, the hypocrisy on their side and the ramifications, if we continue on this path, for the programs that we believe in, the programs that have helped to make the middle class of America and the programs that need to be continued and not snuffed out because the Republicans, on the one hand, essentially skyrocketed the debt, and then they come back to us and say, we are sorry that we are so in debt that we have to keep cutting the programs that middle America counts on for their livelihood, for their jobs, for their education, and their health.

So I strongly urge a ''no'' vote, and I look forward to the motion to recommit by Mr. NEAL.

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

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

I will tell the gentleman from Michigan my constituents don't have to be scared. They watch us. I don't have to tell them anything. And I am certainly not going to tell Mr. Skinner or Mr. Price, trust us, we will retroactively, we will, ladies and gentlemen, we will retroactively—because we are going to surrender today—we are going to retroactively pass a policy in November or December to allow you to expense something that you bought in June, because today Mr. Price needs to buy a loader for his mulch business.

And he scratches his head; retroactively? Retroactively? You guys don't know what operating businesses are all about if you are talking about retroactively, because that has been the narrative here. The other narrative is that the Senate is not going to do it. Well, with all due respect, after the R&D tax credit debate on this floor when the same argument was used, Senator BARBARA BOXER—not someone who I agree with a lot on things—said that maybe we should look at making that permanent. Senator DICK DURBIN from Illinois, a member of the Democrat leadership, opened up the possibility of maybe we should make some of these permanent. Tom and Judy Price would be proud of Mr. DURBIN. I don't know if Mr. DURBIN has run a business or not, but Mr. Price does with his wife.

Ladies and gentlemen, this should be about common sense. Nobody is pure here. We have all added to the deficit. I would argue that the deficit was much higher when the other side was in control. Those are numbers. Less today, less last year, a lot more than 2009, I think we would all agree, the deficit, yearly deficit, the debt is certainly higher. The MTR will create debt. According to the Joint Tax, my bill will as well.

But this is about job creators, about allowing them to invest, invest to grow their businesses, to hire more employees, the American Dream that my mom and dad came here to believe and live in, ladies and gentlemen. In a House that my daughter—my daughter in sixth grade understands that we have a right as a House to pass a bill and have a position that might be different than the Senate's. God forgive us for having a different position than the Senate. But just because the Senate wants to do 2 years doesn't mean we have to do 2 years.

I don't understand that narrative. Even some of my colleagues say, well, why are we doing this because the Senate doesn't agree? Give me a break, ladies and gentlemen. Let's have a conference committee for once. Wouldn't that be great? That would be grand. And we can fight it out in conference committee just like the Founders told us we should.

Ladies and gentlemen, with respect to tax policy, there has been no Member of the House, the Senate, and the administration that has provided leadership to get to comprehensive tax reform like DAVID CAMP. He has been bipartisan, he has been open, and he has provided incredible leadership. But as all of us know in looking at history, one House can't provide leadership. You need an executive at the White House who is going to provide leadership. And, quite frankly, we have had none.

I credit RON WYDEN, the chairman of the Senate, he has got a bill at least. He has got a draft. I might not agree with his draft, but he has a right to have a draft, and the Senate has a right to have a position. And do you know what? Maybe one day we will get there soon, Mr. NEAL. I know you are for that. I am for that. But we should have a House position. We should not surrender to the Senate.

But to get comprehensive tax reform done, ladies and gentlemen, we have to have leadership in the White House. We can't do it alone.

I thank Mr. CAMP for his service. He has moved the ball on comprehensive tax reform greater than anybody has here since I have been here. But today is not about comprehensive tax reform, unfortunately. It is about providing certainty to small businessowners—our job creators in America. This is what they want. This is what they need. This is what has been proven to be successful to allow them to expand their businesses. And today, if Tom Price buys a loader for $200,000, he has to expense it over 7 years. His cash flow is killed, and I am not going to go tell him, ''don't worry. Trust me. We will do it in December retroactively.'' I will not do that.

□ 1115

We need to have a position. We need to do it today. We need to do it right. This is about policy. This shouldn't be about politics. This should be about the House's position.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to put the politics aside, quite frankly, and support this bill, have the House have a position, and let's challenge the Senate, and let's do it before November, before December. Let's do it now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act Of 2014.

H.R. 4457 permanently sets the IRC Section 179 small business expensing maximum limit at $500,000. In order to remain profitable and be competitive, small business like limousine owners as represented by the National Limousine Association, farmers and ranchers, and others must continually upgrade and replace equipment, buildings, and storage facilities.

A This is a very important provision due to its immediacy for small business owners.

With provisions like Section 179, businesses are able to reduce maintenance costs, take advantage of labor-saving advances, become more energy-efficient and adopt technology that is environmentally friendly.

Section 179 allows a taxpayer to deduct the cost of new or used business property rather than depreciating the cost over a longer period of time. The immediate expensing provided by Section 179 allows these businesses increased cash flow for purchases that might otherwise be delayed or that would require them to incur debt expense.

The bill would make permanent rules that allow small businesses to expense capital investments in new equipment and property, making permanent provisions that provide that the maximum amount that a taxpayer may expense is $500,000.

Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, this bill is estimated to cost $73.1 billion over 10 years and it is not paid for, which means that the deficit will necessarily go up as a result.

The Congressional Research Service has reviewed quantitative analyses of the tax

break and found that, ". . . accelerated depreciation in general is a relatively ineffective tool for stimulating the economy."

Mr. Speaker, I understand the point that supporters of the bill argue: that it is necessary to ensure that small businesses can continue to make new investments in property and equipment even as costs rise, affecting more than 10 percent of small-business tax returns.

They say it lowers the cost of capital for tangible property used in business, eliminates depreciation record-keeping requirements with respect to expensed property and removes a disincentive to buying more efficient cooling and heating equipment.

Democrats generally support increased expensing under Section 179 but we cannot sit idly by while the party which has made deficit reduction their rallying cry—refuses to offset the cost of the bill.

It must be noted that permanently extending six tax provisions that GOP leaders want to act on would add $310 billion to the deficit.

With the bills on the floor today, Republicans are continuing their gross double standard of adding billions to the deficit to fund permanent tax breaks for businesses, while insisting on fully offsetting the cost of initiatives for middle class and working Americans, including veterans benefits, student loans, and unemployment insurance.

The Democratic Motions to Recommit would put the brakes on Republicans' deficit-busting spending spree, and shorten these tax extensions. Democrats have always strongly supported expanded "Section 179" expensing for small businesses and tax relief for S-Corporations, but permanent extensions of tax breaks that cost hundreds of billions are hypocritical and irresponsible.

We need comprehensive tax reform that addresses the tax needs of middle class families as well as businesses. In the meantime, Republicans shouldn't be punching hundred billion dollar holes in the deficit.

It is time for Republicans to stop ignoring hard working American families, and work with Democrats to create jobs, invest in innovation, and build an economy that works for everyone not just the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for a two-year extension but these bills must be paid for—because if they are not—future generations will suffer because of the unsustainable debt.

Let us get back to being fiscally responsible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NEAL. In its current form, I am opposed to this legislation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4457 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF EXPENSING LIMITATION.

(a) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''or 2013'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''after 2013'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''after 2015''.

(b) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''or 2013'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''after 2013'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''after 2015''.

(c) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''before 2014'' and inserting ''before 2016''.

(d) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended by striking ''before 2014'' and inserting ''before 2016''.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking ''or 2013'' and inserting ''2013, 2014, or 2015''.

(2) CARRYOVER.—Paragraph (4) of section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking ''2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''2015''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the reading of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit must be pretty powerful with that confab that had to take place on the other side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. TIBERI—and he is my friend—and I am going to remind all that Mr. CAMP did a pretty good job with the draft that he put out. That is not what this is about today.

This is about short-circuiting a long tradition in the Ways and Means Committee as to how tax reform ought to be handled. A reminder, again, 1986 was the last time that we spoke of tax reform in an earnest manner. Mr. TIBERI was, indeed, very animated. I understand the point that he is making.

The problem is, if you do a piecemeal approach to tax reform, you will never do fundamental tax reform. It is like the temptation of repatriation. If you repatriate those dollars, you will never do tax reform. People will just wait for another tax holiday. That is the weakness of the argument that we just heard. A 2-year extension makes a good deal of sense—let some of this economic morass clear up.

Now, Mr. TIBERI was correct when he quoted Jack Lew, an old friend. Economic growth is very weak. The number of people working is the real issue; 200,000 jobs a month won't do it. So why can't we find common purpose and expand the runway in terms of economic growth for all members of the American family? Are you telling me that this austerity package has worked?

By the way, Mr. TIBERI's comment when Mr. TIBERI said the investing class in America and the business class, they are looking for stability, they look at this institution every day and think that they are finding stability, with the arguments that take place here?

There are enough men and women in this institution and on the Ways and Means Committee of good will to continue the conversation that Mr. CAMP has begun on tax reform. This is piecemeal. It is an ill-conceived manner and way to do tax reform.

Again, a reminder, the last time we did tax reform, the Internet had not been invented. That ought to tell us the story.

Here is what tax reform might look like: acknowledging that fossil fuel is not going away in the near future, we can still build a path to the renewables by using the Tax Code.

Let's expand the earned income tax credit. Let's embrace new markets tax credits. They have worked in every nook and cranny of this country. Let's take a look and embrace, again, build America bonds.

In reference to Mr. TIBERI's commentary, let me say this as well: yes, we need a permanent R&D credit, but let's make it even more robust. We heard a presentation yesterday in Massachusetts that, in Cambridge and Boston today, you have the greatest concentration of R&D in the world. Do you think I am not for a more robust research and development credit?

Again, good minds ought to be able to find this path forward, and I challenge the Republicans today: let's get on with renewing the Export-Import Bank. That makes a good deal of sense as well, and you know why—because it is sound economic policy.

This idea that theology takes over all in tax debate is a mistake. Embrace what works, not just the rigid ideology of the intransigence that keeps us from finding a common path.

We started out 3 years ago with Mr. CAMP's work. For 3 years, we sat together, talked, took substantive testimony, and listened to what people had to say. Come in and defend your preference, come in and defend this deduction. Actually, the conversation was very good.

I can't understand the logic of that very sound conversation bringing us to this intersection of public debate. Are we to throw all of that good will over the side? In this simple moment, are

we going to cast aside a deliberative process that really was much of the better that I have had a chance to witness in almost 25 years on the Ways and Means Committee?

That is what you are doing today. You adopt these piecemeal approaches to tax reform, you will never get tax reform.

Think of these numbers: there is more than $2 trillion sitting offshore in cash and tangible assets. The bottom lines of corporate America are stronger than they have been in years.

My last point, downward pressure on wages since 2002 ought to be what motivates us to do tax reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, you know what I hear from the other side? They are happy with the way things are. They are happy with a contracting economy, negative 1 percent growth in the last quarter. They are happy with fewer people in the workforce than the Carter years.

They are happy with more young people living at home than ever before. They are happy with declining incomes for the middle class because they are saying just keep doing what we have been doing.

In fact, as I think about it, my friend from Massachusetts said:

> Let's just wait and let the economic morass clear up.

That is a direct quote.

> Let's just wait.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. No, I will not yield. The gentleman has had his time. I have very limited time here.

Let me just say: if we just sit and wait, nothing is going to change. This policy has been extended many, many times for more than the budget window, unpaid for, with large bipartisan votes. Clearly, at the end of the year, this policy will be extended, unpaid for.

So why not do something good for America? Why not do something good for those employers and those workers who are looking for an economy that starts to recover?

We are the only nation in the world that has temporary tax policy. We are the only nation in the world that lets significant policies that help people invest and create jobs expire. At the end of the year, this will have been expired for a year, and then we will retroactively put it in place, but what we really need is permanent policy.

So let's stop threatening small businesses with higher costs. That absolutely makes no sense. Let's get people back to work. Let's get people earning higher paychecks. Let's do something right for America. Vote against this motion to recommit and vote for the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 4457 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4457, if ordered; the motion to recommit on H.R. 4453; passage of H.R. 4453, if ordered; and adoption of House Resolution 617.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 232, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—180

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
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—232

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
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
Gosar
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
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
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
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
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)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
Cantor
Crowley
Engel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
McHenry
Meng
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Speier

□ 1149

Messrs. HUDSON, KELLY of Pennsylvania, STIVERS, ADERHOLT, MARINO, YOUNG of Alaska, BILIRAKIS, HUELSKAMP, SCALISE, and

PERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CLYBURN, CARSON of Indiana, BECERRA, and HIMES changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 12, 2014 I missed a recorded vote, rollcall No. 308, the motion to recommit H.R. 4457. I would have voted ''yes'' on this measure.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2014, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act (rollcall No. 308). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 144, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—272

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—144

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Coble
Granger
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
LaMalfa
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Stutzman
Webster (FL)

□ 1157

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—188

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
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider