

Mr. Speaker, now 1 year later Mindy, this week, is helping lead a program entitled SevenDays: Make a Ripple, Change the World. It is a week full of events to encourage every citizen to be a force for goodness and kindness and unity in our community and in the world; and in doing so, it is a reminder that each of us can make a ripple and help change the world.

REMEMBERING IRVING SMOLENS

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Irving Smolens: a soldier, a father, a husband, an American hero. And I am very proud to call him my friend.

Irving Smolens was a World War II veteran who survived D-Day, where he served with the U.S. Army 4th Infantry Division. He came home just short of his 21st birthday in 1945 to a country he loved deeply, and he helped build a community in Melrose, Massachusetts.

Irving took his experiences from the darkest moments of our past and advocated for a better, more peaceful world. Up until he left us on Saturday at the age of 90, you could still catch up with Irving at the Melrose schools, where he would recount stories of the Allied invasion in World War II for hundreds of middle schoolers at our assemblies, and he taught thousands in our classrooms.

He recently became a chevalier with the French Legion of Honor, and he was a regular at Democratic events and campaigns. He served as president of the Temple Beth Shalom in Melrose, and he was an avid jazz enthusiast and sports fan. He watched every one of the 19 innings of last week's Red Sox-Yankees game.

He was quick to pen a letter to the Boston Globe and recently took to blogging in his late eighties and to social media. Not only did he comment on politics, but he helped reconnect veterans' families with their fathers' histories.

This past fall, 70 years after Irving stepped onto the beaches of Normandy to fight the Nazis, he returned. This time he would be met by both the American President and the French President in recognition of his valor and patriotism. He was seen by a journalist, who said after the President had delivered a long speech, he was stopped by an old soldier who gave him a piece of his mind. When the journalist caught up with Irving and asked what he had to say to President Obama, Irving replied: "I thanked him for keeping us out of war."

Our thoughts and prayers are with Irving and his family, especially his wife, Edith, and daughter, Karen. We are so proud to have known him and for his service.

□ 1230

HONORING RACHAEL BEVILL

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an incredible young Granite Stater who had the distinct honor of being chosen to represent New Hampshire in the Cherry Blossom Princess Program.

Rachael Bevill, a senior at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and a resident of Merrimack, New Hampshire, embodies all the qualities of a great leader.

As a student at Merrimack High School, Rachael served as class secretary and a member of her student council. Rachael also excels and competes at a State and nationwide level for public speaking and writing, placing third in both the VFW's Americanism essay contest and the Voice of Democracy speech competition.

Currently, Rachael is studying biomedical engineering. Inspired by two of her siblings who have autism, Rachael aims to design nanotechnology and regenerative medicine to make the lives of future generations with similar challenges much easier.

It is ambitious, bright, and altruistic young people like Rachael that provide such great hope for our Nation's future. I congratulate her.

ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF ABDUCTION OF CHIBOK SCHOOLGIRLS BY BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 year since the abduction of the Chibok schoolgirls in Nigeria—1 year, 365 days, nonstop—by Boko Haram.

UNICEF is reporting that 800,000 children have been forced to flee Boko Haram's campaign of violence in Nigeria. Their Missing Childhoods reports that most of the girls remain in captivity, scores more of their peers have since gone missing, and the number of children who are displaced is staggering. The one bright spot is many of the girls have escaped, and 10 of them are in Virginia.

When I went to Nigeria and met with those girls, I said: What can we do to help you?

They said: We want to go to school.

As a school principal, that made me proud because education is the key to all of the Nation's ills; and, in spite of their trials and tribulations, they still wanted to go to school.

Boko Haram means Western education is sin, so we must support our girls and lift them up and let them know that we love them.

Boko Haram has reached out to ISIS, and ISIS has responded. A marriage between Boko Haram and ISIS is a marriage made in hell.

Tweet, tweet, tweet
#bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet,
tweet #followrepwilson. Tweet, tweet
all day long.

ADVISORY COUNCILS

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is important we regularly meet with constituents in order to have a variety of viewpoints and experience to draw upon as we work towards the betterment of our country.

This past district work period, we held advisory council meetings with interested citizens from across North Carolina's Seventh Congressional District. These advisory councils represent different sectors within our community throughout the district, including ag, small business, veterans and defense, law enforcement, homeland security, health care, and education.

There was one theme that continually emerged during these meetings, and the message was clear: we must reduce the burdens of an overly intrusive Federal Government while making improvements in those areas where government has a legitimate and constitutional responsibility, such as our transportation and infrastructure needs.

I look forward to working with these distinguished men and women who have agreed to serve on our advisory councils. Their insights into issues that affect our district, our State, and our Nation are invaluable; and I thank them for their desire and willingness to serve in this capacity.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 650, PRESERVING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACT OF 2015, PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 685, MORTGAGE CHOICE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 650) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; (2) adopts an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 27, as adopted by the House; and (3) adopts such concurrent resolution, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule and the underlying bills that make it easier for hard-working families to purchase a home.

I would like to be perfectly clear from the outset. These bills are about increasing access to affordable housing. They are about helping middle class men and women in our country gain a little bit better footing to help them along their American Dream, and that is why we are here today.

What we are trying to do is get the government out of the way so that more Americans can purchase the homes of their choice. These bills are about achieving the American Dream of owning your own home. That brings us closer to why we are here today. We are here to help families who want to own their own home and to live the American Dream.

The administration's Big Government regulations have made it harder for American families to own a home, so we are here to empower them, instead of rules and regulations by Washington bureaucrats.

The ball of red tape coming out of Washington grows daily, and day by

day, it spreads beyond the housing market. It ties the hands of families who want to own their own home, as well as the hands of business that want to hire new employees and investors that want to fund the next new big idea to make America stronger and better and to build jobs.

Modest, reasonable regulation does have its place; overregulation does not. Overregulation stifles economic growth. It gets in the way and makes it harder for families to pull themselves not only out of poverty, but it keeps them from gaining the footing to get into the middle class. Ultimately, unreasonable regulation destroys a shot that people have at the American Dream.

The problem with overregulation is that it is everywhere. This administration enjoys and relishes the opportunity to inflict themselves on every part of the American economy because they believe Washington knows best. Well, we just can't live this way and have people have their say and whack at the American Dream, also.

Unfortunately, overregulation is like the weeds in the backyard; they have to be removed. One by one, that is how you gain accomplishment. That is what happened yesterday when the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Chairman JEB HENSARLING from Dallas, Texas, brought some reasonable opportunities to the Rules Committee for us to consider.

What are we doing here today? We are removing just a few of the regulatory weeds that were promulgated by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB. These mortgages that we are talking about have rules that make it harder for low- and moderate-income Americans to qualify for a mortgage—harder.

They negatively impact consumers and community banks who offer the majority of these loans to middle class Americans, and it makes them outside of the ability that people have to get them because of the high cost of regulation.

These costs are passed on to consumers who, once again, are victims to an overzealous regulatory regime who stated that they were there to help the consumer in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because we have a bipartisan piece of legislation that has gained over the last few years more people who understand the issues—not only those in the Financial Services Committee, but across Congress—and we are here today because of what is a good bill to remove a few weeds from the garden one at a time. Chairman HENSARLING has given us that chance today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, before we left for our district work period, this House worked in a responsible and bipartisan way to permanently fix the sustainable growth rate formula.

Unfortunately, we return to the floor this week with legislation intended to further undermine the Dodd-Frank financial reform law and give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans by repealing the estate tax without even finding an offset, thereby increasing our deficit.

What we should be doing today, Mr. Speaker, is considering legislation to strengthen financial protection for consumers, create jobs, and ensure the continuation of our economic recovery; or, in honor of Equal Pay Day, we should debate and vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act to ensure that women get paid for equal work.

A full-time working woman still earns significantly less than what a man earns for comparable work. It turns out that women earn nearly 25 cents less than a man for doing the same work. Achieving equal pay for women should be the top of our priority list, but, unfortunately, this Republican majority has denied us a vote on this critical issue.

Today, instead, we will consider two pieces of legislation under a closed process to roll back important Dodd-Frank consumer protections.

H.R. 650, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, strips from manufactured homeowners critical protections enacted by Congress as part of the Dodd-Frank financial reform law.

Manufactured homes are an important affordable housing option for many low- and moderate-income families, especially families living in rural areas. It is critical that these homeowners are able to have access to the same consumer protections afforded to consumers with traditional mortgages.

H.R. 685, the Mortgage Choice Act, would allow mortgages with higher fees to improperly qualify for the qualified mortgage standards established by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. By removing affiliated title insurance fees from the 3 percent cap established by the CFPB, creditors could be incentivized to direct borrowers to expensive affiliates.

Passage of this legislation could ultimately drive up the cost of mortgages, limit competition in the marketplace, and undo borrower protections.

□ 1245

A coalition of civil rights organizations, including the Center for Responsible Lending, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, and I could go on and on and on, has urged the House to reject these bills, as they "could trigger the return of predatory lending, irresponsible underwriting, excessive fees, and the lax

regulatory environment that sparked the housing crisis.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that my friends in the majority don't like the Dodd-Frank financial reform law. They have made countless attempts to overturn the commonsense provisions contained in the law that protect consumers and work to prevent another financial crisis.

But I don't think anybody in this House should want to set the stage for another financial crisis, and I have serious concerns about the process being used by the majority to repeal Dodd-Frank.

My friend, the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee, MAXINE WATERS, has worked in good faith with the majority on legislation to make technical corrections to Dodd-Frank and other bipartisan updates. In fact, just yesterday, this House passed several pieces of legislation from the Financial Services Committee with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

But the two bills that we are considering today fall far short of that goal. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of a clean Homeland Security bill and the SGR fix, I had hoped that bipartisan cooperation in legislating would be contagious. I was wrong.

Today, the Republicans are back to their old ways of bringing up “my way or the highway bills” that will be brought to the floor under a closed rule and then vetoed by the President.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is going to have just his opportunity today because I am sure we are going to vote on this.

I would like to advise the gentleman that I have no speakers. We spent a couple of hours yesterday in the Rules Committee fully debating this, understanding this bipartisan bill, and so I want to advise the gentleman that I will allow him to use the time. I would like to ask if he has any speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do.

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

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

In honor of Equal Pay Day, if we defeat the previous question, which I will ask Members to vote “no” on, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Paycheck Fairness Act.

In this day and age, it is an outrage that women in the United States still make less compared to men for the same work. This bill will help close that pay gap, empower women, and ensure that they get the respect and the compensation that they deserve.

When we talk about paycheck fairness, Mr. Speaker, we also should remember that this is not just a women's issue; it is a family issue. Families increasingly rely on women's wages to

make ends meet, and with less take-home pay, women have less for the everyday needs of their families, from groceries to rent to child care to doctors' visits.

This is discrimination that exists in the United States of America, and we in this Chamber have an opportunity to end it.

We cannot get the Republicans in this House to allow us to have an up-or-down, clean vote on this, so this is the only means available to us. At least have a debate on the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Congress often talks about strengthening the middle class and growing our economy. For many years now, we have had an opportunity to pass a commonsense bill that will actually help us do just that. It was the very first bill that I cosponsored.

The Paycheck Fairness Act ensures equal pay for equal work and will help us end wage discrimination for half of our workforce.

Recent reports tell us that, given current trends, pay equity between women and men will not be achieved until 2058. We shouldn't have to wait until our children are ready to retire before women are finally paid what they are worth.

Women are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars over their lifetime due to wage discrimination. And for women of color, it is an even worse situation. African American women, on average, earn only 64 cents, and Latinas, on average, earn only 56 cents for every dollar earned by White men.

When women aren't paid what they are worth, that means less money for their families, less money for child care, less money for gas and groceries, and less money to help them prepare for the future.

When wage discrimination persists, women and their families are less able to contribute to the economy, and that hurts all of us. Ending wage discrimination for our workforce is just common sense. That is why today, on Equal Pay Day, I urge my colleagues to recommit to restoring the middle class and growing our economy by supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentlewoman recognizes she needs to be talking to the White House probably most of all. During the last few years, every time this issue comes up, we refer to White House pay and equity among women who work at the White House, compared to their colleagues, and so this might just be one of those bills that the White House would veto because they could follow what they choose but maybe they wouldn't want this to be the law, or maybe they would want this to be the law so they could correct what they do at the

White House for equal pay for equal work, women among their colleagues.

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

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

I don't think we have any other speakers here.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I will remind my colleagues that if we could defeat the previous question, we will bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act. It has been somewhat of a puzzle to me that it has been so difficult, in this Republican-controlled House, to bring up legislation that would outlaw and end discrimination against women, and that is what this is.

When a woman is working at the same job a man is and getting paid less for that same work, that is discrimination, and there is no way around that fact. And we have the opportunity, in this House, and in the Senate, to end it.

But yet we can't get this bill to the floor for the kind of up-or-down, clean vote that we have been looking for for now quite a long time.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a women's issue; it is a family issue. We are all talking about how this economy is not recovering as fast as we would like it to. We all like to talk about how we wish that people would earn a little bit more in their paychecks.

Well, here is one way to do it. Make sure women get paid what they deserve, what they have earned. This should not be a controversial issue. This should not be something that requires that we can't get a vote on the floor.

So we are now kind of relying on this procedural motion, by defeating the previous question, to try to at least get a debate on this and to try to get at least some people on record as saying we ought to have an up-or-down vote on this.

As far as the underlying bill is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill that we are considering here today, again, I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule because it is a closed rule, and they are two bills that would undermine the Dodd-Frank financial reform legislation.

Let me remind my colleagues why we have the Dodd-Frank legislation to begin with, and that is because we saw what the excesses of some in the financial industry had done. Our economy almost was ruined because of those excesses, and consumer rights were routinely trampled on.

So we passed, in my opinion, a moderate and sensible kind of check on

some of these financial institutions—that is the Dodd-Frank legislation. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and again, it is a puzzle to me, have spent almost every waking moment that they have trying to undo that, trying to take away protections for consumers, trying to take away protections for small businesses, for homeowners. It doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make any sense at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, and I would urge them to vote “no” on this closed rule.

Again, just to make this point crystal clear, the Equal Pay Act that we are talking about is nothing more than an attempt to end what continues to be a discriminatory practice in the United States. Nobody should be defending a practice that allows women to get paid less than men for doing the same job. That is discrimination, pure and simple, and we ought to bring that to an end.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. He had to sit through the long hearing yesterday, and it was a most interesting one.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that the Rules Committee asked Members and their offices to submit any ideas and amendments regarding this bill, and none were submitted. That is why we have a closed rule. That is why H.R. 685, the Mortgage Choice Act, and H.R. 650, Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, are both under a closed rule because we tried to make it available to as many Members as chose, and no one took us up on it.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because we have two Members who have worked hard in committee, they have worked hard over the last few years as new, young members of this Republican majority, BILL HUIZENGA from Michigan and STEPHEN FINCHER from Tennessee, who worked very diligently inside the Financial Services Committee over the years and have brought these bills back to us.

This is not their first appearance. We now have a Senate, however, that we believe will take up these bills.

Republicans are committed to reducing the regulatory burden that makes it harder for families to get homes. In this case, it may be manufactured housing, it may be directly aimed at the middle class. It may help people a lot. The answer is, yes, it does. And that is why we are doing this.

We are taking our time today because the middle class of this country deserves a right for us to pay attention to them. And community banks, small banks back home that people walk into, see the same people, day after

day, year after year, who live in these communities, community bankers are there to help grow not only the middle class but also rural America and the areas that oftentimes are in agriculture areas, perhaps in the areas where there is a lot of energy exploration.

People choose to have their own roof over their own head and need a chance to get a loan, need a chance to take care of their families.

So, look, we are willing to keep working out and reaching out to Democrats. This is a bipartisan bill, and we are willing to do whatever it takes so that individuals and families can help realize this American Dream.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to allow me to reclaim the balance of my time because I had yielded back, and two of our speakers have just shown up.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of the time I yielded back.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to defeat the previous question so that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) can offer an amendment for the House to immediately consider the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Three weeks ago, I reintroduced the Paycheck Fairness Act. My bill would finish the job started by the Equal Pay Act some 50 years ago. It would end pay secrecy across the board. It would require employers to prove that pay disparities are not based on gender, and passing the bill would give teeth to a very, very simple principle: men and women in the same job deserve the same pay.

The Paycheck Fairness Act has passed the House twice already, with bipartisan support I might add. It has come just two votes shy of passing in the other body.

President Obama has called on us to pass it. More crucially still, the American people know the importance of paycheck fairness.

In October, a Gallup poll asked Americans to identify the top issue facing women in the workplace. Equal pay was, by far, the most common response among men as well as women.

All across the country today, working families are in trouble. Their wages are stagnant. They are in jobs that just don't pay them enough to be able to pay their bills. They are struggling to heat their homes and to feed their children.

Equal pay is a crucial part of the solution to this problem, since women are more than half of the workforce. Two-thirds of us are breadwinners for our families. Lower pay for women means less gas in the car, less food on the table, less money in the college fund, and less spending to support our economy.

Today is yet another Equal Pay Day. What Equal Pay Day means is that it has taken 104 days for the average woman's earnings to catch up with what the average man made last year. That is exactly 104 days too long.

Fifty-two years since the Equal Pay Act became law, a woman still only makes 78 cents, on average, for every dollar earned by a man. The gap has barely changed in over a decade.

For women of color the disparities are wider still. Their Equal Pay Day will not arrive until May or June.

Even in nursing, a profession that is more than 90 percent female, a study last month showed that men earned \$5,100 more per year, on average, than women when controlling for education, experience, and other factors.

Clearly, we must do more to close the gender pay gap. President Obama and the Department of Labor have shown the way by taking action to protect women who work for Federal contractors. It is now time that we in the Congress act to extend real, enforceable pay equity protection to all women.

Equal pay for equal work is the right thing to do. It is the smart thing to do. It, in fact, would reflect what today's economy is all about with women being in the workplace overwhelmingly. It is time to make it a reality for all Americans, and I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1300

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank both the gentleman from Texas as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Equal Pay Day.

Today, April 14, marks the day in which women's earnings from January 2014 have reached men's earnings in 2014 alone.

In one of the wealthiest, most progressive countries in the world, women still find themselves 3½ months behind men in wage disbursement. That means that for every dollar earned by men in the United States, only 78 cents are earned by women. For a woman working full time over the span of her career, that means a total loss of \$430,000, nearly \$500,000. Non-White, disabled, and LGBT women fare even worse, with some making as little as 56 cents to every dollar earned by men in comparable positions.

I am proud to join my colleagues today in recognition of the fact that this disparity is not only antiquated, but economically regressive and morally indefensible.

It has been proven time and time again that increasing pay for women has a direct and immediate impact on improving our economy and the health of American families. Fairly compensating women is not only the right thing to do, but it would increase consumer demand, create jobs, and raise the GDP.

Today, on Lilly Ledbetter's birthday, it is time for Congress to act to enable women to support America's children and families and end this crippling drag on our Nation's economic prosperity and moral stain on our country. It is time we play our part in ending the gender gap.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman was able to have these two additional bright speakers, including the gentleman from the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS. So things worked out very well.

I want to thank my dear friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) who asked for this, and I believe that I have responded in-kind.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his courtesy and generosity in allowing two of my colleagues who feel very strongly about these issues to have an opportunity to speak. I am very, very grateful. So, as a reward, I am not going to say anything else other than to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the relationship that the gentleman and I share is very good. We spend hours a week with each other, and we know that occasionally we have different speakers come, and I am delighted that I was able to give him that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as I began closing a minute ago, let's take a step in the right direction right now, right here today. Let's take these two bills that came directly from the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) at the urging of the Financial Services Committee. I believe this is the right thing to do on, I believe, an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis of that committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 189 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1619) to amend the

Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1619.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

vious question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—239

Abraham	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Aderholt	Cook	Graves (MO)
Allen	Costello (PA)	Griffith
Amash	Cramer	Grothman
Amodei	Crawford	Guinta
Babin	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barletta	Culberson	Hardy
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Harper
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Benishek	Denham	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Dent	Heck (NV)
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Black	Dold	Hice, Jody B.
Blackburn	Duffy	Hill
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Bost	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Boustany	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Brat	Farenthold	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Fincher	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Buchanan	Fleming	Issa
Buck	Flores	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Forbes	Jenkins (WV)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Carter (TX)	Garrett	Jordan
Chabot	Gibbs	Joyce
Chaffetz	Gibson	Katko
Clawson (FL)	Gohmert	Kelly (PA)
Coffman	Goodlatte	King (IA)
Cole	Gosar	King (NY)
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Kinzing (IL)
Collins (NY)	Granger	Kline
Comstock	Graves (GA)	Knight

Labrador	Palmer	Simpson	Swalwell (CA)	Tsongas	Wasserman	Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (MO)	Takai	Van Hollen	Schultz	Moolenaar	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Lamborn	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Takano	Vargas	Waters, Maxine	Mooney (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Lance	Perry	Smith (NJ)	Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Watson Coleman	Mullin	Rohrabacher	Trott
Latta	Pittenger	Smith (TX)	Thompson (MS)	Vela	Welch	Mulvaney	Rokita	Turner
LoBiondo	Pitts	Stefanik	Titus	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Upton
Long	Poe (TX)	Stewart	Tonko	Visclosky	Yarmuth	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Love	Poliquin	Stivers	Torres	Walz		Newhouse	Roskam	Wagner
Lucas	Pompeo	Stutzman				Noem	Ross	Walberg
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Thompson (PA)				Nugent	Rothfus	Walden
Lummis	Price, Tom	Thornberry	Bass	Hanna	Ruiz	Nunes	Rouzer	Walker
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Tiberi	DeSantis	Hinojosa	Ryan (WI)	Olson	Royce	Walorski
Marchant	Reed	Tipton	Ellison	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Palazzo	Russell	Walters, Mimi
Marino	Reichert	Trott				Palmer	Salmon	Weber (TX)
Massie	Renacci	Turner				Paulsen	Sanford	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	Ribble	Upton				Pearce	Scalise	Weststrup
McCauley	Rice (SC)	Valadao				Perry	Schweikert	Westerman
McClintock	Rigell	Wagner				Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Westmoreland
McHenry	Roby	Walberg				Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Williams
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Walden				Poe (TX)	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Walker				Poliquin	Shimkus	Wittman
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Walorski				Pompeo	Shuster	Womack
McSally	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi				Posey	Simpson	Woodall
Meadows	Rokita	Weber (TX)				Price, Tom	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Meehan	Rooney (FL)	Webster (FL)				Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman				Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Mica	Roskam	Whitfield				Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)
Miller (FL)	Ross	Williams				Renacci	Stefanik	Young (IN)
Miller (MI)	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)				Ribble	Stewart	Zeldin
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Wittman				Rice (SC)	Stivers	Zinke
Mooney (WV)	Royce	Womack				Rigell	Stutzman	
Mullin	Russell	Woodall				Roby	Thompson (PA)	
Mulvaney	Salmon	Yoder						
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Yoho						
Neugebauer	Scalise	Young (AK)						
Newhouse	Schweikert	Young (IA)						
Noem	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)						
Nugent	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin						
Nunes	Sessions	Shuster						
Olson	Shimkus							
Palazzo	Shuster							

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1333

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 148, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

AYES—237

NAYS—183

Adams	Engel	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Eshoo	(NM)
Ashford	Esty	Lynch
Beatty	Farr	Maloney,
Becerra	Fattah	Carolyn
Bera	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McCollum
Blumenauer	Gabbard	McDermott
Bonamici	Galleo	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	McNerney
F.	Graham	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Meng
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Moulton
Bustos	Grijalva	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Capps	Hahn	Napolitano
Capuano	Hastings	Neal
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Carney	Higgins	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Himes	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Honda	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pascarell
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Payne
Chu, Judy	Israel	Pelosi
Ciçilline	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clyburn	Kaptur	Polis
Cohen	Keating	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Conyers	Kennedy	Rangel
Cooper	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Costa	Kilmer	Richmond
Courtney	Kind	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Cuellar	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee	Schakowsky
Delaney	Levin	Schiff
DeLauro	Lewis	Schrader
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Scott, David
Deutch	Loeb sack	Serrano
Dingell	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Loudermilk	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Sinema
F.	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Duckworth	(NM)	Slaughter
Edwards		Speier

Abraham	Denham	Hultgren
Aderholt	Dent	Hunter
Allen	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Amash	DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Babin	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Barletta	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Benishak	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Joyce
Black	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Fleming	King (IA)
Bost	Flores	King (NY)
Boustany	Forbes	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Kline
Brat	Poxx	Knight
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Lamborn
Buchanan	Gibbs	Lance
Buck	Gohmert	Latta
Bucshon	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Burgess	Gosar	Long
Byrne	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Calvert	Granger	Love
Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Chaffetz	Griffith	MacArthur
Clawson (FL)	Grothman	Marchant
Coffman	Guinta	Marino
Cole	Guthrie	McCarthy
Collins (GA)	Hardy	McCauley
Collins (NY)	Harper	McClintock
Comstock	Harris	McHenry
Conaway	Hartzer	McKinley
Cook	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	Rodgers
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McSally
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Crenshaw	Hill	Meehan
Culberson	Holding	Messer
Curbelo (FL)	Hudson	Mica
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)

NOES—185

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Nadler
Ashford	Garamendi	Napolitano
Beatty	Gibson	Neal
Becerra	Graham	Nolan
Bera	Grayson	Norcross
Beyer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Payne
Boyle, Brendan	Hahn	Pelosi
F.	Hastings	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peters
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pingree
Bustos	Hinojosa	Pocan
Butterfield	Honda	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Huffman	Quigley
Cárdenas	Israel	Rangel
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Courtney	Lee	Sinema
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cuellar	Lewis	Slaughter
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Takai
DeFazio	Lofgren	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	(NM)	Tsongas
Dingell	Lynch	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney,	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Veasey
F.	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Duckworth		Velázquez
Edwards		Visclosky
		Walz
		Wasserman
		Schultz
		Waters, Maxine
		Watson Coleman
		Welch
		Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bass	Huizenga (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Ellison	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)
Hanna	Ruiz	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1353

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. KATKO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the week, I was absent for legislative business; had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: rollcall 145—H.R. 1259—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 146—H.R. 1265—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 147—H.R. 1480—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 148—H. Res. 189—On Ordering the Previous Question—"yes," rollcall 149—H. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"yes."

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall Vote No. 148—Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule—"no," rollcall Vote No. 149—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, as amended, is considered as adopted.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves that the House take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, with the House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

I will remind my colleagues that, the week before we left for our Easter break, the House passed a budget in this Chamber and that the Senate passed a budget as well, and this motion does something very simple. It simply says that we will work to com-

bine the best features of those two resolutions: to restrain the size and the scope of government, to reduce spending, and to balance the budget without raising taxes.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the resolution S. Con. Res. 11 be instructed—

(1) to recede from its disagreement with the Senate with respect to section 363 of S. Con. Res. 11 (relating to the requirement for earned paid sick time to address the health needs of workers and their families); and

(2) to recede from subsection (c)(3) of section 808 of the House Amendment (relating to changing the current Medicare program, and replacing it with premium support payments).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The House has passed a budget. It is a budget that is wrong for America. It does not reflect our country's priorities, and it does not reflect our values. What it says to the American people is work harder and take home less. That is the House budget. We also have the Senate budget. The Senate budget is also wrong for America. The Senate budget also says to the American people work harder and take home less. That is the message.

When you have got a House budget that is wrong for America and a Senate budget that is wrong for America, both which say to the country "work harder and take home less," the midpoint between the two—or any point between the two—is also wrong for America and also says to the American people work harder and take home less.

Now, why do I say that both the House and the Senate budgets say "work harder and take home less"?

It is because, amazingly, they both actually increase the tax burden on working families. How? They actually phase out the increase in the child tax credit, which helps working families. They phase out the increase, or get rid of the increase, in the earned income

tax credit. They entirely get rid of the higher education deduction. These are deductions that families use to help make college more affordable. They get rid of the Affordable Care Act tax credits, which help millions of Americans afford health insurance. They are squeezing hard-working, middle class families.

At the same time, the House budget calls for a big tax cut for folks at the very high end of the income scale—for millionaires. If you look at the Romney-Ryan tax plan, which this budget green-lights—sort of paves the way for—it would call for a one-third cut in the top tax rate. That is a huge wind-fall for the wealthiest in the country in the same budget that is increasing the tax burden on working families.

What else do the Republican budgets do?

They disinvest in America. They slash way below the lowest historical levels in recorded history the amount that we invest in the categories of the budget that help our kids' educations—early education, K-12, special education. They devastate that part of the budget that is used to invest in innovation and in scientific research, things that have helped power our economy.

□ 1400

Their budget assumes that the transportation trust fund will run dry in a few months. That is not accounted for within their budget numbers.

So that is what the Republican budgets do, both the House budget and the Senate budget. There is no way to remedy those problems in conference because any point between those two is bad for America.

The only way to remedy it would be if we were able to instruct the conferees to adopt the House Democratic budget proposal that we put forward a few weeks ago which actually provides additional tax relief to working families. It significantly increases the child and dependent care tax credit, so if you are a working family and want to make sure your child is in quality health care, you are going to get a little bit more tax relief; or if you have an elderly loved one at home that you want to make sure has quality care, you get a little more tax relief. If you are a two-worker family, we scale back the marriage penalty. So the Democratic budget actually provides more tax relief for working Americans while the Republican budget provides tax increases to working families.

The Democratic budget also invests in our future—in our kids' education, in scientific research, in transportation—by closing a lot of the tax breaks in the Code that actually encourage American companies to move jobs and capital overseas. We get rid of those loopholes and say let's invest the money here in America. That is what the Democratic budget does. The rules don't permit us to instruct the conferees to do the right thing and adopt that alternative which does reflect the