State. When we ask them if they would like to step across the river, they are disbelieving until we take them up there to Itasca. Literally, it is no wider than this desk.

I wish that trying to figure out one's student loans and grants and workstudies were as easy as getting across the Mississippi River.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 5, strike ''and the'' and insert ''the most recent national average cohort default rate, and the''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to support the legislation that we are considering today, and I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together to work on this important bill.

As we have been hearing, it is critical that we provide our Nation's students with the information they need to make informed decisions about what colleges they should attend and how they should pay for them.

I think the authors of this bill did a great service by including a provision to provide students with information about the student loan default rate for the schools they plan to attend. However, I believe that this legislation does not provide the students with the national student loan default rate across all schools, making it harder for them to have an accurate understanding of where their prospective schools stand nationally.

I have introduced a simple amendment to provide student loan borrowers with the latest national average default rate for all schools. If this amendment passes, all students, as they are applying for their student loans, will know what the default rate for student loans is at the schools they are choosing to attend versus the national default rate for student loans. I believe that this will allow students to better determine whether an institution has a record of delivering a quality education that is right for them. By providing students with more tools in their pursuits of education, students will be able to make more informed choices and save taxpayers the cost of more Federal student loans going into default.

Students in my district and around the country know the burden of student loan debt all too well. Giving our students all of the information will give them a better chance of being able to repay their loans and build successful futures.

Mr. Chairman and my colleague, Ms. BONAMICI, I applaud you on your work on this strong and important piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, after line 16, insert the following new subparagraph, and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly:

(E) in clause (ix), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''decreased credit score,'' after ''credit reports,''; and

(ii) by inserting ''reduced ability to rent or purchase a home or car, potential difficulty in securing employment,'' after ''Federal law,'';

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that builds upon the existing language in this bill to strengthen protections for American students. My amendment ensures students have the information that they need to make important financial decisions that could impact their lives long after graduation.

As you may be aware, combined student loan debt in our Nation has topped $1 trillion, and the unfortunate reality is that many of those students do not know the enormous harm that defaulting on that debt can cause to them. Nearly 15 percent of the student loan borrowers default within 3 years of graduation, and this can have serious consequences on their ability to rent an apartment, to purchase a car or a house, or to even obtain future employment.

Madam Chair, I applaud the spirit of this bipartisan legislation to provide enhanced financial counseling services to our Nation's students, and I look forward to voting in favor of it. My amendment will make a very simple adjustment to ensure the full effectiveness, however, of the bill.

My amendment will simply require that all student borrowers receive an explanation of the impact of a delinquency or of a default on loans to their credit scores, including the borrower's future ability to find employment or to purchase a home or a car. It is important for students to have this information when they first receive the loans. For many recent graduates, the idea of a credit report or a credit score may seem very abstract. My amendment ensures that the impact of delinquencies or defaults are explained in very concrete terms.

Recent graduates are the top in their fields but, all too often, fall behind when it comes to financial literacy, which can have a lasting impact on their lives, and it can also take a toll on our economy. For more than 20 years, I worked as a financial adviser, helping families plan for their futures. It is important that all of our graduates understand how the decisions they make today will affect them and their families down the road when they are finding a job, buying a car, or renting or trying to own a home. We need to promote financial literacy when it can do the most good—before a borrower gets in trouble.

As we continue working to make college more affordable for our students, I believe this legislation and my amendment to it are both commonsense steps in the right direction that we can act on immediately. I look forward to a strong bipartisan vote on this bill, and I hope the Senate takes up this important legislation in a timely manner. I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3393, STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4935, CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 680

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-54 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 3393 the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 3393;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 3393 to reflect the addition of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 3393, H.R. 4935 shall be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1345

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. COLE. Madam 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of two measures, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of these two measures, as is customary with tax legislation. In addition, the resolution provides for 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935. And it provides for a motion to recommit on each bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the rule combines both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935 before sending it to the other body.

Madam Speaker, with tuition prices continuing to climb, more Americans are struggling to plan for and afford higher education. Today's broken Tax Code makes it even harder to pay for college, with 15 complicated, overlapping education provisions that take the IRS 90 pages to explain.

We need to simplify education tax benefits so families can actually use them, and we need to get our economy back on track so students and families are earning enough to afford a good education.

H.R. 3393 takes a good first step. It consolidates four current tax benefits for higher education, the American opportunity tax credit, the Hope Scholarship credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the college tuition deduction into a new, simplified and, most importantly, permanent tax credit.

In addition, H.R. 3393 also includes strong antifraud provisions requiring taxpayers to include on their tax return the name and taxpayer identification number of the student and the employer identification number of the applicable higher education institution.

In addition, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4935, which modernizes and improves the child tax credit. Originally created in 1997 to help ease the financial burden that families incur when they have children, this credit has failed to keep pace with the cost of raising a child. Initially, it provided a maximum credit of $400 per child. However, under the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, this credit was expanded to $1,000 per child, was made partially refundable, and was indexed for inflation.

Unfortunately, some of these good changes expired in 2010. I would note for my colleagues that even with these increases, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by approximately 4.4 percent a year.

H.R. 4935 would index the child tax credit for inflation, eliminate the marriage penalty, and would require an individual to include their Social Security number on their tax return to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit.

Current estimates suggest that at least $13 billion in improper refundable tax credit payments are made each year. This provision would help to combat that growing problem.

Madam Speaker, the cost of raising children increases every year, but the current child tax credit fails to take these increased costs into account. In addition, the current tax credit penalizes married couples.

By making these commonsense changes, we can ensure that the credit truly serves its intended purpose.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation, which continues our targeted approach to updating, improving, and modernizing the Tax Code.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman for recognizing the great State of Colorado, where we hope to have you visit my district and ski in Vail, or perhaps enjoy the comfortable, temperate summer weather in our mountain resort area.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, and H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.

These two so-called extender bills, which are among several that this body has considered, are all unpaid for.

Instead of allowing amendments on these bills, they are brought before us under an entirely closed process that blocks efforts by either Democrats or Republicans to come up with new and better ways to improve the effectiveness of these tax cuts, or to provide offsetting cuts to expenditures or closing other revenue loopholes that would pay for these tax cuts. So, essentially, this is not a real proposal before us today.

I think that the child tax credit and Student and Family Tax Simplification Act are widely popular on both sides of the aisle, but real policy discussion is how we pay for them. That is the real discussion. That is what the House and the Senate will need to negotiate. That is what the President will need to negotiate.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with corresponding cuts so that these can be paid for. But, under this closed rule, we are not even able to have a discussion of that. We are considering yet another set of unpaid-for tax extender bills that will add to our deficit.

Now, at the beginning of this year, Chairman CAMP put forward a true, revenue-neutral comprehensive tax reform bill. That was a real attempt to not add to our ballooning deficit and reduce taxes. To be clear, this is not.

While I oppose this bill, I certainly support the intention of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which is to provide incentives for people across the

country to pursue higher education, and I look forward to the real discussion of how we pay for it. Money doesn't grow on trees.

Students can receive a maximum annual credit of $2,500 for pursuing college, vocational school, or a university to help them pursue their dreams of achieving a postsecondary education, which is more important than ever to have a chance at succeeding in the 21st century workforce.

I am pleased the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act authorized the AOTC to help both undergraduate and graduate students pay for their studies. I am thrilled the Republicans now support extending provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That is a positive development for families across our country.

In my home district of Colorado, I am pleased to have two flagship research universities, Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder, which are leading the way in undergraduate and graduate education and research that benefits our communities and our health.

Students at these universities shouldn't have to spend their time wondering how the Tax Code will affect their ability to pay for books and tuition. They should be learning. They should be engaged in research and innovation to grow our economy, and not have to play the guessing game about what Congress does, which this bill, unpaid for, only furthers.

Now, while this legislation would extend the AOTC to help more traditional students, unfortunately, it would take away educational benefits from the majority of students today.

By replacing the Hope Scholarship Credit and eliminating the Lifetime Learning Credit, we will harm adult learners and those who might have lost their jobs in one sector and are trying to get training to go into another growing sector so that they can improve their life station.

Many students who use the Lifetime Learning Credit, which has no limit on the number of years it can be claimed for each student, are low-income Americans, out-of-work Americans, folks who we want to get back to work so they are not reliant on government programs.

Madam Speaker, why would we remove a tax credit that provides incentives for adults to learn throughout their lives at a time in our economy where it is more important than ever to do so?

We need to recognize the changing demographics and ensure that our tax system aligns with the real needs of 21st century learners.

That is why the major higher education associations, including the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, and the Association of American Universities all oppose this legislation. These colleges and universities want to make higher education more affordable, not just for traditional students but for lifelong learners as well.

I applaud my colleagues for recognizing the challenge of college affordability. I applaud my colleagues for basing a program around expiring provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

I was thrilled that just yesterday the House passed H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, which I coauthored with Representative SALMON, by a vote of 414–0. How wonderful the Democrats and Republicans were able to come together around a practical method to reduce costs and improve the quality of college.

While this legislation would provide much-needed relief for some students, it is far from making college more affordable for everybody. Unfortunately, the legislation called forth under this rule would actually increase our Federal deficit by approximately $96.5 billion over 10 years.

Let's have a real discussion about making college more affordable. Let's have a real discussion about paying for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend. We do agree conceptually on quite a bit in terms of the Tax Code. I think both of us individually, and both sides collectively, honestly want to do things that make it easier for people to pursue a higher education.

Certainly, I think we are all interested in eliminating the marriage penalty as well. So I think we are moving broadly in the same direction, even though we have some disagreement.

I will point out to my friend that it is not unusual that tax legislation would come to the floor in a closed rule. As a matter of fact, that is almost always the way it is done, simply because you have to be able to score the items, and you have to understand what the real cost of tweaking is.

So whether Republicans or Democrats are in control, a closed rule is usually the order of the day on any tax legislation.

I appreciate my friend's concern about the deficit, and in that I am quite sincere.

Now, I do also always like to point out to my friends that when they were in the majority, for 4 years in a row the deficit got greater each year. And since we have been in the majority the last 4 years the deficit has gotten smaller each year.

So I actually think that we not only have a rhetorical concern about the deficit, we have demonstrated over and over again that certainly this current majority is very, very serious about dealing with it and will continue to do that by reining in spending and putting forward thoughtful reform proposals, which I believe we have done.

I would also point out to my friend, and I think he would agree with me on this, this is a vehicle. This is not going to be the final product. My friend is exactly correct when he says there will be a negotiation.

Our concern has been, watching what has been going on on the other side of the rotunda, so to speak, is that there hasn't been very much serious work. We think they are going to look at the extenders package in terms of tax relief and basically just try and jam that through without any thoughtful pruning and without making elements of it which have been approved over and over and over again, and which are clearly popular on a bipartisan basis, permanent.

So that is what we are trying to do. I think we are constructing a platform to go into negotiation with the Senate. And I suspect what emerges will be somewhat different than what either side goes in with. That is pretty normal in the legislative process.

But I think the concepts here that we are moving forward on are correct and, I think, have broad popular appeal and bipartisan support. These are provisions—and we have done this over several bills now—that both parties have approved overwhelmingly, time and time again on a sort of yearly basis. And we want to take those things and make them permanent.

I suspect, in that process, some things that are less popular might be jettisoned. But again, that is for the negotiators to decide. We are simply trying to get to that conference.

We are marking out what our position is. We recognize the Senate will have to do the same thing, and from there we will move and, perhaps, at a later point in this process we can find ourselves actually on the same side.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend from the State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my fellow Rules Committee Member and RSC president now, rapid ascent, to make whatever remarks he cares to.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee has a tough job, but it is interesting to hear folks down here talking about both their agreement on tax reform and deficits and their agreement about what a rule ought to look like.

I have kind of gotten a little bit of both of their passions with me today, Madam Speaker, because Ways and Means bills do have to come to the floor under a closed rule.

The way the rules work, if you have an open rule, anything that is relevant to the underlying bill, you can discuss, so when you bring a tax bill to the floor, suddenly, the entire Tax Code becomes available for amendment, and you can imagine what a brouhaha that would be. I would enjoy that debate. I would thoroughly enjoy that debate, but it would never, ever end.

That is not so with our spending bills. When our spending bills come to the floor, they come under a completely open process, so that we can examine the underlying spending.

Just to take folks through the Rules Committee process a little bit, Madam Speaker, what we did here is we waived the CutGo provision in the rules. There are a lot of focus groups going on around the Chamber right now about how we should change the rules to make the system work better.

Sometimes, in the Rules Committee, we end up waiving some of the rules to make the system work better. Some folks think it makes it work better, some folks think it makes it worse, but we should have that conversation as a body.

We had to waive CutGo in this rule, Madam Speaker, because it increases mandatory spending. I have a bill beside me—and it really drives this point home. In fact, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado who was making this point.

We voted on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill this year. It was a $3 billion spending bill. We had eight amendments on the floor of the House. It passed. We voted on the Financial Services spending bill. It was a $21 billion spending bill. We had 51 amendments on that bill. We passed it out of the House.

We voted on the Energy and Water spending bill, a $34 billion spending bill, with 78 amendments on the floor of the House. We voted on the Commerce-Justice-Science bill, a $51 billion bill, with 84 amendments on the floor of the House. It goes on: Transportation, $52 billion, with 68 amendments; Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, $71 billion, with 24 amendments.

It brings us to one of the underlying bills today, a bill that I think touches the heart of absolutely every man or woman in this Chamber, our constituents back home, trying to help our children access the higher education services that they need, but in this case, it is going to increase mandatory spending by $73 billion—more than any of the appropriations bills we passed this year, except for our Defense Department Appropriations bill—and it is not going to be able to allow a single amendment on the floor of the House.

Now, that is just the process. That is the process that we have when we are dealing with tax bills, but my question for my colleagues is: Does mandatory spending deserve some additional scrutiny, the kind of scrutiny that we give to appropriated spending, to discretionary spending? I will tell you that it does. I am so proud of what this House does on discretionary spending.

My friend from Oklahoma happens to be an appropriator. He is an appropriations cardinal, in fact, which means he has leadership responsibilities over there. This committee comes to the Rules Committee—and my friend from Colorado recognizes this—they come to the Rules Committee, and they ask for an open rule every single time.

They say: We have done the best we can do to give the House our proudest work, but if anybody else has ideas about how to improve it, come to us. We want this to be a collaborative product.

We can't do that with this bill before us today, and it increases mandatory spending by $73.7 billion. I cannot count the number of times I have heard my colleagues in this body say it is not the appropriations spending that is the problem. It is the mandatory spending that is the problem.

We are moving awfully fast in the body this week to appropriate $73.7 billion in new mandatory spending. I know people's hearts and heads are with these young people that we are trying to help get ahead, that we are trying to help access higher education, but there is only one place we are going to find this $73.7 billion, and that is in the pocketbooks of those very same young men and women when we borrow this money today to spend it on them and ask them to pay it back, with interest in the future.

I caution my colleagues today, spending is a constitutional responsibility that we have. It is a constitutional responsibility that we have placed in the Appropriations Committee, where things are scrutinized line by line by line.

Never before this year has so much money gone out the door in so little amount of time, with so little input from the very capable Members on both sides of the aisle.

With that, again, I encourage my colleagues to read this rule. You will support this rule, but examine the underlying legislation carefully.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to take all this in. I certainly agree with his premise that we need to talk about mandatory spending. I think that there is a bipartisan desire to do that, and several years ago, there was a thoughtful Bowles-Simpson proposal that began to take on some of those issues.

I think that it is a discussion that—particularly when nondiscretionary spending is the vast majority of Federal spending, you can only do so much on the discretionary side, so it is very important to do that.

Clearly, all of these tax extenders and tax expenditures and mandatory spending through outlays and Social Security and Medicare, that is what that discussion is about. It is a very important one. This bill is yet another one that kicks the ball down the road, doesn't deal with any of those issues, and doesn't allow for any consideration of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill creates a new tax credit to provide an incentive for U.S. companies to move jobs from overseas back to America and will end the tax deductions for companies that outsource jobs.

Instead of considering two tax bills that hurt American families and bloat the deficit, let's consider one that brings American jobs home.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, so that we can offer an amendment to consider my legislation, H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Yesterday, it passed in the Senate 93–7.

Now, there is something fundamentally wrong if we can't get a boost here, and it passes 93–7 across the board, Democrats and Republicans.

So what are we talking about here? An ''aye'' vote for the previous question is a vote to keep giving corporate America a tax break for every job they ship overseas to China. Let's start there.

Over the last few weeks, I heard a lot about corporate welfare in reference to the Export-Import Bank, before we debate it next week. It costs the government not one dime to help out the businesses. In fact, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has 255,000 jobs in jeopardy in Oklahoma.

The Bring Jobs Home Act ends taxpayer writeoffs that pay moving costs when companies ship jobs abroad. We, as a body, have supported in the past giving money to businesses and corporations that send jobs overseas. That does not make sense.

What we want to do is to help those companies to come back because these are good-paying jobs. That is how manufacturing jobs primarily left this country.

Over the last 10 years, 2.4 million American jobs have been shipped overseas, and U.S. taxpayers have helped foot the bill. That, to me, is insanity. It is like paying someone for the rope they are going to hang you with.

Economists estimate that across the country, over 21 million jobs are at risk of being outsourced, 500,000 of them in my own home State of New Jersey.

At a time when we are trying to create good-paying manufacturing jobs in the United States, it quite simply makes no sense for the U.S. taxpayers to help foot the bill for companies that want to outsource jobs instead. My bill ends this taxpayer subsidy once and for all.

Instead, the Bring Jobs Home Act would provide a new 20 percent tax credit for companies that bring jobs back to the United States of America. This will provide a substantial incentive for more and more companies to create jobs and invest right here in our own country.

We are already seeing a trend towards insourcing. Manufacturing employment is up by 600,000 jobs since the

end of the Great Recession, and for the first time, in 2013, companies were reshoring jobs at the same rate that they offshored them. We have still got a big hole to dig ourselves out of from 2003, with up to 150,000 jobs being offshored each month. We are still out of balance by about 1 million jobs.

Companies like Master Lock, Caterpillar, Ford, GE, and Walmart even—which is not one of my favorites—are starting to see the value in bringing manufacturing back to this country. We have got the R&D, the infrastructure, the educated workforce, and we have got the consumers, and, again, we have the most productive workers in the world.

It is not just the big guys. More than 80 percent of companies bringing work back have $200 million or less in sales, so let's give these companies a little extra incentive to make it in America by providing them with this tax credit to help our manufacturing economy continue its rebound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. A robust manufacturing-based economy will lead to widespread prosperity for businesses and the people who work there. Manufacturing jobs pay 23 percent more than workers in other parts of the economy, and every $1 in manufacturing sales creates $1.40 worth of economic impact.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the shortsighted policies that stifle investment here in America and focus on what we can do to incentivize investment and job creation. I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have opened quite a range of things to talk about with Mr. WOODALL's remarks and Mr. POLIS' response and my good friend from New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL's proposal. Let me sort of take some of them up in order.

My friend from Colorado, who I know is sincere, talked a little bit about the need to reform entitlements, and I couldn't agree with him more, and that is a discussion I think we really, seriously need to engage in as a body.

I would invite my friend, if he has an opportunity, to look at a bipartisan bill that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY)—from his side of the aisle—and I have on Social Security reform.

It doesn't really deal with a lot of the reform, but it is a process bill. It would send us down the road to have a bipartisan proposal which, I can assure you, would have things that your side doesn't like and things that my side doesn't like, and then we would have to vote on it up or down.

I think it is a thoughtful way to try to begin to deal with some of these, and it is genuinely bipartisan, so I would hope my friend from Colorado would look at that.

My friend from New Jersey mentioned the Ex-Im Bank. I couldn't agree with him more. I support it. I have consistently supported it, and I know there is a disagreement on our side of the aisle, I think, largely about that.

I hope that it is resolved in regular order—that is, that the committee votes on it and it comes down to the floor. When that happens, I look forward to working with my friend to enact that legislation.

I am intrigued by what my friend from New Jersey had to say about his tax proposal because I think, at the minimum, he has certainly put his finger on an important problem which is a real loophole that we ought to consider.

Now, I don't consider myself an expert on tax legislation. I am like my friend in the chair. I am an appropriator. That is the world I know. So I would hope that my friend's proposal would get appropriate consideration in our Ways and Means body and move through regular order because I think this is an area that we can cooperate on.

Frankly, we have got some bipartisan proposals in terms of stranded profits overseas that I think both sides could work together on, perhaps, and bring some investment back to our shores, but we do have to defend the process whereby we move legislation—that is it needs to come through the appropriate committee, we duly consider it, and it reaches here.

Again, while I may oppose the process by which my friend is moving, I am not at all prepared to say I oppose his product. I just simply haven't had a chance to look at it, but I think he is addressing an important issue.

The last area I do have to disagree with my friend on a little bit: I do like Walmart. I am a shopper at Walmart, and I am a stockholder at Walmart, and I think they are a great American company, but we live in a great country. My friend can shop where he chooses to, and I can shop where I choose to, and we will get down the road.

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

□ 1415

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I don't have a Walmart near where I live, so I don't have that same choice.

I would add that I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I think the frustration around the process is we are open to any process of bringing forward the ideas that Mr. PASCRELL talked about to the floor, and we are presenting them in this context. There is a growing frustration on a number of issues, whether it is fixing our broken immigration system, whether it is extending unemployment, or whether it is how we are paying for these tax cuts. We want to avail ourselves of every procedural opportunity for this House to consider the items that matter to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for American jobs and good government. I rise to support the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Our current corporate tax law is broken. Today, companies that move American jobs overseas are able to take tax deductions for relocating jobs outside the United States. Let me say that again. Companies located here in the United States are able to take tax deductions for moving American jobs overseas.

Don't we have that backwards? Shouldn't we give tax deductions to those moving jobs back home, back to America? The Bring Jobs Home Act will provide for not only an end to company rewards for shipping jobs overseas, it will also provide companies an incentive to restore jobs in America.

Right in my home State of Illinois, over 690,000 jobs are at risk of being sent overseas. At a time when we are desperately trying to grow the job market in our country, we simply cannot, in good conscience, let the American taxpayer foot the moving bill for megacorporations.

When I was a young man, I worked the assembly line at Caterpillar, just like my father did. We put in a hard day's work for an honest day's pay. Caterpillar understood the importance of keeping jobs here in America. In the last few years, Caterpillar has been bringing jobs back to the U.S., back to my home State of Illinois, just like GE and Ford have. Let's give them the incentive they deserve for doing the right thing.

Join me in supporting this bill so we can bring jobs home.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I care to consume.

Again, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, I frankly have no objection to my friends' using the process to bring these ideas up for debate and discussion. I actually think that is helpful and that moves the process forward, and I applaud them for that. I don't disagree necessarily with what they are talking about in terms of tax deductions for jobs that are exported as opposed to jobs that could be imported. I think that is something we ought to consider.

But, it is not the subject of the legislation that is in front of us today. Those subjects are, one, what can we do to modernize the Tax Code and give students permanent certainty in terms of tax deductions that are available to educate themselves and give their families the ability to deal a little bit with the mounting cost of college. That is a good idea. Both sides can broadly agree at least in principle. And what can we do to make sure the marriage penalty disappears and that we can target appropriate tax relief to families with

children at least up to a certain level of income, I believe $150,000, to give them a little break with the cost of raising children.

Those, to me, are modest steps, but they are important programs because they affect the daily lives of American workers. I am not suggesting that what my friends are proposing doesn't do the same thing. I just think this vehicle, we probably ought to work within the bounds of what Ways and Means has sent us.

I will say, I sense some of my friend's frustration in terms of moving legislation. We have got 321 bills sitting in the United States Senate that haven't been acted upon that this House has sent over there, so I know a lot about feeling shut out. I think if our friends on our side of the aisle in the upper Chamber were here, they would tell you that they have had fewer amendments this year than Democrats in this Chamber have gotten on any appropriations bill that we have brought forward. We don't have a broken Congress. We have a broken United States Senate, in my view.

But, having said that, we have got a chance, I think, here to take a step in the right direction, to thoughtfully consider things that have worked their way through the Ways and Means Committee, to position this Chamber to sit down at a later point and negotiate with our friends—Republican and Democrat alike—in the other Chamber and perhaps produce, toward the end of this year, some good and permanent changes in the Tax Code that, if an agreement is reached, I suspect we could have overwhelming bipartisan support for.

So, we are just at that point in the process where we need to develop and put forward our proposals. We would hope that our counterparts in the United States Senate do the same thing, and that we can sit down and again find common ground in between. We have done that on some occasions before. If we will just operate the way our procedures are set up, I am confident we can do that again.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. COLE. I am certainly prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill here before us today are yet another symbolic bill, and when this House only has another week in session before September, we are passing a bill that doesn't move here or there on the actual renewal of these tax credits, doesn't deal with the deficit or entitlement spending, and doesn't deal with immigration reform. It is a bill to presumably show the public that Republicans care about this particular tax credit as do, of course, Democrats.

But there is no real effort to figure out how we are going to pay for it. We would all love to cut every tax. Why not cut every tax down to zero and not tax anybody? But where is the money coming from?

It is the same with this. It is a feel-good, meaningless gesture that I, frankly, think the American people see through, which is why this body's approval rating hovers around 12 percent.

The bill makes in order the child tax credit improvement and costs $115 billion over 10 years. Un-offset costs of this cost each taxpayer $2,600.

Aside from the significant cost this imposes on the American people, there are also some substantive concerns that we talked about. While the bill would give some families a permanent tax break, it would actually harm our most vulnerable women and children. Specifically, the bill fails to extend a critical provision of CTC, which has helped low-income, working families lift themselves out of poverty.

The bill also indexes the current maximum credit of $1,000 per child to inflation, which only benefits those with incomes high enough to receive the maximum benefit. Further, the bill extends the child tax credit up the income scale on a permanent basis, allowing only families who make over six figures to benefit.

Ironically, on the same day that Representative PAUL RYAN is unveiling his antipoverty plan, this particular proposal before us—which we are not allowed to offer our suggestions to amend under this closed rule—would actually push 12 million more people, including 6 million children, into poverty.

Unfortunately, there has been a provision added to this bill at the Rules Committee that would bar children who are American citizens but have immigrant parents from receiving the tax credit. This bill includes a provision that only allows the tax credit to be claimed if the taxpayer has a Social Security number, even if they are claiming the credit for children who have a Social Security number and are full American citizens.

This impact is huge. It would deny 5.5 million poor American children from being able to receive this tax credit, deny millions of U.S. citizens much-needed assistance for being able to afford their rent, clothing, and food just because of who their parents are. That is not right and that is not just.

It is no wonder that groups that care about this from across the ideological spectrum, including the National Women's Law Center, First Focus Campaign for Children, Half in Ten, Children's Defense Fund, National Immigration Law Center, and the National Council of La Raza, have all come out in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it would be disgraceful if one of the only votes we took on immigration this year was to roll back benefits for U.S. citizens who happen to have parents who violated our law. With 1 week left before the August recess, Republicans, unfortunately, have little time to introduce and pass a bill that actually deals with immigration and addresses the crisis at our border.

President Obama sent a request to Congress to address the increased flow of families and unaccompanied minors from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala across our border. As you know, these families that I had the opportunity to visit with this last weekend in McAllen, Texas, in San Antonio, at Lackland Air Force Base, are fleeing horrific situations, often including gangs, rape, murder, trafficking, and extreme poverty, and are seeking refuge in this great country just as my own great-grandparents did, as well as that of many of my colleagues.

This problem with the crisis at the southern border is only one of so many symptoms about our dysfunctional immigration system, which is why Congress needs to bring forward the bipartisan H.R. 15 bill for a vote and allow that to proceed to the Senate and President Obama's desk to resolve this crisis.

It is unconscionable to think that the only immigration-related legislation that the House actually may pass in the 113th Congress could be one aimed at cutting off benefits to American children or deporting children. We continue to fail to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress. This body has already had the opportunity to act on legislation that passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds and that the President would sign.

H.R. 15, our House bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I am a proud sponsor of, would create American jobs, ensure we are more competitive in a global economy, lower the deficit, reflect our values as Americans, unite families, secure our border, and restore some sense of normalcy and law to the chaos that now surrounds our immigration system.

The American people overwhelmingly support immigration reform, but, unfortunately, House Republicans continue to not allow a vote on reform and have failed to bring forward a bill to address the dire humanitarian crisis at our border. And here in this bill, we have another bill to cut off benefits to American kids just because of who their parents are.

I cannot support this closed rule and these underlying bills. They will add to our deficit. They fail to address some of the most critical issues of our time, and they have significant policy flaws that make these particular programs worse for some of our American families that need the credits the most.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Let me address a number of remarks my friend made in passing. Let me begin by reminding anybody who happens to be listening or following the debate this isn't an immigration bill. This is actually a tax bill, and it is really about trying to make some things that have had bipartisan support permanent.

We all agree that we need to, insofar as we can, help people that are educating themselves or members of their family and provide appropriate tax relief. That is what this bill does. It is simply that simple.

Number two, we all think that you shouldn't have a tax penalty for being married, and if we can do things to help you with the cost of raising a family, we ought to try and do those things because it has been tough. That is what this bill does.

Now, we can disagree about the merits, but I think the general thrust is something we probably broadly agree on. Making those items permanent within the Tax Code is important so people can actually get used to using the benefits, understand them—sort of internalize them—and make them permanent and predictable for families. So that is our goal with this legislation.

Finally, we would like to get, eventually, to a conference with our friends in the Senate who I suspect would share some of my friend from Colorado's concerns that might be in their legislation. He knows how the process works. We will sit down at that point and see if we can find common ground. If the two negotiating teams can, then I suspect we will come back with something that a great number of us on both sides of the aisle can support.

What my friend, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of Ways and Means, is trying to do is actually make permanent some very good bipartisan ideas that I think we can rally around.

Now, my friend also mentioned the deficit, and I want to, again, laud his concern for that. I appreciate that. I genuinely do. I recognize this is a work in progress, not a final product, but I will point out again for the record, when my friends were in the majority, the deficit got worse every single year. It has gotten lower every single year since then. So I think we are serious about dealing with the deficit.

I would invite my friend, and I know he would seriously engage in this, let's find some areas on the part of the budget that I think need addressing—the entitlement area—where perhaps we can find some common ground.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. There is no doubt that it takes both parties working together to dig the country into this much debt.

Mr. COLE. I do want to disagree with my friend on a couple of points.

Number one, this isn't a symbolic piece of legislation. It is legislation in progress, but it is not feel-good. I know Mr. CAMP and his committee are anxious to actually change many aspects of the Tax Code.

□ 1430

I know Mr. CAMP wants to make at least some of these things permanent. We may succeed or we may not, but it is certainly not meant to be anything other than serious.

Also, my friend mentioned and talked at considerable length about the issue of immigration and the border crisis, two issues that I regard as somewhat distinct. We do have a border crisis, and I suspect we will see legislation to deal with that. There is a difference in philosophy. I think the administration just wants resources to manage it. I think we would like to change some of the root causes and address it, and hopefully stop the massive flow and all of the human tragedy that goes with it.

There is a huge debate about what do we do with unaccompanied juveniles or minors who arrive, and that is an important debate to have. But we ought to stop and think: Is there something that we are doing that is encouraging that flow? Because, believe me, everything that is coming out of this is bad. It disrupts the societies from which these people are coming. We are treating children from Mexico different than we are treating them from Guatemala. We have people now pouring money into criminal cartels and strengthening them. And finally, the children themselves, the juveniles themselves, are confronted with a thousand-mile long journey where they are breaking not just the laws here but also in Mexico. They are at great risk. They are traveling with criminals. There is a lot of abuse. Some of them are undoubtedly forced into sex trafficking and perhaps others to the drug trade. There are plenty of opportunities for abuse. Nobody should want that to happen.

We are going to try to offer some serious proposals. I am very pleased with my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, KAY GRANGER from Texas, who has put together a working group and some very thoughtful proposals. We have tried to scrub them on the Appropriations Committee. Hopefully we will be able to address that issue.

Finally, let me just end with this. In closing, I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, to continue this deliberative approach towards fundamental tax reform. The child tax credit has existed since 1997, and the reforms contemplated in this legislation are important. In addition, the consolidation of four separate education credits into one simplified credit will result in much less taxpayer confusion.

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

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 680 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. 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 Ways and Means. 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. 851.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend

the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
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
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)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
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
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
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

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Carney
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Nunnelee
Rogers (MI)

□ 1501

Messrs. MCNERNEY, GARCIA, and Ms. KUSTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WOODALL and COFFMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on July 24, 2014, I missed rollcall vote No. 442 on Ordering the Previous Question. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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.

Mr. POLIS. 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 226, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
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
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)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford

Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Barber
Barrow (GA)
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
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
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

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Edwards
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kingston
Lewis
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1508

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4984.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1510

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–546 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 14, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—404

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer