

□ 1215

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4438, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014, sponsored by Representative KEVIN BRADY. This bill will provide American businesses with the certainty they need to invest in good-paying middle class jobs and develop the technologies of the future.

The House is also scheduled to consider a privileged resolution finding Lois G. Lerner, former Director, Exempt Organizations Division, Internal Revenue Service, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, authored by Chairman JOHN KLINE. Mr. Speaker, America does not work if our children are trapped in failing schools. This bipartisan bill provides an opportunity for our children to attend schools which foster a quality learning environment focused on those students succeeding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information with reference to the legislation for next week. He leads with a bill that is entitled American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014.

As the gentleman knows, we have an agenda which I have talked to him about briefly. We call it Make It In America, which is essentially about growing manufacturing and encouraging manufacturers to return to the United States and encouraging people when they want to go into manufacturing to do so here in America.

Not only will that provide for a "Made in America" label all over the world, but it will also provide the kind of middle class jobs and opportunities that we need.

Part of that agenda, I will tell my friend, is to make permanent the research and development tax credit. This bill does that. This bill also costs somewhere in the neighborhood of \$150 billion, maybe a little less, over 10 years. It is unpaid for.

The series of bills that were passed by the Ways and Means Committee will cost \$310 billion. They are also unpaid for. I suggest to my friend—and as he knows, I preach relatively regularly that one of the things that we need to do for the business community and for America is to get ourselves on a fiscally sustainable path.

Mr. CAMP offered a comprehensive piece of legislation, Mr. Leader, as you know, which I think was an honest effort, but it also made hard choices. It made hard choices not to increase the deficit and, therefore, provided offsets for tax cuts. I think that is absolutely essential for us to do.

This bill that we will consider next week, which is a proposition I think most of us support, and that is giving businesses the insurance that the research and development tax credit will in fact be available not only for 1 year, but for a series of years—in this case, I believe 10 years.

What the business community doesn't need and what America doesn't need is making the deficit worse. As a matter of fact, Mr. Leader, your party talks a lot about bringing the deficit down. This goes in exactly the opposite direction, and I think that is lamentable. I said \$150 billion. It is actually \$155 billion over 10 years.

I would hope that the party that is demanding that unemployment insurance be paid for, that is demanding that the sustainable growth rate be paid for, and that any change in the sequester be paid for, ought to have consistency and not add \$155 billion to our deficit in a vote next week on something that I think we are all for; and it is easy, Mr. Leader, as you well know, to vote for tax cuts—easy. It takes no courage whatsoever.

I have been at this business 45 years. It has been my experience that, over those 45 years, it is easy for Members to vote for tax cuts. What is hard to do is to pay for the policies you adopt. This bill does not do that. This bill makes the deficit worse, exacerbates the lack of confidence that Americans have in the fiscal responsibility of their country, and puts us in a worse place.

So I would hope, Mr. Leader, that before this bill comes to the floor, that you and the Rules Committee and Mr. CAMP, as he did in the bill that he offered to this House, which was, frankly, dismissed out of hand because it made tough decisions, this bill makes no tough decisions. It has a tax cut. It has all the candy and none of the spinach.

It is all good, and nobody has to pay the price. Nobody has to take responsibility. I think that is lamentable, and I would hope that, before this bill

comes to the floor, there would be a way to pay for this bill.

I want to suggest to you that there is a way to pay for it. There is a way to pay for the other extenders that the committee wants, and that is by passing a comprehensive immigration bill.

Mr. BOEHNER indicated that that was not being done because it was tough and people didn't want to do tough things. I understand that. It is hard to do tough things. That is why they are called tough. Mr. BOEHNER now says he was kidding when he said that.

My view is he was deadly serious, and the reason we are considering this bill next week is because it is easy to do. The reason we are not considering comprehensive immigration reform is because it is difficult, but comprehensive immigration reform would pay for all of the tax cuts that are being proposed in these six extenders and, indeed, in all of the extenders that are proposed by the Senate Finance Committee.

They only proposed that for 2 years, not 10 years, but it would pay for all of them. In fact, CBO says if we pass comprehensive immigration reform, it would mean \$200 billion for the next 10 years and \$900 billion over the next 20 years.

In December, the Budget Committee chairs, Mr. RYAN and Mrs. MURRAY, were able to come up with a substantial sequester replacement. We ought to be able to do that as well.

Let me close this part of my comment with two quotes, one from Republican Secretary of the Treasury Hank Paulson, who said:

As a general rule, I don't believe that tax cuts pay for themselves.

And then Mr. Alan Greenspan, who initially said in 2001 and 2003 that he thought the tax cuts would pay for themselves. However, upon review of those tax cuts, he came back in response to a question on "Meet the Press" from David Gregory, and the question was:

You don't agree with the Republican leaders who say tax cuts pay for themselves?

Mr. Greenspan:

They do not.

So all of your Republican colleagues are being asked to vote for a \$155 billion increase in the deficit, which they all say they want to bring down. I am sure they will get up and rationalize—as they did in 1981, in 2001, and 2003—that those tax cuts would magically grow the economy, so that they would not exacerbate the deficit. In the 33 years I have been in Congress, that has not been our experience.

So, Mr. Leader, I very sincerely hope that we can join together in a bipartisan way and support this legislation because it is the right thing to do in terms of growing manufacturing, and it is the right thing to do in bringing down our deficit to pay for it.

I yield to my friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that for 30-plus years, the R&D tax credit has been on temporary extension. This is nothing but reflecting reality, saying that this is a very important part of incentives, so that we can fulfill the mission that the gentleman is on, that we share as well, which is more manufacturing here in America.

If making it in America is important, the R&D tax credit is fundamental to that mission. This has been in place for over 30 years on temporary extension, and to hold it hostage as the gentleman suggests, Mr. Speaker, is not the way to go about facilitating growth in our economy.

I respect the gentleman's commitment to fiscal discipline. Obviously, we have different opinions about how to get to that goal, but both of us, I think, would agree, Mr. Speaker, that growth is something that has been too little, too tepid, and we need to return to an era in which we can see some robust growth in our economy.

It will help those who are chronically unemployed. It will help businesses grow. It will help communities grow and families get by easier, so they can see a better future. This R&D tax credit is something that, as the gentleman says, he supports, and to support that means support it as it has existed, but let's once and for all send the signal of certainty that this will be the policy for manufacturing and others in this country, so we can continue to innovate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would say that the rationale he uses, however, is applicable to the sustainable growth rate reimbursement for doctors serving Medicare patients. We do that every year as well. The Republican side of the aisle demands that be paid for.

We do unemployment insurance.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield on that.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the difference in the SGR to this is we have consistently offset the expenditures under SGR. This R&D tax credit is a tax credit. It is allowing businesses who invest to keep more of that investment, to plow it back into research.

The precedent is not there, as it is on SGR and the other items that perhaps the gentleman would point to. This is important to growth. This is important to manufacturing. We should all join together and support the current extension of what has been in place for over 30 years, on extension over a dozen times.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation, Mr. Speaker. The other side of the aisle laments the deficit; they lament the debt. We have the debt, we have the deficit because we don't pay for what we buy. That is why we have a debt. That is why we have a deficit.

When we were in charge, we put in a pay-as-you-go rule. That rule said, if you are going to spend money, this is essentially a tax expenditure; it is a worthy tax expenditure. It is something that I support. It helps to grow the economy, but it is a tax expenditure.

No one on this floor can say that it does not make the deficit worse; no one with any degree of credibility.

□ 1230

The argument has been made, of course, though, that tax cuts, they will grow so much that you won't get the deficit. That is what President Reagan argued and his proponents argued in 1981. The debt increased 187 percent under President Ronald Reagan because they didn't pay for themselves.

When the Republicans took over, Mr. Speaker, they amended the rule so we didn't have to pay for things. This bill comes to the floor without any necessity to pay for it. So we will give a tax cut, assuming it passes, and somebody is going to pay for it. My children, my grandchildren, your children, Mr. Speaker, they are the ones who will pay for it because we are going to make a decision, apparently, not to pay for something that we know is going to increase the deficit.

So the analogy when we want things paid for is not always followed, Mr. Speaker, for instance, unemployment insurance almost invariably not paid for. Almost every economist says investing in unemployment insurance grows the economy, will help grow the GDP, but we don't follow that practice here, unfortunately.

We have a bipartisan paid-for unemployment insurance bill that the Senate has passed that we can't even get to the floor. That is paid for. It grows the economy and it helps 2.5 million people who are falling through the cracks. Yet we bring a bill to the floor that has a \$155 billion cost, we don't pay for it, and the unemployment insured, 2.5 million, are ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we don't think that policy is one that we ought to pursue. We would hope, again, before this bill comes to the floor that it is paid for.

I referred to comprehensive immigration reform, Mr. Speaker.

I will yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment on a previous comment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to just point out that the last time the gentleman's party was in the majority in this House during a lame-duck session we did extend the R&D tax credit unpaid for. I hear what the gentleman is saying, but I would point that out for historic accuracy.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I guess there may be a little bit of different view on how deficits are created. The disproportionate cause for our deficit is the fact that we have demographics in this country, 10,000 people every day

turning 65 becoming eligible for our health care entitlement programs, and those programs are almost 50 percent—the Medicare program is almost 50 percent underfunded. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

I think all of us have said you can't tax your way out of it; you can't grow your way out of it; you have to change the structure of the program. That is something that the gentleman's party nor the President will agree with us on. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

An additional cause of the deficit is we don't have enough growth; we don't have revenues coming into the Federal Government. For some reason, there has been an acceptance around here of a new norm, a very low and tepid growth. The R&D tax credit is something that is growth oriented; it is certainty. The gentleman said so himself. The gentleman said that manufacturing in America needs certainty in the R&D tax credit.

We have essentially been allowing an R&D tax credit since 1981 in this country. So let's just call it what it is and make it permanent so that we can get back on the path to growth. Addressing growth, addressing our unfunded liabilities connected with entitlement programs, that is the sure way to reduce deficits and reduce the debt burden.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman point that out. I have been trying to work with the gentleman and his party for some period of time now starting with Bowles-Simpson and some other comprehensive suggestions.

As I said, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has offered a comprehensive bill. I don't agree with some of the things in it, but it is an honest piece of legislation that makes the tradeoffs, the tough choices, that need to be made. This bill does not. That is my point.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, because I know the majority leader has another engagement, comprehensive immigration reform, I said that it scores approximately \$1 trillion positive for our economy over the next 20 years; but it is also morally the right thing to do to fix a broken system, a system that doesn't work, with which everybody agrees.

I would again appeal to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor. I understand that there are many on his side of the aisle that don't agree with it. Fine. Vote against it, but give this House an opportunity. Give the American people the opportunity to have a comprehensive immigration bill voted in the people's House on this floor so that we can fix a broken system, or offer alternatives to that which is proposed by the United States Senate and passed overwhelmingly by the United States Senate.

If the gentleman wants me to yield to him, I will, certainly.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just respond, we have had this discussion before. The majority is in opposition to the Senate bill. The Speaker has said as much, and I have said as much.

I have also said, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, to the President, and others that we have got a lack of trust between this House and the White House. I have said to the President that what could help is we start rebuilding that trust, which starts with an admission that it can't be my way or the highway, and it must instead be building trust, understanding where we can agree together.

Yes, we all agree the system is broken. We have a system that is broken on the legal side, and we have illegal immigration. There are things that this House has done before, like a green card stapled to a diploma. The President says, no, we can't do something like that; we can't do something like that without taking care of everything. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is where the problem lies.

There is not enough trust on the part of the Members of this body to think that the White House and the administration is going to implement whatever it is that we pass. So instead, why shouldn't we focus on where we agree and start from there? That has been the position that I have expressed to the gentleman as well as to the administration.

So again, I just take issue with his insistence that somehow we can just do that and it will all be fixed. That is the fundamental problem here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental problem is not my way or the highway. It is no way.

The Republican Judiciary Committee has passed out a number of immigration reform bills. The Homeland Security Committee headed by a Republican chairman has passed out an immigration reform bill dealing with border security. None of those bills have been brought to the floor. It is not a question about liking the Senate bill or trusting the President of the United States.

Everybody agrees, Mr. Speaker, the immigration system is broken; but there is no way, no bill, no option that has been brought to this floor to fix that system to respond to what everybody agrees is a broken system of immigration.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Taoiseach, otherwise known as the Prime Minister of Ireland, celebrated St. Patrick's Day here with us at a luncheon, and part of his speech was about passing comprehensive immigration reform.

They don't have to take our bill; they don't have to take the Senate bill; but, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have a bill on the floor to fix a broken system. It is not a question of whether they trust the President; it is whether or not they trust the word of the House of Representatives that it

can work its will. I would hope that we could work our will on this issue. It is important for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 6, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LET THE STATES LEAD ON JOB CREATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent Monthly Labor Review report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics reiterates that energy production and energy jobs are surging in parts of the country, including my home State of Pennsylvania.

The report, which reviews employment trends from 2007 to 2012, states:

Pennsylvania has seen a surge in natural gas production and employment over the past 2 years, resulting in substantial growth in terms of both employment and wages.

Over the report's study period, Pennsylvania went on from being the tenth largest State by oil and natural gas employment in 2007 to being the sixth largest in 2012, and the Commonwealth also had the second largest employment increase over the same period, positioning itself only after Texas.

We talk a lot about what Washington can do to boost growth and employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, this report speaks to the fact that we should allow private innovation in States like Pennsylvania to lead the way.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Chairman PAUL RYAN held a hearing on poverty—a timely and necessary conversation. But the problem is that not one single person living in poverty was a witness at that hearing, and that is really a shame.

There are plenty of men and women, like Barbie Izquierdo or Tianna Gaines Turner from the Witnesses to Hunger, who should be invited here to describe what it is like to be hungry or cold simply because there isn't enough money to heat a house and buy enough food to eat. They can describe for Mr.

RYAN how difficult it is to stretch a SNAP allotment for the entire month and, most importantly, how hard it is to make ends meet with a job that pays an inadequate wage.

We need to hear from those who struggle with poverty and not just those think tank gurus. We need to hear what is working and what is not working on the ground in our communities.

Chairman RYAN's hearing missed the mark. When it comes to issues involving poverty and hunger, Mr. Speaker, this majority that runs this House doesn't have a clue.

I urge everyone to listen to real people who are struggling in poverty. Perhaps if we did, this Congress wouldn't be so cruel to poor people.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN DONALD BUSKA

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor Donald Buska, a Montana World War II veteran who passed away earlier this week.

I had the honor to meet Donald on Monday, just a day before he passed away. Donald was in Washington, D.C., as part of the Big Sky Honor Flight, an incredible program that allows Montana veterans to travel to D.C. and see their memorials.

One of the best parts of my job is meeting with these Montana veterans and honoring their service and their sacrifice. It is an honor to hear their stories, to stand with them before the memorials honoring their service, and to shake their hands.

I am glad Donald was able to participate in this once-in-a-lifetime trip to accomplish his lifetime dream.

Thank you, Donald, for your service. Cindy and I join all Montanans in saying "thank you" and keeping your family in our thoughts and prayers.

GLOBAL HUNGER/LIVE BELOW THE LINE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is the lunch hour here in Washington, D.C., but for the over 840 million people around the world who are struggling with hunger, an adequate lunch is a luxury they cannot afford. Instead of enjoying food, they are facing a terrible, gnawing pain in their gut right now. By the time I finish this statement, six children will have perished because of hunger or inadequate nutrition.

This week, the World Food Program is asking everyone to try to Live Below the Line—to put yourself in the shoes of the hungry, and to try to get by on