

Motion to Recommit H.R. 1

January 28, 2009

Summary of Motion: The motion would recommit H.R.1, the Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act, back to the House Appropriations Committee with instructions that the committee report the bill back to the House floor forthwith (i.e. instantaneously) with an amendment that increases spending on certain programs by **\$60.3 billion** and decreases spending on certain programs by **\$164 billion**.

On net, the legislation would reduce discretionary spending in the underlying bill by \$103.7 billion.

The spending increases in the amendment are: \$24.3 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers (Construction), and an additional \$36 billion for highway spending.

The amendment strikes \$164 billion worth of spending in the bill. A *partial list* of these reductions: \$3.5 billion for Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants, \$1 billion for the Advanced Battery Manufacturing Grants, \$1 billion for the Advanced Battery Loan Guarantee Program, \$4.5 billion for the “smart grid”, \$79 billion for the state fiscal stabilization fund, \$1.2 billion for Youth Summer Jobs Program Grants, \$50 million for the National Endowment of the Arts, \$200 million for Americorps, and \$6.7 billion for the Federal Building Fund.

Process: This MTR moves to recommit the bill (with instructions) “forthwith.” If passed, the forthwith directive would technically send the bill back to committee along with the MTR instructions, requiring the committee to immediately return the bill to the House along with the amendment. In effect, the chairman of the committee would take the floor and immediately report the bill back to the House with the amendment instructions in the MTR. The House would then vote on the amendment (in essence, a second vote on the MTR with instructions). If this passes, a vote on final passage – with the amendment included – would be before the House.

NOTE: The House Democrat Rules package for the 111th Congress (H.Res 5) denied the minority the right to offer MTRs “promptly.” If passed, the promptly directive would actually send the bill back to committee along with the MTR instructions. It would NOT instantaneously amend the bill, as would a “forthwith” directive, **nor would this motion kill the bill** (as the majority has falsely asserted). In this instance, the committee would not *required* to act upon the bill. However, the committee could convene a special meeting to consider the bill and potentially send it back to the House, but the Rules Committee would have to meet and report

another rule for consideration of the bill. All of this could happen on the very same legislative day, if so desired.

The “promptly” motion would allow for more thoughtful consideration of minority amendments, but the Democrats have decided they do not want such consideration.

RSC Staff Contact: Brad Watson, brad.watson@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9719