(659); 1-January; HR 8
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2013/01/fiscal-cliff-deal.shtml

(645); 20-December; HR4310
  o **HR 4310** - National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013: NO. The NDAA retains provisions which provide for the indefinite detention of Americans on mere suspicion of aiding groups that might associate with terrorists. This is an affront to the Constitution and a threat to our most fundamental rights as Americans.

(644); 20-December; HR 6684
  o **H.R. 6684** - Spending Reduction Act of 2012: AYE. I reluctantly support this measure, which institutes a number of structural spending reforms, including tightening Food Stamp eligibility, providing some improvements in medical malpractice awards, ending the “too big to fail” provisions of Dodd-Frank, and halting abuse of the Child Tax Credit by illegal immigrants. Although the ten year budget savings are far greater than those anticipated under the sequester – and the reason for my aye vote -- I am skeptical of provisions that reduce the first year savings mandated by the sequester. It is a short-term increase in spending (relative to the sequester) in exchange for much greater long-term savings.

(460); 11-July; HR6079
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/07/obamacare-repeal.shtml

(446); 29-June; HR5972
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/the-subway-to-nowhere.shtml

(434); 27-June; HR5972

(417); 26-June; HR5972
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/essential-air-service.shtml

(388); 19-June; HR2938
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/in-opposition-to-hr-2938.shtml

(317); 5-June; HR5325
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/amendment-5-to-hr-5325----fossil-fuels.shtml

(315); 5-June; HR5325
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/amendment-3-to-hr-5325----nuclear-energy-subsidies.shtml

(311); 1-June; HR5325
  o http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/06/subsidizing-failure.shtml

(270); 18-May; HR4310
o HR 4310 – Smith/Amash Amendment #46: YES.
  This amendment restores the Constitutional rights of due process and trial by jury
  that were decimated by section 1021 of the NDAA of 2012. Opponents argue that
  this would require suspected terrorists in the United States to be treated like
  ordinary criminals when in fact they are spies and saboteurs. That is true, but of
  course we have very good criminal laws under which to prosecute spies and
  saboteurs. The alternative is unthinkable: to sacrifice our most sacred liberties on
  the altar of an ill-defined, open-ended and perpetual war that knows neither
  victory nor defeat, subjecting our nation to indefinite detentions and military
  tribunals that are anathema to our Bill of Rights.

• (264); 17-May; HR4310
  o HR 4310 – Lee Amendment #5: YES.
    This amendment directs an orderly withdrawal from Afghanistan. The
    attack of 9/11 was an act of war requiring an unambiguous declaration of
    war by the Congress and the swift annihilation of every pillar and vestige
    of that government and all of its belligerent agencies, including Al Qaeda.
    Had we done so, the war would have been over long ago, Afghanistan
    today would more resemble post-war Japan than pre-war Iraq, and an
    indelible lesson would have been taught to any power that wishes us ill.
    Unfortunately, that’s not what happened. Instead, two presidents and six
    congresses have failed every test of war leadership. I believe it is time to
    remove our soldiers from a conflict they have not been allowed to win,
    rebuild our armed forces and recover the martial strength that could have
    and should have been brought to bear after September 11th.

• (262); 17-May; HR5740
  o HR 5740 – National Flood Insurance Program Extension: NO.
    This program uses taxpayer money to subsidize government-issued flood
    insurance, pushing private companies out of the market. Prices, if left to
    the free market, convey accurate information about the risk of flooding for
    a given property. Higher flood risk reduces the price of the property but
    increases the price of the insurance, giving homebuyers the ability to
    make rational choices between risks and rewards. Government
    intervention corrupts this data by hiding the true cost of the flood risk,
    which in turn encourages development on flood plains. Taxpayers lose
    twice: once by initially subsidizing the rates, and second, by paying out
    more and more claims as more and more people are encouraged to build
    homes in flood-prone areas where they wouldn’t if they had received
    accurate price signals.

• (258); 16-May; HR4970
  o HR 4970 – Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act: NO.
    This is a feel-good measure that uses “Violence Against Women” as an
    excuse to vastly expand a dizzying array of government grant programs,
    hamstring judges who are attempting to resolve and reconcile highly
    volatile relationships, add $1.8 billion to the nation’s debt and generally
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insinuate the federal government into matters the Constitution clearly reserves to the states. Federal grants of all kinds (essentially gifts of public money with little or no oversight) are out of control and ought to be abolished -- not expanded. I am particularly concerned with provisions adding federal mandatory minimum sentences in domestic violence cases, which ought to be left to judges on a case by case basis. The Eagle Forum (a conservative women’s group) cites a similar Florida law in which a judge was recently required – against his better judgment – to send a mother of two to prison for 20 years for firing a warning shot at her abusive husband.

- (244); 10-May; H RES 648
  - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oG-Pvkqiblw
- (224); 9-May; HR2072
  - http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/05/the-export-import-boondoggle.shtml
- (207); 8-May; H RES 5326
- (204); 8-May; H RES 5326
  - http://mcclintock.house.gov/2012/05/unauthorized-appropriations-to-the-international-trade-administration---amendment-to-cut.shtml
- (195); 27-April; HR 4628
  - HR 4628 – Student Loan Subsidies: NO.

Tuition is rising at four times the rate of inflation specifically because of the billions of dollars of subsidies that the government is pumping into that market. Then, under the guise of "helping" students pay for these government-inflated prices, we offer them below-market student loans that they can't possibly repay. The result is an economy where student loans now exceed consumer credit card debt and one out of two college grads can't find a job. Meanwhile, they're left to struggle with catastrophic debt that the government has lured them into acquiring with teaser rates. As the father of two college students myself, I believe the best way we can help these students and their families is to bring tuition costs back down to earth by getting the government out of the market. Instead, this bill continues to pump up a trillion-dollar debt bubble that will someday burst with devastating results.

- (192); 26-April; HR3253
- (177); 9-April; HR9
- (151); 29-March; H CON RES 112
- (149); 29-March; H CON RES 112
The tragedy of George W. Bush is not that he cut taxes, but that he refused to cut spending at the same time. This bill continues that folly by extending the Social Security payroll tax cut, while refusing to cut the spending that it pays for. The bill adds $101 billion to the deficit this year and further undermines the Social Security system’s solvency. Sadly, the House ignores HR 3551 that would permanently give every American the choice of taking the tax relief and delaying retirement by one month, an option that would pay for itself and protect Social Security’s finances. When these tax relief measures were initiated in December, 2010, I expected the incoming majority to reduce spending commensurately. It has not, and we are now another year closer to a sovereign debt crisis like that which now convulses Greece.

Mr. Chairman:
This bill presents us with a simple question: “It is possible – just possible – that from time to time Congress has passed a spending bill or two that ought to have had greater scrutiny?” The answer to this question might elude some members of the House, but I assure them it is self-evident to everybody else. A country whose finances are as far out of control as ours suffers not from too many checks and balances on spending, but from too few. Opponents discuss this bill as if it were a new and radical idea. The fact is, many states operate with a genuine line item veto and have for generations. For those states, it has been an important tool to control their spending, and those provisions are far more stringent than what is proposed here. In conformance with our Constitution, this bill simply invites the President to call to Congress’s attention those spending items he recommends that we give additional thought to and to put a six-week hold on those funds while we do so. In fact, from 1801 until 1974, the President had the recognized authority to impound excess spending indefinitely – a legitimate executive function first asserted by President Thomas Jefferson. The Budget Act of 1974 stripped the executive of this vital check on Congressional excess. I would prefer to see us restore that fiscal safeguard, or better still, amend the Constitution to provide the President an actual line item veto.
But let’s at least set up a process so the President can warn us when he believes we have appropriated more money than he needs to execute the laws that we pass. This bill is frankly a mouse when we need a lion. The fact that it has produced shrieks of horror from some quarters of the House is an exact measure of the extent and nature of our problem.

- (42); 7-February; HR3581
  - House floor remarks by Congressman Tom McClintock
    February 8, 2012
    A family that excludes from its budget the mortgage payments it knows it must make is deluding itself and sabotaging its own finances. That’s precisely what the federal government is doing right now with respect to billions of dollars of liabilities because of its ill-fated sponsorship of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.
    This bill takes a small step toward restoring honest and accurate accounting to our government’s finances by requiring that the enormous liabilities incurred by Fannie and Freddie be accounted for in the federal budget process using the same accounting standards for loans that we already impose on mortgage lenders.
    I wish this bill abolished Fannie and Freddie outright. I wish it restored the days when banks or borrowers who made bad decisions took responsibility for them, and didn’t demand that their neighbors pay for their mistakes.
    But can’t we at least agree that the public has a right to expect that the costs of this folly are honestly accounted for in the nation’s budget?

- (30) 2-February; HR 3582
  - HR 3582- Pro-Growth Budgeting Act: Y
    House floor remarks by Congressman Tom McClintock
    The simple question now before us is whether it is better for Congress to have more information or less information when it is deliberating on matters that directly affect the economy of this nation.
    The answer should be self-evident, but apparently, some members of this house prefer blissful ignorance than having to go to the fuss and bother of actually assessing the full ramifications of the policies they are enacting. (That explains a lot about some of the decisions they’ve made in recent years).
    The economy is a dynamic and fast-changing thing, responding rapidly to every tax and regulation imposed by government and every dollar that changes hands in markets.
    Yet, the rules under which the Congressional Budget Office operates severely constrain its ability to take this obvious reality into account in the information that it provides us.
    This measure doesn’t presume to tell the CBO how to do its job or what formulae to use in its analysis. It doesn’t even change the outmoded static modeling it uses to score the fiscal impact of measures before us.
All that it says is, “give us the complete picture.” If a proposal is going to affect the economy significantly – for good or ill – tell us. Tell us what you think and show us why you think so. Patrick Henry summed up this bill perfectly when he said, “For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.”