United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2010 No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 14, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PASTOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our Creator, You are the source of love and of life. You want us to have life and the fullness of life as members of society and as a nation.

By Your Divine Providence, the full expression of love for You, Almighty God, as well as love of neighbor, begins with the realization of the unique personhood in each and every member within the family. It is there we learn the great task of love, how to accept love and show love in return. Human life teaches us that neither friendship nor patriotism can take the place of family in helping us find our place of fitting in or belonging.

Lord, may the prism of family life prove to be the instrument of discernment for the Members of Congress as they formulate laws and policies for the good of this Nation.

May You bless the families of Congress and this Nation so this common ground may give You glory, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, right now, 15 million out-of-work Americans are waiting on the Senate to extend unemployment benefits which contribute to paying mortgages, health care bills, utility bills and the cost of food when there isn't a paycheck coming in.

The Democrats' unemployment bill will provide up to 99 weeks of unemployment checks, averaging about $300, to people whose 26 weeks of State-paid benefits have run out. The benefits would be extended through the end of November. In a new Washington Post-ABC News poll released July 13, more than six in ten Americans support congressional action to extend unemployment benefits for jobless workers.

Earlier this month, the House passed the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act to restore and extend emergency unemployment benefits through November 30. Americans know these benefits not only are much needed, but they are their life support.

CONGRATULATING THE PATRIOTS OF PACE HIGH SCHOOL ON BECOMING THE REGION 1, CLASS 5A BASEBALL STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today and congratulate the Patriots of Pace High School for becoming the Region 1, Class 5A baseball state champions.

Pace High School's varsity baseball team, led by Coach Charlie Warner, finished the season with an impressive 31–2 record. The Patriots went unbeaten against Florida competition and won their last 25 games.

For their dominance on the baseball diamond, the Patriots of Pace High earned a number one ranking from ESPN and were crowned ESPN's RISE FAB 50 national champions.

Now, while the Patriots achieved their goal and brought home a state championship, it was not done without countless hours of practice and immeasurable amounts of sacrifice. The time they spent together on and off the field will not only be remembered for capturing a second state title in 5 years, but the forged friendships and lessons learned will never be forgotten.

Once again, I would like to congratulate Pace High School's baseball team on winning their fourth state championship. My wife Vicki and I are extremely proud of these young men.

Printed on recycled paper.

MOVING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

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

Mr. BACA. These are tough times for our Nation, but the American people can take heart that with the leadership of President Obama, we are headed in the right direction.

When the President took office, he inherited a $1.2 trillion deficit, two wars, the recession, mounting job losses, and disasters like Katrina that pushed our economy to the brink.

Since then, with his guidance we have passed the American Recovery Act that saved jobs; the expansion of SCHIP, to provide health coverage to 11 million children; the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the equal pay act for women in the workplace; the Credit Card Bill of Rights; and the historic health reform that finally makes quality, affordable coverage a right for every American. Soon we will enact financial reforms that give us the oversight and accountability to prevent another economic collapse.

The President continues to move us in the right direction and is doing all the right things. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues continue to have no plan and no direction.

TRIBUTE TO PEARL REX-HARTZELL

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House to pay special tribute to Pearl Rex-Hartzell, who passed away recently.

Pearl's life was dedicated to serving others. She said once, ''As long as I live I have to serve.'' Living up to her motto of service, she could be found constantly smiling, dancing and participating in numerous organizations. Pearl believed that ''we can't just sit back and enjoy freedom. We must work to preserve it.'' This remarkable woman had a deep love of God, country, and family, and she selflessly dedicated her life to helping all those in need.

Pearl represents the reality that a single person can make a positive difference in the lives of those around her by smiling, serving and standing by their principles.

It is appropriate that we honor her accomplishments, her example and her lifelong dedication to community service. I wish nothing but the best to her family and hope they feel the deep gratitude of Utah and truly remember this remarkable woman. She has served our community well, and we will miss her.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY RELEASE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS BY CUBA

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we cannot be fooled by the Castro regime's announcement to release 52 political prisoners. That would be 52 out of approximately 5,000.

The release of these prisoners, held only because they disagree with the government, would be good news if they were actually being released, but only five to 10 prisoners will be released immediately. The rest will be let go over the next three to four months. Why does it take months to release a group of prisoners when it only took one night to arrest them? We cannot be fooled.

The Castro regime has released prisoners many times before in exchange for lesser sanctions, but these temporary releases never result in permanent reforms.

The regime is unilaterally releasing 52 prisoners, but what is to keep them from simply arresting hundreds more? We cannot be fooled. And above all, we cannot alter our sanctions or policies towards Cuba based on this one superficial gesture.

□ 1010

DEBT

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

Ms. JENKINS. For the past 18 months, the leadership in the House has ignored the impending fiscal crisis, acting like they know best and that the economy would recover if we simply spent more money. They're wrong. And today, I'd like to remind them of one number that should get their attention: $166 billion. A few years ago, that was more than the annual budget deficit. Now, that's how much the debt increased on June 30 alone. The President's fiscal commission said this debt is a cancer ''that will destroy the country from within.'' As a daughter of two cancer survivors, those words are strong. But as a CPA that knows how debilitating debt can be, I couldn't agree more. It's time for the majority to stop ignoring reality. It's time to stop the reckless spending and get the $13.2 trillion debt under control.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. SCHRADER. As a member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, I would like to bring attention to my district's growing concern about our national debt. Oregon's Fifth Congressional District has been severely impacted by the recent economic downturn. Like Oregon families throughout my State, Congress must start learning to live within its means. I put a high priority on financial responsibility, which is why I've introduced H.R. 5363, the Preventing Waste, Fraud, and Abuse Act of 2010. The Act encourages the Federal Government to make strategic investments to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in our entitlement programs. For every dollar we put into the program, we get $1.50 to $8 back.

Today, we will be voting on the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010. By passing this bill, we will expand the process of identifying programs and activities susceptible to improper payments. Identifying these programs will eliminate fraud. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

MOB VIOLENCE

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, mob violence serves no good purpose. Last week, a California mob violently disagreed with the jury verdict in a high-profile case. I have no opinion if the verdict is inconsistent with the facts of the case, but I do have an opinion that mob violence offers no solutions. I do not embrace all jury verdicts, but when I am not in agreement with jury verdicts, I do not resort to violence. I do not promote the smashing of plate-glass windows. I do not promote the stealing of goods behind those windows. I do not promote the inflicting of injury upon innocent third parties.

Mob members taking the law into their own hands, Mr. Speaker, is opposed to all that is good about America, yet few people have spoken out against it. Surely, the majority of Americans are opposed to mob violence. I reiterate: Mob violence serves no good purpose and should be deterred and rejected.

FIGHTING FOR SENIORS

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of seniors across upstate New York. Since coming to Washington, I have fought to strengthen Medicare, protect Social Security, and ensure that our seniors can retire with dignity. As a founding member of the Seniors Task Force, I was proud to help introduce the Seniors Bill of Rights to guarantee the dignity and independence of all older Americans. We need to ensure that they have access to quality, affordable health and long-term care. We need to provide protection from scams, abuses, and exploitation. And we need to provide safe and livable communities.

For years, credit card companies have taken advantage of our seniors by

doing things like changing the terms of their agreements without telling them or advertising one rate and giving another. Last year, we saw a bipartisan effort with the Credit CARD Act to prevent these kinds of scams. We also worked this year to close the Medicare part D doughnut hole. Last month, our seniors started receiving $250 checks to close that hole. And by 2020, it will be gone entirely. No senior should have to choose between purchasing drugs and medicines they need or putting food on their table. And no senior should be scammed by credit card companies.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE STEINBRENNER

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as the owner of the New York Yankees, George Steinbrenner was known for his bravado. But to the people of my district, he was known as a gentleman horse farm owner and community leader. He had a tremendous impact on north central Florida. In 1969, he bought the 850-acre Kinsman Stud Horse Farm in Ocala. He was an active horse breeder and a successful local businessman. He also owned the Pinstripes Ramada Inn in Ocala. In addition, Mr. Speaker, he became one of the largest benefactors in the University of Florida's history. He built the George Steinbrenner Band Hall, and he helped found the large animal and equine programs at the University of Florida veterinary school.

While most of the tributes to George Steinbrenner rightfully focus on his ownership of the New York Yankees, the people of north central Florida feel we have lost a great friend and a good neighbor.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress to support ideas, no matter whose they were, to get our economy going. Well, unemployment rates across my district in Michigan are gradually falling. There are 23,000 people that I represent that will lose their lifeline by the end of the year unless the Republicans end their filibuster in the Senate.

Let's be clear: Our economy will worsen and our deficit will worsen if unemployment benefits aren't extended. I repeat that: Our economy will worsen and our deficit will worsen if unemployment benefits aren't extended at this critical time. Don't take my word for it—economists of all political stripes agree. Even JOHN MCCAIN's economic adviser, Mark Zandi, said, No form of the fiscal stimulus has proved more effective during the past 2 years than emergency unemployment insurance benefits providing a bang-for-the-buck of $1.61 for every dollar of unemployment benefits.

It's time for us to act to provide a lifeline and help our economy.

MORE DELAYS ON TROOP FUNDING

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, before Congress adjourned for the July 4th recess, I stood at this spot with a plea to Democratic leadership to do the right thing and bring the military supplemental bill forward as a clean bill for quick passage. My request and those of many of my colleagues went unanswered. The result? Our troops at risk do not have the funding they need. It is a shame that Congress could not get this troop funding bill passed before the Pentagon's deadline. By not passing or debating a budget—another travesty—Congress certainly has had plenty of time to get this done.

As a veteran myself, with four sons currently serving in the military, I know we have brave men and women in uniform around the world who shouldn't have to worry about Congress' failure to fund their programs and missions. We have counterinsurgency operations right now in Iraq and Afghanistan that should not be interrupted or held up by lawmakers so they can add billions of additional dollars in unrelated pet projects.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WHY GO BACK?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Republicans, sadly, apologized to BP and call Wall Street reform an ant being hated by the U.S. Government. Meanwhile, they continue to say ''no'' to Democratic Party attempts to extend unemployment insurance benefits for the next 6 months. They're calling these benefits an ''entitlement'' and say that they're being abused by folks who can't find a job. And this despite an analysis by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office suggesting that extending unemployment benefits is the most cost-effective and fast-acting way to spur the economy.

Congressional Republicans support the special interests that benefited from George Bush policies and created the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. A decade of Republican rule nearly doubled our national debt. Why would we go back to that?

□ 1020

AMERICA SPEAKING OUT

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

Mr. REHBERG. Thousands of Montanans are joining millions of Americans speaking out. I have heard from them at seven listening sessions across Montana just last week. And thanks to an innovative House Republican initiative called America Speaking Out, they can join people around the country online at americaspeakingout.com.

Unfortunately, this majority has not been listening. When emails and phone systems were overwhelmed by the opposition to the stimulus, they turned off their phones. When town hall meetings were overrun by angry constituents, they stopped holding public meetings. When the opposition to their health care takeover got too hot, they held closed-door meetings and capped it off with a 1 a.m. vote. Americans deserve better.

We deserve a government that listens first and then acts. We deserve a government that remembers who it works for. That's what I'm doing in Montana, and that's what House Republicans are doing online. Please join me today by logging on at americaspeakingout.com. Together, we will make a difference.

CUBA CONTINUES TO OPPRESS ITS PEOPLE

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in protest of the Castro regime's intention to forcibly deport 52 political prisoners under the guise of release. Historically, the Castro regime has used political prisoners as pawns to extract international concessions and ease criticism. But as The Washington Post pointed out in their reporting on this story, this gesture does not represent fundamental political change. As more political dissidents die of hunger strikes in Cuba, we cannot allow this hollow gesture to blind us from the reality on the ground.

In Cuba's authoritarian dictatorship, every dollar that flows into the country props up the Castro regime. In the meantime, Alan Gross of Potomac, Maryland, arrested for distributing cell phones and laptops to Cuba's tiny Jewish community, continues to sit in prison with no hope of release.

A relationship with the United States must be earned. Banishing political dissidents from their homeland hardly meets that test. This cheap political trick is surely of no solace for Gross and others still in jail.

CUBA'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro showed himself on television this week to remind the world that he is alive and in power, despite having turned over some titles to his puppet brother. What he does is he throws Cuban patriots in the dungeons; and then when he feels pressure, he releases Cuban patriots, deports them from the country, expels them, gives them the choice, ''Do you want to stay in the dungeon or be expelled from your country?'' to gain diplomatic and economic oxygen. He wants U.S. sanctions eliminated and he wants the European common position, which ties a close relationship between Cuba and Europe to an improvement in human rights, he wants that common position eliminated.

He comes together with the Spanish Foreign Minister, Mr. Moratinos, and they agree upon a supposed number of political prisoners; under 200, they say there are. The U.S. State Department, in March, makes clear that only those charged under so-called dangerousness—whatever that means—number 5,000 in the Cuban dungeons.

Let's not be fooled. Let's not be fooled. The solution to the Cuban problem is free elections, the release of all political prisoners through free elections in Cuba.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, by continuing to deny the extension of unemployment benefits, Republicans are perpetuating their heartlessness on the backs of the working people of this country. Last week in Hilo, I met a group of contractors who shared with me not only their struggles in today's difficult economy, but that of people they know who have lost their jobs. These hardworking people can't find jobs not for a lack of effort but for a lack of jobs.

Before the July 4 recess, the House passed a bill that would extend unemployment benefits through the end of November. This extension would save 6,000 residents in Hawaii from losing their benefits. Every month that Congress fails to act, another 2,150 people in Hawaii will lose their benefits. These benefits amount to an average of $415 a week, which helps families buy food and keep a roof over their heads until they can find a job. And for every $1 they spend, $1.60 is generated in economic growth for local businesses.

We cannot turn our backs on hardworking people by taking away their unemployment benefits. The time to act is now.

TIMMY BERGERON WRITES THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a really mad Cajun named Timmy Bergeron. He is from Houma, Louisiana, and runs an oil-related drilling business.

Timmy's letter is to the President and says, ''I am terribly troubled that after striving to find jobs for Americans, you make a hasty decision to stop drilling for 6 months. Did you stop coal mining after all the incidents they have been having? No. Did you stop the airlines after all the crashes and accidents they have been having? No. Now you want to shut down the oil industry for 6 months, which will hurt tens of thousands of workers! I only hope you understand the trickle-down effect this will have on many industries.''

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the letter gets a bit more colorful, but Mr. Bergeron wants to know why the President is intentionally putting him out of business. Maybe the President will write him back. Meanwhile, the ill-advised deepwater drilling ban is putting people out of work and is the second disaster in the Gulf of Mexico.

And that's just the way it is.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans continue to refuse to allow the extension of unemployment insurance benefits to the American people. Let me tell you what that does in my State.

If we don't extend those benefits within a very short period of time, 125,000 Kentuckians will be without the means to support their families. That means, in addition to human suffering, we're talking about $125 million a month that will not be spent in the Kentucky economy. Multiply that across the country, and you see the incredible effect that it can have.

I don't think that Republicans really mean it when they say, Well, we're okay with supporting it, but we want to pay for it. They didn't say the same thing when they got into two wars, provided a new entitlement prescription drug benefit, and passed tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

You can't build a political philosophy on the pain and suffering of the American people, but that's the only conclusion that I can reach. They figure, create as much pain and damage as you can create, and then the American people will blame the party in power for it. That's a pretty cynical way to approach the lives of the American people and Kentuckians.

A TRIBUTE TO THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the recent accolades of the Third Congressional District of Texas. While I know it's a great place to live, work, and raise a family, clearly, other notable and even national publications have paid attention, too.

For example, D Magazine put the spotlight on the best suburbs for Dallas; and 11 out of all 11 cities in the Third District outside of Dallas ranked among the top: Parker, Murphy, Allen, Sachse, Plano, Frisco, Wylie, McKinney, Rowlett, Richardson, and Garland.

Money Magazine just named McKinney, Texas, as the fifth most desirable place to live in the Nation, while Allen took 16th and Rowlett claimed 24th. In addition, Newsweek featured 10 Third District high schools in June in the America's Best High Schools edition.

My hat goes off to the people who make Texas places so special and the leaders who had the vision and courage to make their dreams for these communities a reality. Congratulations to all. God bless you. I salute you.

A TRIBUTE TO TOMMY DURHAM

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tommy Durham, a gentleman in my community who passed away a few days ago. Tommy was known as the mayor of West Madison Street, where he ran a used appliance business and fixed air conditioners, stoves, heaters. Anything that needed fixing, Tommy could do it.

He was passionately involved in politics and ran for office more than 40 years ago. He did not win the election, but he did win a place in the hearts and minds of the people, and I pay tribute to him and his life today.

□ 1030

CUBA'S RELEASE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week we've seen that the Castro dictatorship has released a handful of political prisoners in an attempt to try to win concessions from the European Union and the United States. It's not the first time they've done that to try to win concessions.

At the same time, the Obama administration recognizes that there are about 5,000 Cubans that are held in the gulags of that nation for the charge of dangerousness. Those are 5,000 additional political prisoners that languish in prison.

We've got to remember who the Castro regime, that terrorist regime, who

they are. This week alone they've blamed the United States for sinking the South Korean ship that killed 46 sailors early this year. They blamed the United States.

This is the same regime that holds an American hostage, Mr. Alan Gross, a Jewish American contractor who was providing humanitarian aid to Cuban Jews within that island nation.

This is the same regime that, last month, Fidel Castro himself compared Israel to Nazi Germany. And yet some want to give concessions to that regime. Some want to help that regime with billions of dollars.

Let's stay firm. Let's demand elections. Let's demand freedom for the Cuban people.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INSURANCE BENEFITS

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

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on my colleagues, and particularly my colleagues in the Senate and those Republicans, to give much needed relief to 15 million out-of-work Americans and extend unemployment compensation insurance benefits. It is unprecedented not to do so at a time of high unemployment, over 10 percent in my district.

And I take strong issue with comments that the unemployed don't want to work, that they aren't looking for jobs. They do. They want to pay their bills. They want to support their families, make those utility payments, put food on their table, send their children to college.

But right now I have talked to anguished, hardworking men and women who have lost jobs when their factories closed and have been looking continuously for work. It's not yet there. They are looking for these jobs, but they need this help now. It is time that we extend unemployment compensation and give these hardworking citizens the help that they need.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT MATTHEW R. HENNIGAN

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army Sergeant Matthew Hennigan, a resident of southern Nevada who was killed in action serving in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Hennigan was a strong willed and brave soldier who never shied away from a challenge or turned down an opportunity to serve. With a contagious smile and a warm personality, Sergeant Hennigan was a strong and fearless soldier and a friend to many. He is remembered by his fellow soldiers as a model citizen, a strong warrior, and a respected leader.

He was an inspirational captain of the Silverado High School wrestling team in his senior year; and upon graduation, he answered the call to serve his Nation at the young age of 17. He did so with valor and dignity.

Matthew Hennigan is a true American hero. He epitomizes the best this country has to offer. Let us always honor his memory, never forget his sacrifice, and promise to be there for his family in this sad time.

God bless our troops.

PASSPORTS FOR THE IROQUOIS NATIONAL LACROSSE TEAM

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, this morning a team of Iroquois Indians attempted to board a plane for the United Kingdom to compete in an international lacrosse competition, where they would represent the Iroquois or Hodneshoni Nation on the world stage. Again they were denied entry because they were traveling on their own people's passports instead of U.S. or Canadian.

Though the British invited this team to compete from the Iroquois Nation, they refused the Iroquois passports unless the U.S. officially said it was okay. But the U.S. refused to do so, even though dozens of Iroquois have traveled internationally, including overseas with these documents.

Mr. Speaker, the Iroquois nationals team is not a security risk and willingly subjected themselves to fingerprinting and background checks. In fact, the U.S. State Department offered to rapidly expedite U.S. passports for much of the team. But to this team, accepting U.S. passports would be akin to renouncing their own national and ethnic identity. It's a matter of principle to them.

The State Department and Homeland Security Department have lost the forest through the trees in refusing to allow the team to travel as citizens of an indigenous nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the Academy Award winning film, ''Chariots of Fire,'' a Scottish running hero, Eric Liddell, is praised for sticking to his religious beliefs even when they threatened to keep him out of the 1924 Olympics. He's a true man of principle.

Mr. Speaker, this team is a true team of principle.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator JOHN KYL called unemployment insurance ''a necessary evil,'' and I must say his statement gave me some clarity for the first time in months. I've been mystified about how the Republicans could repeatedly block unemployment benefits in a struggling economy that they drove into the ditch.

I couldn't grasp this reasoning behind depriving millions of American families the support they need to buy food and pay their mortgage while they searched for work. Now, I understand that Republicans evidently believe that helping jobless workers is an evil.

I foolishly thought we might hear some compassion from the very party that is causing countless Americans to lose their lifeline. I just hope that enough Republicans in the other body will find the courage to buck their party and end this.

Millions of families are counting on them. Their phone calls come into my office every single day from all over the country: When will the extended benefits be put back in? And I say, look to the Republicans in the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

IMPROPER PAYMENTS ELIMINATION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2010

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1508) to amend the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) in order to prevent the loss of billions in taxpayer dollars.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1508

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. IMPROPER PAYMENTS ELIMINATION AND RECOVERY.

(a) SUSCEPTIBLE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF SUSCEPTIBLE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall, in accordance with guidance prescribed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, periodically review all programs and activities that the relevant agency head administers and identify all programs and activities that may be susceptible to significant improper payments.

''(2) FREQUENCY.—Reviews under paragraph (1) shall be performed for each program and activity that the relevant agency head administers during the year after which the

Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 is enacted and at least once every 3 fiscal years thereafter. For those agencies already performing a risk assessment every 3 years, agencies may apply to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for a waiver from the requirement of the preceding sentence and continue their 3-year risk assessment cycle.

''(3) RISK ASSESSMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this subsection the term 'significant' means—

''(i) except as provided under clause (ii), that improper payments in the program or activity in the preceding fiscal year may have exceeded—

''(I) $10,000,000 of all program or activity payments made during that fiscal year reported and 2.5 percent of program outlays; or

''(II) $100,000,000; and

''(ii) with respect to fiscal years following September 30th of a fiscal year beginning before fiscal year 2013 as determined by the Office of Management and Budget, that improper payments in the program or activity in the preceding fiscal year may have exceeded—

''(I) $10,000,000 of all program or activity payments made during that fiscal year reported and 1.5 percent of program outlays; or

''(II) $100,000,000.

''(B) SCOPE.—In conducting the reviews under paragraph (1), the head of each agency shall take into account those risk factors that are likely to contribute to a susceptibility to significant improper payments, such as—

''(i) whether the program or activity reviewed is new to the agency;

''(ii) the complexity of the program or activity reviewed;

''(iii) the volume of payments made through the program or activity reviewed;

''(iv) whether payments or payment eligibility decisions are made outside of the agency, such as by a State or local government;

''(v) recent major changes in program funding, authorities, practices, or procedures;

''(vi) the level, experience, and quality of training for personnel responsible for making program eligibility determinations or certifying that payments are accurate; and

''(vii) significant deficiencies in the audit report of the agency or other relevant management findings that might hinder accurate payment certification.''.

(b) ESTIMATION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) ESTIMATION OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—With respect to each program and activity identified under subsection (a), the head of the relevant agency shall—

''(1) produce a statistically valid estimate, or an estimate that is otherwise appropriate using a methodology approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, of the improper payments made by each program and activity; and

''(2) include those estimates in the accompanying materials to the annual financial statement of the agency required under section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, or similar provision of law and applicable guidance of the Office of Management and Budget.''.

(c) REPORTS ON ACTIONS TO REDUCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) REPORTS ON ACTIONS TO REDUCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—With respect to any program or activity of an agency with estimated improper payments under subsection (b), the head of the agency shall provide with the estimate under subsection (b) a report on what actions the agency is taking to reduce improper payments, including—

''(1) a description of the causes of the improper payments, actions planned or taken to correct those causes, and the planned or actual completion date of the actions taken to address those causes;

''(2) in order to reduce improper payments to a level below which further expenditures to reduce improper payments would cost more than the amount such expenditures would save in prevented or recovered improper payments, a statement of whether the agency has what is needed with respect to—

''(A) internal controls;

''(B) human capital; and

''(C) information systems and other infrastructure;

''(3) if the agency does not have sufficient resources to establish and maintain effective internal controls under paragraph (2)(A), a description of the resources the agency has requested in its budget submission to establish and maintain such internal controls;

''(4) program-specific and activity-specific improper payments reduction targets that have been approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

''(5) a description of the steps the agency has taken to ensure that agency managers, programs, and, where appropriate, States and localities are held accountable through annual performance appraisal criteria for—

''(A) meeting applicable improper payments reduction targets; and

''(B) establishing and maintaining sufficient internal controls, including an appropriate control environment, that effectively—

''(i) prevent improper payments from being made; and

''(ii) promptly detect and recover improper payments that are made.''.

(d) REPORTS ON ACTIONS TO RECOVER IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) REPORTS ON ACTIONS TO RECOVER IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—With respect to any improper payments identified in recovery audits conducted under section 2(h) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), the head of the agency shall provide with the estimate under subsection (b) a report on all actions the agency is taking to recover improper payments, including—

''(1) a discussion of the methods used by the agency to recover overpayments;

''(2) the amounts recovered, outstanding, and determined to not be collectable, including the percent such amounts represent of the total overpayments of the agency;

''(3) if a determination has been made that certain overpayments are not collectable, a justification of that determination;

''(4) an aging schedule of the amounts outstanding;

''(5) a summary of how recovered amounts have been disposed of;

''(6) a discussion of any conditions giving rise to improper payments and how those conditions are being resolved; and

''(7) if the agency has determined under section 2(h) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) that performing recovery audits for any applicable program or activity is not cost-effective, a justification for that determination.

''(e) GOVERNMENTWIDE REPORTING OF IMPROPER PAYMENTS AND ACTIONS TO RECOVER IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—

''(1) REPORT.—Each fiscal year the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report with respect to the preceding fiscal year on actions agencies have taken to report information regarding improper payments and actions to recover improper overpayments to—

''(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include—

''(A) a summary of the reports of each agency on improper payments and recovery actions submitted under this section;

''(B) an identification of the compliance status of each agency to which this Act applies;

''(C) governmentwide improper payment reduction targets; and

''(D) a discussion of progress made towards meeting governmentwide improper payment reduction targets.''.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking subsections (f) (as redesignated by this section) and inserting the following:

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' means an executive agency, as that term is defined in section 102 of title 31, United States Code.

''(2) IMPROPER PAYMENT.—The term 'improper payment'—

''(A) means any payment that should not have been made or that was made in an incorrect amount (including overpayments and underpayments) under statutory, contractual, administrative, or other legally applicable requirements; and

''(B) includes any payment to an ineligible recipient, any payment for an ineligible good or service, any duplicate payment, any payment for a good or service not received (except for such payments where authorized by law), and any payment that does not account for credit for applicable discounts.

''(3) PAYMENT.—The term 'payment' means any transfer or commitment for future transfer of Federal funds such as cash, securities, loans, loan guarantees, and insurance subsidies to any non-Federal person or entity, that is made by a Federal agency, a Federal contractor, a Federal grantee, or a governmental or other organization administering a Federal program or activity.

''(4) PAYMENT FOR AN INELIGIBLE GOOD OR SERVICE.—The term 'payment for an ineligible good or service' shall include a payment for any good or service that is rejected under any provision of any contract, grant, lease, cooperative agreement, or any other funding mechanism.''.

(f) GUIDANCE BY THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Section 2 of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended by striking subsection (g) (as redesignated by this section) and inserting the following:

''(g) GUIDANCE BY THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prescribe guidance for agencies to implement the requirements of this section. The guidance shall not include any exemptions to such requirements not specifically authorized by this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The guidance under paragraph (1) shall prescribe—

''(A) the form of the reports on actions to reduce improper payments, recovery actions, and governmentwide reporting; and

''(B) strategies for addressing risks and establishing appropriate prepayment and postpayment internal controls.''.

(g) DETERMINATIONS OF AGENCY READINESS FOR OPINION ON INTERNAL CONTROL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall develop—

(1) specific criteria as to when an agency should initially be required to obtain an opinion on internal control over improper payments; and

(2) criteria for an agency that has demonstrated a stabilized, effective system of internal control over improper payments, whereby the agency would qualify for a multiyear cycle for obtaining an audit opinion on internal control over improper payments, rather than an annual cycle.

(h) RECOVERY AUDITS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''agency'' has the meaning given under section 2(f) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) as redesignated by this Act.

(2) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CONDUCT OF AUDITS.—Except as provided under paragraph (4) and if not prohibited under any other provision of law, the head of each agency shall conduct recovery audits with respect to each program and activity of the agency that expends $1,000,000 or more annually if conducting such audits would be cost-effective.

(B) PROCEDURES.—In conducting recovery audits under this subsection, the head of an agency—

(i) shall give priority to the most recent payments and to payments made in any program or programs identified as susceptible to significant improper payments under section 2(a) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note);

(ii) shall implement this subsection in a manner designed to ensure the greatest financial benefit to the Government; and

(iii) may conduct recovery audits directly, by using other departments and agencies of the United States, or by procuring performance of recovery audits by private sector sources by contract (subject to the availability of appropriations), or by any combination thereof.

(C) RECOVERY AUDIT CONTRACTS.—With respect to recovery audits procured by an agency by contract—

(i) subject to subparagraph (B)(iii), and except to the extent such actions are outside the agency's authority, as defined by section 605(a) of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 605(a)), the head of the agency may authorize the contractor to notify entities (including persons) of potential overpayments made to such entities, respond to questions concerning potential overpayments, and take other administrative actions with respect to overpayment claims made or to be made by the agency; and

(ii) such contractor shall have no authority to make final determinations relating to whether any overpayment occurred and whether to compromise, settle, or terminate overpayment claims.

(D) CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The agency shall include in each contract for procurement of performance of a recovery audit a requirement that the contractor shall—

(I) provide to the agency periodic reports on conditions giving rise to overpayments identified by the contractor and any recommendations on how to mitigate such conditions;

(II) notify the agency of any overpayments identified by the contractor pertaining to the agency or to any other agency or agencies that are beyond the scope of the contract; and

(III) report to the agency credible evidence of fraud or vulnerabilities to fraud, and conduct appropriate training of personnel of the contractor on identification of fraud.

(ii) REPORTS ON ACTIONS TAKEN.—Not later than November 1 of each year, each agency shall submit a report on actions taken by the agency during the preceding fiscal year to address the recommendations described under clause (i)(I) to—

(I) the Office of Management and Budget; and

(II) Congress.

(E) AGENCY ACTION FOLLOWING NOTIFICATION.—An agency shall take prompt and appropriate action in response to a report or notification by a contractor under subparagraph (D)(i)(I) or (II), to collect overpayments and shall forward to other agencies any information that applies to such agencies.

(3) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts collected by agencies each fiscal year through recovery audits conducted under this subsection shall be treated in accordance with this paragraph. The agency head shall determine the distribution of collected amounts, less amounts needed to fulfill the purposes of section 3562(a) of title 31, United States Code, in accordance with subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D).

(B) USE FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Not more than 25 percent of the amounts collected by an agency through recovery audits—

(i) shall be available to the head of the agency to carry out the financial management improvement program of the agency under paragraph (4);

(ii) may be credited, if applicable, for that purpose by the head of an agency to any agency appropriations and funds that are available for obligation at the time of collection; and

(iii) shall be used to supplement and not supplant any other amounts available for that purpose and shall remain available until expended.

(C) USE FOR ORIGINAL PURPOSE.—Not more than 25 percent of the amounts collected by an agency—

(i) shall be credited to the appropriation or fund, if any, available for obligation at the time of collection for the same general purposes as the appropriation or fund from which the overpayment was made;

(ii) shall remain available for the same period and purposes as the appropriation or fund to which credited; and

(iii) if the appropriation from which the overpayment was made has expired, shall be newly available for the same time period as the funds were originally available for obligation, except that any amounts that are recovered more than five fiscal years from the last fiscal year in which the funds were available for obligation shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except that in the case of recoveries of overpayments that are made from trust or special fund accounts, such amounts shall revert to those accounts.

(D) USE FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTIVITIES.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts collected by an agency shall be available to the Inspector General of that agency—

(i) for—

(I) the Inspector General to carry out this Act; or

(II) any other activities of the Inspector General relating to investigating improper payments or auditing internal controls associated with payments; and

(ii) shall remain available for the same period and purposes as the appropriation or fund to which credited.

(E) REMAINDER.—Amounts collected that are not applied in accordance with subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except that in the case of recoveries of overpayments that are made from trust or special fund accounts, such amounts shall revert to those accounts.

(F) DISCRETIONARY AMOUNTS.—This paragraph shall apply only to recoveries of overpayments that are made from discretionary appropriations (as that term is defined by paragraph 7 of section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) and shall not apply to recoveries of overpayments that are made from discretionary amounts that were appropriated prior to enactment of this Act.

(G) APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to recoveries of overpayments if the appropriation from which the overpayment was made has not expired.

(4) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—The head of each agency shall conduct a financial management improvement program, consistent with rules prescribed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) PROGRAM FEATURES.—In conducting the program, the head of the agency—

(i) shall, as the first priority of the program, address problems that contribute directly to agency improper payments; and

(ii) may seek to reduce errors and waste in other agency programs and operations.

(5) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—Any nongovernmental entity that, in the course of recovery auditing or recovery activity under this subsection, obtains information that identifies an individual or with respect to which there is a reasonable basis to believe that the information can be used to identify an individual, may not disclose the information for any purpose other than such recovery auditing or recovery activity and governmental oversight of such activity, unless disclosure for that other purpose is authorized by the individual to the executive agency that contracted for the performance of the recovery auditing or recovery activity.

(6) OTHER RECOVERY AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), subchapter VI of chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code, is repealed.

(ii) Section 3562(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall continue in effect, except that references in such section 3562(a) to programs carried out under section 3561 of such title, shall be interpreted to mean programs carried out under section 2(h) of this Act.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter relating to subchapter VI.

(ii) DEFINITION.—Section 3501 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and subchapter VI of this title''.

(iii) HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS.—Section 2022(a)(6) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''(as that term is defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 3561 of title 31, United States Code)'' and inserting ''under section 2(h) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note)''.

(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as provided under paragraph (5), nothing in this section shall be construed as terminating or in any way limiting authorities that are otherwise available to agencies under existing

provisions of law to recover improper payments and use recovered amounts.

(i) REPORT ON RECOVERY AUDITING.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officers Council established under section 302 of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (31 U.S.C. 901 note), in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency established under section 7 of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 110–409) and recovery audit experts, shall conduct a study of—

(1) the implementation of subsection (h);

(2) the costs and benefits of agency recovery audit activities, including—

(A) those activities under subsection (h); and

(B) the effectiveness of using the services of—

(i) private contractors;

(ii) agency employees;

(iii) cross-servicing from other agencies; or

(iv) any combination of the provision of services described under clauses (i) through (iii); and

(3) submit a report on the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Comptroller General.

SEC. 3. COMPLIANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given under section 2(f) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) as redesignated by this Act.

(2) ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—The term ''annual financial statement'' means the annual financial statement required under section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, or similar provision of law.

(3) COMPLIANCE.—The term ''compliance'' means that the agency—

(A) has published an annual financial statement for the most recent fiscal year and posted that report and any accompanying materials required under guidance of the Office of Management and Budget on the agency website;

(B) if required, has conducted a program specific risk assessment for each program or activity that conforms with section 2(a) the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note); and

(C) if required, publishes improper payments estimates for all programs and activities identified under section 2(b) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) in the accompanying materials to the annual financial statement;

(D) publishes programmatic corrective action plans prepared under section 2(c) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) that the agency may have in the accompanying materials to the annual financial statement;

(E) publishes improper payments reduction targets established under section 2(c) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) that the agency may have in the accompanying materials to the annual financial statement for each program assessed to be at risk, and is meeting such targets; and

(F) has reported an improper payment rate of less than 10 percent for each program and activity for which an estimate was published under section 2(b) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

(b) ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REPORT BY INSPECTORS GENERAL OF AGENCIES.—Each fiscal year, the Inspector General of each agency shall determine whether the agency is in compliance and submit a report on that determination to—

(1) the head of the agency;

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Oversight and Governmental Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Comptroller General.

(c) REMEDIATION.—

(1) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an agency is determined by the Inspector General of that agency not to be in compliance under subsection (b) in a fiscal year, the head of the agency shall submit a plan to Congress describing the actions that the agency will take to come into compliance.

(B) PLAN.—The plan described under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) measurable milestones to be accomplished in order to achieve compliance for each program or activity;

(ii) the designation of a senior agency official who shall be accountable for the progress of the agency in coming into compliance for each program or activity; and

(iii) the establishment of an accountability mechanism, such as a performance agreement, with appropriate incentives and consequences tied to the success of the official designated under clause (ii) in leading the efforts of the agency to come into compliance for each program and activity.

(2) NONCOMPLIANCE FOR 2 FISCAL YEARS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an agency is determined by the Inspector General of that agency not to be in compliance under subsection (b) for 2 consecutive fiscal years for the same program or activity, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that additional funding would help the agency come into compliance, the head of the agency shall obligate additional funding, in an amount determined by the Director, to intensified compliance efforts.

(B) FUNDING.—In providing additional funding described under subparagraph (A), the head of an agency shall use any reprogramming or transfer authority available to the agency. If after exercising that reprogramming or transfer authority additional funding is necessary to obligate the full level of funding determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under subparagraph (A), the agency shall submit a request to Congress for additional reprogramming or transfer authority.

(3) REAUTHORIZATION AND STATUTORY PROPOSALS.—If an agency is determined by the Inspector General of that agency not to be in compliance under subsection (b) for more than 3 consecutive fiscal years for the same program or activity, the head of the agency shall, not later than 30 days after such determination, submit to Congress—

(A) reauthorization proposals for each program or activity that has not been in compliance for 3 or more consecutive fiscal years; or

(B) proposed statutory changes necessary to bring the program or activity into compliance.

(d) COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT PILOT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may establish 1 or more pilot programs which shall test potential accountability mechanisms with appropriate incentives and consequences tied to success in ensuring compliance with this Act and eliminating improper payments.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to Congress on the findings associated with any pilot programs conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include any legislative or other recommendations that the Director determines necessary.

(e) REPORT ON CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS ACT OF 1990.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officers Council established under section 302 of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (31 U.S.C. 901 note) and the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency established under section 7 of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 110–409), in consultation with a broad cross-section of experts and stakeholders in Government accounting and financial management shall—

(1) jointly examine the lessons learned during the first 20 years of implementing the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (31 U.S.C. 901) and identify reforms or improvements, if any, to the legislative and regulatory compliance framework for Federal financial management that will optimize Federal agency efforts to—

(A) publish relevant, timely, and reliable reports on Government finances; and

(B) implement internal controls that mitigate the risk for fraud, waste, and error in Government programs; and

(2) jointly submit a report on the results of the examination to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Comptroller General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget recently reported that the Federal Government made $98 billion in improper and overpayments last year. This is a staggering amount and completely unacceptable. No family or business in America would tolerate being charged twice or overbilled for anything, and neither should our government.

We need to do everything we can to ensure that the government spends every tax dollar in the most responsible way possible. In fact, we have an obligation to the taxpayers to fight waste, fraud and abuse and to ensure that if the government overpays for something, it has the means to recover those precious tax dollars.

The bill we're now considering, S. 1508, the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010, will provide the government with the means to fulfill this obligation to the taxpayers.

Senate 1508 amends the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 to require the head of each Federal agency to review agency programs and activities every 3 fiscal years and identify those programs that may be susceptible to significant improper payments. If agency heads determine that significant overpayments have occurred, they must then recover them by following the procedures in the act.

The bill also requires the agencies which make significant improper payments to implement internal controls and other procedures to help eliminate any future improper payments.

□ 1040

The House passed a companion bill, H.R. 3393, the Improper Payments Elimination Act of 2009, introduced by Representative PATRICK MURPHY on April 28, 2010, by a voice vote. S. 1508 has small but important changes from the base text in H.R. 3393. S. 1508 strengthens the bill by requiring recovery audit contractors to report the fraud they find and to conduct appropriate training on the means and methods to do so. S. 1508 also requires the agencies to report to Congress and OMB their actions and plans to address the recommendations they receive from the audit recovery contractors.

S. 1508 provides the Federal Government with the tools needed to prevent mistakes and overpayments in the first place, and recover funds that are paid in error. It makes Federal agencies more accountable for properly managing taxpayer funds. The bill requires agencies to develop and report corrective action plans based on measured error rates, and creates incentives for meeting their goals and penalties for failure. Importantly, the bill also gives the agency the means to go after the funds they have overpaid, which will make the taxpayer, agencies, programs, and activities which relied on those appropriations whole.

We are living in a time when our government is living under extreme fiscal demands, and we need to do everything possible to ensure that every tax dollar goes to where it is needed. To ensure this takes place, we need to provide our Federal agencies with the tools to properly manage their spending. We also need to give the agencies the ability to follow through with their oversight and provide them with the ability to recover erroneous payments. However, we cannot stop there. We must do everything we can to ensure that Federal agencies that make improper payments fix the problems that allowed the improper payments in the first place.

I would like to thank Representatives MURPHY, BILBRAY, TOWNS, and ISSA for working together in a truly bipartisan manner to get this important piece of legislation enacted into law. S. 1508 is a commonsense, good government bill, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill 1508, the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010. The amount of waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars by Federal agencies is absolutely staggering. The Office of Management and Budget, the OMB, has reported that nearly $100 billion is wasted each year as a result of mistakes by our Federal agencies when paying for products and services. Last year, roughly $98 billion was lost in improper payments, $98 billion, the result of fraud or poor financial management. Half of this came from Medicare and Medicaid programs alone.

Ninety-eight billion dollars is more than double the budget of the Department of Homeland Security. At a time when our country is facing record budget deficits, we cannot afford to lose billions of dollars each year to mistakes and fraud.

Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, the House passed H.R. 3393, the companion to Senate bill 1508. The Senate has since made improvements to the legislation that will strengthen our ability to eliminate improper payments and recover lost funds. Like H.R. 3393, Senate bill 1508 helps prevent improper payments by requiring agencies to report their corrective action plans and improper payment reduction targets used to remedy their payment error problems, lowers the reporting threshold for improper payments, and expands the use of recovery auditing by requiring that all agencies with outlays of more than $1 million perform recovery audits on their programs and activities to increase the recovery of overpayments.

Senate bill 1508 strengthens H.R. 3393 by requiring additional reporting and training related to fraud, and ensures that agencies take action to mitigate overpayment vulnerabilities by requiring agencies to report to the OMB and the Congress on the measures that they are taking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation to help stop the waste, fraud, and abuse of the taxpayer dollars. We should expect nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to one of the key people in the development of this legislation, my colleague from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed working with PATRICK MURPHY, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, developing this bill, really looking at creating a transparent process so the American people can finally see what they have been telling Washington for a long time existed.

While this is a small step, it is a good example of what the American people have been demanding over the years, but especially just recently. I think all of us that go home and talk to our constituents understand that the exchanges with the average citizen for a Member of Congress has been let's just say brisk to say the least. And one of the greatest things that the American people are upset about is the feeling that their money is not being handled appropriately, that the dollars and cents that the Federal Government is taking from them after they work hard for every dollar and cent is not being handled in an appropriate way that they feel confident with.

Today we are going to take an action that is a small step. It's not going to solve the problem, but it is very much an indication of the kind of action the American people have been demanding. The fact is it's time that the bipartisan forces in this Congress and in future Congresses understand that our greatest responsibility and obligation is not to the party leaders of either Republican or Democrat, but to the taxpayers who pay our salary, but more importantly, trust us with their hard-earned money to use it appropriately and responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about this year facing a $1.3 trillion deficit, I think that we have got to recognize it's time that we start doing what the American people are demanding. Ending improper payments is the low-hanging fruit right now. Basically, it's there for the picking. And that's probably why we are able to do it today.

Frankly, according to the Office of Management and Budget, we are talking about approximately $98 billion. Now, $98 billion seems to be an abstract, but consider the fact that that is almost twice what we spend on the homeland security budget. We talk about defending our neighborhoods, trying to secure our borders, trying to make sure terrorism stays out of our communities, we talk a lot about that. But when we recognize that we are now giving away, wrongly, twice as much money as we spend on our own homeland security, I think the American people have a reason to be outraged, and justifiably so.

By working in a bipartisan manner, we have been able to get the Senate to cooperate and craft a solution for this long-standing problem. And frankly, I think our bill really does set the goal that we should try to follow, and that is, let's find out how much more we can cooperate, how many more dollars we can save, and how much more credibility we can finally start bringing back to this body from the American people, for the American people. Our bill is endorsed by the budget watchdog organizations liked the National Taxpayers Union and the Council on Citizens Against Government Waste.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving as the ranking member for the Subcommittee on Procurement. I not only strongly ask my colleagues to support this bill, but I would like to leave you with a question, a question for Republicans and Democrats, but most importantly a question the American people would like to ask. And that

is, how much more could we save if this Congress was brave enough to look deeper into our budget and our expenditures? How much more could we be saving for the taxpayer or providing to the citizens if we were brave enough to really audit our own books the way we expect the private sector and citizens to do every year?

If we only had the bravery to look in and find the truth and take action on it, I think that when we go back to our districts there would be a different welcome, a different type of response. And frankly, I think the response we have received in the past is one that we have deserved. Hopefully, we will earn the right to deserve a more positive response from the constituents when we take this action and follow it up with more concrete action to make sure that we do maintain the trust.

So again, I ask Congress let's take this as a first step. I appreciate the support from my colleague from his great State to be able to say let's work together, let's make the move, but let's stop being in denial that there isn't more that Congress ought to do to maintain the integrity of our budget process.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to one of the persons who worked extremely hard to bring this legislation to the floor and to craft a very excellent piece of legislation, Representative MURPHY.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle, Republican Representative BRIAN BILBRAY from California, for partnering with me on this bipartisan bill for commitment to fiscal responsibility. I also want to thank the other Chamber over in the Senate, specifically Senator TOM CARPER, for his tireless efforts in advancing this legislation over in the other body, and his Republican colleague on this bill, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

□ 1050

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is proof that good things can happen when Democrats and Republicans are willing to work together and put their differences aside for commonsense measures to get things done for the American taxpayer.

Now, I am so proud that after 2 years of hard work on this piece of legislation, Mr. BILBRAY and I, after we vote on this today in this House because it just passed in the Senate, will be sending this bill to the President of the United States for signature and it will become law. In this time of tightened belts and strained budgets, it is more important than ever to get our fiscal house in order and to eliminate waste from our system and make sure that we earn the trust of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act, is a bipartisan, commonsense solution to cut waste from the Federal budget and streamline the payment systems of Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American people would be horrified to learn that every day the Federal Government either overpays or pays twice the amount for products and services than they need to. In fiscal year 2009 alone, Federal agencies made nearly $98 billion in improper payments. These improper payments occur as a result of fraud or from poor financial management systems that do not detect or prevent mistakes before Federal dollars are already out the door.

This bill, our bill, will help identify, reduce, and eliminate these improper payments. It will cut fraud and abuse by requiring agencies to develop action plans to avoid improper payments.

Mr. Speaker, I think now is the time that we must demand higher levels of fiscal management and accountability from each Federal agency. There needs to be repercussions of money misspent and wasted. That is why this legislation contains strong measures to hold those in power accountable for failing the American taxpayer. And perhaps most importantly, this legislation would force the Federal Government to reclaim more money that was improperly sent out.

My bill ensures that the Federal Government holds itself to the same standard of fiscal responsibility as any hardworking household or any business would across America and in my home district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. It will save the American taxpayers billions of dollars that would otherwise be lost.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we already know that this legislation will work by setting stricter targets for reducing and recovering improper payments. The Office of Management and Budget was able to reduce errors in the food stamp program by a little more than half of a percentage point. But those stamps and a fraction of a percent saved the American taxpayer $330 million just last year. That's one little program and one little agency, a half of a percentage point. That's $330 million. That's $330 million that can go to pay off our national debt, to provide tax relief to middle class families, or make critical investments in our future. With this bill, we can replicate that success in every single Federal agency and every program within the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, after 2 hard years to get this to this point today, we all know that this legislation is long overdue. The American people are demanding that this kind of action from our government today will happen, and it's about time.

So I want to thank Mr. BILBRAY. I want to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member DARRELL ISSA. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and finally, after years of hard work, that we pass this legislation on behalf of the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my father always taught us that a penny saved was a penny earned. And, of course, if it's good enough for our families, it certainly is good enough for our national government.

I compliment the gentleman on the development of an excellent piece of legislation. I urge its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1508.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DAVID JOHN DONAFEE POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5390) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13301 Smith Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the ''David John Donafee Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DAVID JOHN DONAFEE POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13301 Smith Road in Cleveland, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''David John Donafee Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''David John Donafee Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio, Representative KUCINICH.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank my colleague and all Members for their support of this bill: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and my colleague Ms. SUTTON.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to offer today H.R. 5390, which renames the post office located at 13301 Smith Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the ''David John Donafee Post Office Building.'' I would like to thank Chairman LYNCH for his efforts to bring H.R. 5390 to the floor of the House.

David John Donafee was a lifelong northeast Ohioan who committed his life to family and community. He was born and raised in Brook Park, Ohio, and graduated from Polaris High School in Berea.

He served northeast Ohio as a postal carrier for 14 years. His coworkers knew David for his geniality and positive spirit, his sense of humor and willingness to go out of his way for anyone. One coworker remarked, ''He was the guy that made the place a little better.''

David was well known in the local hockey community for his support of and involvement in his son's youth hockey league. He announced and scored the games. He was the ''heart of all of the teams,'' according to his wife, Sandi.

Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 2008, Valentine's Day, David Donafee was walking his mail route in Parma Heights, Ohio. He was delivering the mail to people on his route just like he did every other day, but this day was different. He was struck by a car while in the line of his duties as a postal worker, as a mail carrier, and he was killed. His tragic death resounded in the community and resounded with his coworkers.

He left behind his wife, Sandi, and their two sons, Derek and Liam. And my thoughts and the thoughts of the people in the community continue to be with the Donafee family as they adjust to life without their beloved David.

In honoring David John Donafee by naming a post office building after him, we actually honor all of those who deliver the mail, showing that when something like an unexpected tragedy happens, that this Congress does appreciate the work of those who make it possible for the commerce of the country to move by virtue of the mail.

□ 1100

So I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of David John Donafee and honoring his legacy. I urge passage of H.R. 5390.

[From cleveland.com, Sept. 4, 2008]

SOUTHWEST BREWFEST TO BENEFIT FAMILY OF DECEASED LETTER CARRIER DAVID DONAFEE

(By Damon Sims)

Neither snow nor rain nor gloom of night kept David Donafee from his appointed rounds.

Nor could a little foul weather keep the 42-year-old letter carrier from scoring his son's Padua High School hockey games, or from the Friday night beer-and-bull session with his buddies at the Brew Kettle Taproom & Smokehouse in Strongsville.

''It was like 'Cheers,' '' said Donafee's wife, Sandi. ''My husband was kind of the life of the party, but in a quiet, gentle way.''

That all changed on a gloomy Valentine's Day this year. Donafee, a postman for 14 years, was making his rounds about noon when he was struck by a car and killed while crossing York Road near Valley Forge High School in Parma Heights. The driver, a 19-year-old Cleveland man, was questioned. No charges have been filed, and the accident remains under investigation.

Donafee, of Brunswick, is survived by his wife, Sandi, and sons, Derek, 15, and Liam, 11. His death also left a void in the youth-hockey community, with his postal-worker colleagues and with his friends at the Brew Kettle, who remember him as a fun and convivial companion.

''He was one of the happiest, most positive people I've ever met,'' said the Brew Kettle's owner, Chris McKim. ''When the world loses a grouch, it's sad. When it loses a guy like Dave, a guy who was always upbeat and always on his A-game, it's a tragedy.''

The different forces that helped define Donafee's life—good friends, good music, good beer—are coming together Saturday for an event designed to honor his memory and help his family. McKim has organized the first Southwest Brewfest, a charity craft-beer festival at the Chalet near the Cleveland Metroparks' toboggan chutes in the Mill Stream Run Reservation in Strongsville.

The festival will feature beer from brewers in Cleveland's southern and western suburbs: Brew Kettle, Rocky River Brewing Co., Cornerstone Brewing Co. and Buckeye Brewing.

Musicians David Fayne, Woody Leffel and the Armstrong Bearcat Band will provide the soundtrack to the event, which takes place from 1 to 7 p.m. The $30 ticket will include a commemorative glass along with 10 four-ounce beer samples.

Proceeds will help the Donafee family with Derek's $8,300 annual tuition at Padua, a Catholic preparatory school in Parma Heights.

The annual event will also help send Liam, now a sixth-grader, to Padua. Leftover money will go directly to Padua to benefit other students.

That would have meant a lot to Donafee, who said Derek's experience at Padua turned around his son's academic career, according to McKim, himself a Padua graduate.

Donafee's death didn't escape the notice of the powers-that-be. Earlier this year, U.S. Rep. Dennis Kucinich paid tribute to the mail carrier on the floor of the House. Sandi Donafee has the congressman's words inscribed on a plaque in her living room.

''May his life be an example of how we should lead our own,'' Kucinich told colleagues.

And what would the genial mailman have thought of all the attention?

''It would have made Dave smile,'' McKim said with a chuckle.

[From cleveland.com, Feb. 14, 2009]

WIDOW SANDI DONAFEE OF BRUNSWICK MOURNS HUSBAND, DAVID, WHO WAS KILLED ON VALENTINE'S DAY

(By Stan Donaldson, Plain Dealer Reporter)

PARMA HEIGHTS.—Sandi Donafee left a handmade valentine Tuesday on York Road for her husband—a cracked heart.

As cars drove by the poster-size card, a tear rolled down the cheek of the 43-year-old Brunswick woman's face.

This is where her husband, David, a U.S. postal worker, was killed last Valentine's Day after he was hit by a car as he crossed the street while delivering mail.

Since the accident, Donafee, a hairstylist, has had to raise her two teenage sons without their dad. His postal brethren, family and friends have worked to help them through the grieving process.

''I feel like this has been one big nightmare that I haven't been able to wake up from,'' said Donafee, as she looked at a two-sided valentine she placed on a telephone pole. It reads ''Recklessness took my love.''

The valentine includes a photo of the couple smiling.

Police said David Donafee, a 42-year-old father of two, was hit by Jeff Kluter, 19, as he crossed York near Independence Street. Donafee was not in a crosswalk.

Kluter was arraigned on misdemeanor aggravated vehicular homicide charges in November. Kluter has a pretrial hearing scheduled for Monday.

If convicted, he faces up to six months in jail and a fine of up to $1,000.

Messages left for Kluter were not returned this week. Donafee's family and friends are upset because they feel the Cleveland man should face more time in jail. Sandi Donafee also wants Parma Heights City Council to reduce the 35 mph speed limit to 25 mph because it's near Valley Forge High School and Cuyahoga Community College.

Eric Donafee, 51, said the family will forever be heartbroken.

He said his kid brother left the steel industry in his mid-20s to become a postal worker because he thought of it as a safer career.

[From cleveland.com, Feb. 15, 2009]

A CRACKED HEART MARKS BRUNSWICK WOMAN'S VALENTINE PAIN

(By John Kroll, The Plain Dealer)

PARMA HEIGHTS.—Sandi Donafee left a hand-made Valentine Tuesday on York Road for her husband—a cracked heart.

As cars drove by the poster-size card, a tear rolled down the cheek of the 43-year-old Brunswick woman's face.

This is where her husband David Donafee, a U.S. postal worker, was killed last Valentine's Day after he was hit by a car as he crossed the street while delivering mail.

Since the accident, Donafee, a hair stylist, has had to raise her two teen-age sons without their dad. His postal brethren, family and friends have worked to help them through the grieving process.

''I feel like this has been one big nightmare that I haven't been able to wake up from,'' said Donafee, as she looked at a two-sided Valentine she placed on a telephone pole that says ''Recklessness took my love.''

The Valentine includes a photo of the couple smiling.

Police said that Donafee, a 42-year-old father of two, was hit by Jeff Kluter, 19, as he crossed York near Independence Street. Donafee was not in a crosswalk.

Kluter was arraigned on misdemeanor aggravated vehicular homicide charges in November. Kluter has a pre-trial hearing scheduled for Monday.

If convicted, he faces up to six months in jail and fine of up to $1,000.

Messages left for Kluter were not returned this week. Donafee's family and friends are upset because they feel the Cleveland man should face more time in jail. Sandi Donafee also wants Parma Heights City Council to reduce the 35 mph speed limit to 25 mph because it's near Valley Forge and Cuyahoga Community College.

Eric Donafee, 51, said the family will forever be heartbroken. He said his kid brother left the steel industry in his mid 20s to become a postal worker because he thought of it as a safer career.

''It happened because [the driver] was negligent,'' his brother said. ''He broke a lot of hearts and it isn't right.''

His sister-in-law also wants justice.

''I have tried in my heart to forgive him but I am not there yet,'' Donafee said. ''I look at what my boys and I lost . . . it is too hard.''

At the accident site, Donafee was surrounded by some of her husband's former coworkers from the Middleburg Heights post office branch where he had worked for 14 years. They stood at the makeshift memorial and shared stories.

In September, friends held a benefit in Strongsville that raised money for his sons—ages 16 and 11—to attend Padua, a Catholic prep school in Parma. Members from the post office will lay a wreath at his grave today—the family isn't emotionally ready to go back just yet.

''This shouldn't be a part of the job,'' said Paul Hunt, who worked with Donafee for more than 10 years. ''You shouldn't have to worry about getting hit by a car.''

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5390 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13301 Smith Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the David John Donafee Post Office Building.

I appreciate the good work that my colleague Mr. KUCINICH has done on this and his heartfelt and sincere approach to recognizing this great gentleman and the tragic situation but also the great life that he led.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we honor Mr. Donafee by naming this post office in Cleveland for him. It was out of this post office that he was based.

On February 14, Valentine's Day, 2008, David Donafee was delivering the mail on foot along his usual route in Parma Heights, Ohio, only minutes from the post office on Smith Road. As he was crossing York Road near Independence Boulevard, Mr. Donafee was struck and killed by a vehicle driving recklessly down the street.

Tragically, the 42-year-old husband and father of two was run over only blocks from the post office to be named in his memory. Mr. Donafee was killed on a route that is notorious among local mail carriers for dangerous drivers. I hope that the tragic circumstances of Mr. Donafee's death will serve as a call for safer driving on all roads across our country.

Prior to his career of delivering mail, Mr. Donafee had worked in a Cleveland area steel mill which he had told family members he felt was too dangerous of a place to work. His older brothers recall that David took the job in the post office so that he could have a safer place to work. Sadly, the 14-year veteran of the postal service couldn't escape the danger he had tried to get way from.

Mr. Donafee is remembered by his wife as a great father and by coworkers as a generous man who ''would do anything for you.'' He had a wonderful sense of humor, and according to fellow mail carriers, he was the guy that made the place a little better.

An active member of his community, Mr. Donafee was very involved with his town of Brunswick's youth hockey league.

Mr. Donafee was born on April 29, 1965, in Parma, Ohio. He leaves behind his wife, Sandi, of almost 18 years, and his two teenage sons, Derek and Liam. Our heart goes out to this family.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper that we pass this resolution to honor the memory of David John Donafee. I call on all Members of this House to support this measure and hope they know that members of the postal community, the greater postal community, those who work and serve every day in their lives, if by this small gesture we can remember them and give some degree of comfort to that family and that we always remember them.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BETTY SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I thank my colleague, Congressman KUCINICH, for his efforts and leadership on this legislation.

David John Donafee was a 42-year-old letter carrier for the U.S. Postal Service who lived in the congressional district that I am so honored to serve. He lived in Medina County, Ohio, in the city of Brunswick; and, sadly, David was crossing the street while walking his route when he was fatally hit by a car on February 14, 2008.

David was a devoted husband, a father, a son, a brother, a brother-in-law and uncle; and he was very involved in the community in children's hockey.

For 14 years, David delivered the mail; and to paraphrase the U.S. Postal Service's motto, he went about his life with duty, honor, and pride. Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, nor the winds of change, nor a Nation challenged stayed David from the swift completion of his appointed rounds. But tragically, a reckless driver did.

Our hearts remain with Sandi, his wife, his children, and the entire Donafee family. David's death was a tragedy that should not have happened. While we are honoring his life by naming the post office after him, as it should be, we also have a duty to remind drivers to yield to pedestrians crossing the street. We know that this small gesture will not close the hole in the Donafee family's hearts, but we want them to know that we care and we appreciate all that he did for our community. He connected us, one with another.

With this post office naming, we will remind people of David's noble service, and we will remind each other of our obligation to look out one for another.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in support of H.R. 5390, a bill designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13301 Smith Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the David John Donafee Post Office Building.

H.R. 5390 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative DENNIS KUCINICH, on May 25, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on June 7, 2010. The measure has the bipartisan support of 17 Members of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. David John Donafee was a letter carrier for the United States Postal Service for 14 years. An active member of his community, Mr. Donafee volunteered with the youth hockey league in his town of Parma, Ohio. Tragically, he passed way on February 14, 2008, at the age of 42, after being struck by the driver of a car while delivering mail on his regular route. He is survived by his wife, Sandi, and two sons, Derek and Liam.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donafee's untimely death during the course of his duties as a letter carrier is deeply saddening. Let us now pay tribute to this man's life through the passage of H.R. 5390. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5390.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5502. An act to amend the effective date of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009.

CLARENCE D. LUMPKIN POST OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4840) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the ''Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

On page 2, line 3, strike ''1979'' and insert ''1981''.

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to designate the facility of the United States

Postal Service located at 1981 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the 'Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office'.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in support of H.R. 4840, a bill designating the United States postal facility located at 1981 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office.

H.R. 4840 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative PATRICK TIBERI, on March 12, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which reported it by unanimous consent on March 18, 2010.

□ 1110

The measure passed the Senate with an amendment correcting the address by unanimous consent on May 25, 2010. It has bipartisan support from 17 members of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. Clarence Lumpkin was born in 1925 and spent years as a community activist in Columbus, Ohio. He is also affectionately referred to as the ''Mayor of Linden,'' a neighborhood in the northeastern part of the city.

Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Lumpkin has helped the Community Development Block Grant Task Force, persuaded the city to separate storm and sanitation sewers to stop basement flooding, led antidrug marches throughout Columbus, made Linden the first inner-city community with lights on every residential street, and improved the Linden area by including the Point of Pride concept that was first shared by city leaders in a speech given in 1974.

Before moving to Linden, Mr. Lumpkin served in the United States Army and is a veteran of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence Lumpkin has spent his life serving his community and his country doing everything he could to improve the lives of his fellow citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this great American by supporting this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4840, designating the United States Postal Service located at 1981 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4840 was passed by this body on March 21, 2010, by a vote of 420–0. The bill was originally passed with an incorrect street number in the address. With the address now accurate and the correction being made, I fully support the passage of H.R. 4840. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 4840.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM BRADLEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5450) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5450

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TOM BRADLEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. WATSON), the author of this legislation.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5450. I would also like to thank the members of the California delegation for supporting this bill.

H.R. 5450 would designate a Post Office in my district located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the Tom Bradley Post Office Building.

Tom Bradley served as the mayor of Los Angeles for an unprecedented 20 years, as a city councilman for 10 years, and as a Los Angeles police officer for 21 years. Tom Bradley, the son of sharecroppers and the grandson of a former slave, was born on December 29, 1917, to Lee and Crenner Bradley in Calvert, Texas. In 1924, the Bradleys moved to Los Angeles near Temple and Alvarado Streets.

A young Tom Bradley attended Polytechnic High School, where he starred in track and was an all-city football player. Upon graduating from high school in 1937, Bradley attended the University of California at Los Angeles on a track scholarship. During his junior year at UCLA, Bradley dropped out to attend the Los Angeles Police Academy.

After becoming a police officer in 1940 and serving many years in the department, Tom Bradley would rise to the rank of lieutenant, which was the highest rank for an African American at that time.

While working for the Los Angeles Police Department, Bradley studied at night at Southwestern University School of Law and received his law degree in 1956. He later passed the State bar, and in 1961 he would leave the LAPD to practice law.

In 1963, Tom Bradley, along with Billy Mills, would become the first African Americans elected to the Los Angeles City Council. Bradley would serve on the City Council until the year 1972. During his tenure on the City Council, he would speak out against racial segregation within the LAPD, as well as the department's handling of the Watts riots in 1965.

In 1969, Tom Bradley first challenged incumbent mayor Sam Yorty. Armed with key endorsements, Bradley held a substantial lead over Yorty in the primary, but was a few percentage points shy of winning the race outright. However, in the runoff, Yorty pulled an amazing come-from-behind victory to win reelection, primarily because he played racial politics.

In 1973, Tom Bradley would unseat Sam Yorty to become Los Angeles' first African American mayor and the second African American to be mayor of a major United States city.

During Tom Bradley's tenure as mayor, Los Angeles overtook San Francisco as the financial capital of the State and much of the West. The

City of Los Angeles sprouted a skyline of new and impressive office buildings, and with a booming international airport and Port of Los Angeles, the city became a transportation hub and gateway to the Pacific rim.

In 1982, as the Democratic Party nominee, Tom Bradley lost the race for California governor to George Deukmejian by less than 1 percentage point of the vote. The racial dynamics that appeared to underlie his narrow and unexpected loss in 1982 gave rise to the political term ''the Tom Bradley effect.''

In 1984, amid a chorus of people predicting disaster, Tom Bradley championed Los Angeles as the host of the Summer Olympics. The games were a huge success, bringing the city not only great publicity, but a $250 million surplus, and I am happy to announce that that surplus has grown and it still remains around $300 million.

Tom Bradley's most difficult moments as mayor came in the last years of his tenure. During the 1992 Los Angeles riots, more than 50 people were killed in the civil unrest following the acquittal of the police officers involved in the Rodney King beating.

During a speech in September of 1992 when Bradley announced he would not seek a sixth term as mayor, he stated, ''The April unrest tore at my heart, and I will not be at peace until we have healed our wounds and rebuilt our neighborhoods. Let us all, every one of us, pledge to make Los Angeles a beacon of mutual respect, justice and tolerance from this day forward.''

□ 1120

The words of tolerance, justice, and respect were how Tom Bradley lived his life, governed the city of Los Angeles, and created coalitions with people from every race, religion, and ethnic background.

At the age of 80, Tom Bradley died on September 29, 1998. He was survived by his late wife, Ethel Bradley, and their two daughters, Lorraine and Phyllis. The city of Los Angeles will never have a mayor that served as long as Tom Bradley and had the type of impact and influence he commanded. For this Congress to give Tom Bradley this honor would be fitting, due to his life's work as a public servant working to bring justice and prosperity to all citizens of Los Angeles.

And I proudly, Mr. Speaker, would like all of you to know Tom Bradley followed my father, who was a police officer in Los Angeles, and he was proud to say that he helped to train him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5450.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5450, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building.'' Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this for the late Mayor Tom Bradley, a man who tirelessly and selflessly served the citizens of Los Angeles, and who truly embodies the quintessential American success story.

Born in Calvert, Texas, on December 29, 1917, Mayor Bradley was the son of sharecroppers and the grandson of a slave. In 1924, he moved to Los Angeles, where he was raised by his single mother and excelled in school and athletics. Upon graduation from high school, Mayor Bradley attended the University of California at Los Angeles, or UCLA, where he ran track and field, as well as achieving multiple records, and eventually became the team captain. When he graduated from UCLA in 1940, Mayor Bradley joined the Los Angeles Police Department and eventually was promoted to the rank of lieutenant. He was the first African American in the department's history to attain that rank. While working for the LAPD, Mr. Bradley attended Southwestern Law School at night and graduated in 1956. He passed the State Bar of California on the first try, and in 1961 resigned from the LAPD so he could practice law full time.

Mr. Speaker, like so many of us, Tom Bradley entered politics because he cared about the community in which he resided. In 1949, he volunteered for an Los Angeles City Council campaign and during his time at the LAPD he became active in the Democratic Minority Conference and the California Democratic Council. In 1963, he threw his hat into the political ring and was elected to the Los Angeles City Council, representing the city's 10th District. That year marked the first time in the city's history that an African American was elected to the city council, Bradley being one of those three.

After winning reelection in 1967, the always ambitious Bradley ran for mayor of Los Angeles in 1969. After winning the primary, Bradley lost in a runoff in his bid for mayor to Sam Yorty. Not discouraged by the outcome of his first try for mayor, Bradley ran again in 1973, this time beating Sam Yorty. Bradley became the first African American elected as mayor of Los Angeles. Mayor Bradley was able to win by building a multiethnic coalition that transcended race and united residents from all walks of life.

Tom Bradley would go on to serve five consecutive terms. During his 20 years in office, Mayor Bradley did much for the citizens of Los Angeles. Under his stewardship, Los Angeles became the financial capital of California and gained international prominence as the gateway to the Pacific Rim. Not only did Bradley promote and expand international trade and travel through Los Angeles, he improved social services and the lives of those struggling most in the inner city. Mayor Bradley doubled the number of minorities and women working in City Hall. And though he endured much opposition, he successfully brought civilian control over the Los Angeles Police Department.

Aside from the economic development and skyline of new and impressive buildings in downtown Los Angeles, many would argue that Mayor Bradley's greatest accomplishment surrounded the 1984 Summer Olympics hosted in Los Angeles. Amid much skepticism, Mayor Bradley was able to not only bring the games to Los Angeles, but he helped make them a huge success. Los Angeles received fame and publicity. And when the games left town, Los Angeles had a $250 million surplus that evidently continues to grow. After serving five terms as mayor, Tom Bradley resigned in 1993. He was the city's longest-serving mayor.

Tragically, in 1996, Mayor Bradley suffered a debilitating stroke that left him partially paralyzed and not able to speak. Then, on September 29, 1998, Mayor Bradley passed away after suffering a heart attack. He was 80 years old. Surviving him was his wife of 57 years, Ethel Arnold Bradley, as well as his two daughters, Lorraine and Phyllis.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I leave this body with a quote from Mayor Bradley upon his resignation as mayor, where he said, ''Let us all, every one of us, pledge to make Los Angeles a beacon of mutual respect, justice, and tolerance from this day forward.'' I firmly believe this is a pledge that not only Angelenos should take, but that all Americans should consider.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper that we pass this legislation in honor of the memory of Mayor Tom Bradley, a true American hero and success story. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 5450 for consideration. This measure would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles California as the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building.''

H.R. 5450 was introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Representative DIANE WATSON, on May 27, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on June 17, 2010. The measure enjoys the bipartisan support of 52 members of the California delegation.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Bradley was born on December 29, 1917, in Calvert, Texas. The son of a sharecropper and the grandson of former slaves, Mr. Bradley achieved many firsts over the course of his career in Los Angeles, where he moved with his family as a child. He

was the first African American lieutenant in the Los Angeles Police Department, where he served for 22 years. He took night classes at the Southwestern University School of Law during this time and received a law degree in 1956. In 1963, he was elected to the Los Angeles City Council and was its first African American member. He was also the city's first African American mayor as well as the longest-serving mayor in the city's history, serving from 1974 to 1994.

Mr. Bradley was a physically imposing figure, standing well over 6 feet tall, but his manner was soft, low-key, and calming. He helped lead Los Angeles through difficult times, including the first energy crisis of 1973 to 1974, and helped to boost economic development and investment in the city. Following the riots associated with the Rodney King incident in 1992, Mr. Bradley, along with then-Governor Pete Wilson, formed the Rebuild Los Angeles Task Force, an extensive effort to revitalize the city. Mr. Bradley also formed the Christopher Commission in July of 1991, charging it with conducting ''a full and fair examination of the structure and operation of the Los Angeles Police Department, including its recruitment and training practices, internal disciplinary system, and citizen complaint system.''

□ 1130

And so, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bradley's leadership, vision for his community, and skill as a conscientious administrator are inspirations to us all. Let us now pay tribute to this great American through the passage of H.R. 5450. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Again, I commend Representative DIANE WATSON for introducing this legislation. It deserves all of our votes, and I would urge its passage.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5450, which honors long-time Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley by designating the United States Postal Service located at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, the ''Tom Bradley Post Office Building.'' H.R. 5450 is an important measure that commends a man who has left a lasting and positive impact on the Los Angeles community and our nation.

I would like to thank Chairman TOWNS for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the sponsor of this legislation, Congresswoman WATSON, for taking the time to honor Tom Bradley and his historic contributions to our ration's social and economic progress.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Tom Bradley did much to improve the city of Los Angeles during his record five terms as mayor. In his 20 years in office, Los Angeles successfully hosted the 1984 Olympics and passed Chicago to become the second most populous city in the country. These changing dynamics brought social challenges that demanded incredible leadership from Mayor Bradley. After the 1992 Rodney King riots he worked tirelessly to rebuild Los Angeles and continue the process of racial reconciliation. Mayor Bradley famously stated, ''The April unrest tore at my heart, and I will not be at peace until we have healed our wounds and rebuilt our neighborhoods. Let us all, every one of us, pledge to make Los Angeles a beacon of mutual respect, justice and tolerance from this day forward.''

Prior to his record five terms as mayor of Los Angeles, Tom Bradley served on the Los Angeles City Council from 1963 to 1972. In 1963, he and Mr. Billy G. Mills became the first African Americans elected to the City Council. The district that he represented was based around the ethnically diverse Crenshaw neighborhood. During his tenure, he spoke out against racial segregation within the LAPD, as well as the department's mishandling of the Watts Riots in 1965.

Growing up in the Los Angeles area, Mayor Tom Bradley had a positive impact on my life. His service to our community, commitment to social and economic progress, and hard work to bring about racial reconciliation was an example that inspired me to get involved in public service. I am grateful for the progress that he led in the Los Angeles community.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that we honor and express our national gratitude for Mayor Tom Bradley's record service, during which time he worked on behalf of millions of Americans and helped fight poverty, inequality, and social injustice. The U.S. Postal Service building at 3894 Crenshaw Boulevard will honor a great humanitarian, politician, and all around remarkable individual. Naming a post office in his honor is the least we can do to recognize Mayor Tom Bradley's great contributions to the Los Angeles community and our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5450.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5450.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS', SENIORS', AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2010

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5712) to provide for certain clarifications and extensions under Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans', Seniors', and Children's Health Technical Corrections Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF PART B SPECIAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR DISABLED TRICARE BENEFICIARIES.

Effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 111–148, section 3110(a)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to elections made on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.''.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF DELAY OF RUG–IV.

Effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 111–148, section 10325 of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION FOR AFFILIATED HOSPITALS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENCY POSITIONS.

Effective as if included in the enactment of section 5503(a) of Public Law 111–148, section 1886(h)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(h)(8)), as added by such section 5503(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) AFFILIATION.—The provisions of this paragraph shall be applied to hospitals which are members of the same affiliated group (as defined by the Secretary under paragraph (4)(H)(ii)) and the reference resident level for each such hospital shall be the reference resident level with respect to the cost reporting period that results in the smallest difference between the reference resident level and the otherwise applicable resident limit.''.

SEC. 5. CONTINUED INCLUSION OF ORPHAN DRUGS IN DEFINITION OF COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS WITH RESPECT TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS UNDER THE 340B DRUG DISCOUNT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUG.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 340B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256b) is amended by striking ''covered entities described in subparagraph (M)'' and inserting ''covered entities described in subparagraph (M) (other than a children's hospital described in subparagraph (M))''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 2302 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1927(a)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–8(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''and a children's hospital'' and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting a period.

SEC. 6. MEDICAID AND CHIP TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES FROM MEDICAID.—Section 6502 of Public Law 111–148 is repealed and the provisions of law amended by such section are restored as if such section had never been enacted. Nothing in the previous sentence shall affect the execution or placement of the insertion made by section 6503 of such Act.

(b) INCOME LEVEL FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN UNDER MEDICAID.—Effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 111–148, section 2001(a)(5)(B) of such Act is amended by striking all that follows ''is amended'' and inserting the following: ''by inserting after '100 percent' the following: '(or, beginning January 1, 2014, 133 percent)'.''.

(c) CALCULATION AND PUBLICATION OF PAYMENT ERROR RATE MEASUREMENT FOR CERTAIN YEARS.—Section 601(b) of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–3) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary is not required under this subsection to calculate or publish a national or a State-

specific error rate for fiscal year 2009 or fiscal year 2010.''.

(d) CORRECTIONS TO EXCEPTIONS TO EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.—Section 2110(b)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397jj(b)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''PER PERSON'' in the heading; and

(B) by striking ''each employee'' and inserting ''employees''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', on a case-by-case basis,''.

(e) ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.—Effective as if included in the enactment of section 4201(a)(2) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), section 1903(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(t)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(E), by striking ''reduced by any payment that is made to such Medicaid provider from any other source (other than under this subsection or by a State or local government)'' and inserting ''reduced by the average payment the Secretary estimates will be made to such Medicaid providers (determined on a percentage or other basis for such classes or types of providers as the Secretary may specify) from other sources (other than under this subsection, or by the Federal government or a State or local government)''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(B), by inserting before the period the following: ''and shall be determined to have met such responsibility to the extent that the payment to the Medicaid provider is not in excess of 85 percent of the net average allowable cost''.

(f) CORRECTIONS OF DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(10), in the matter following subparagraph (G), by striking ''and'' before ''(XVI) the medical'' and by striking ''(XVI) if'' and inserting ''(XVII) if''; and

(B) in subsection (ii)(2), by striking ''(XV)'' and inserting ''(XVI)''.

(2) Section 2107(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg(e)(1)) is amended by redesignating the subparagraph (N) of that section added by 2101(e) of Public Law 111–148 as subparagraph (O).

SEC. 7. FUNDING FOR CLAIMS REPROCESSING.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of, and amendments made by, this Act that relate to title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and other provisions relating to such title that involve reprocessing of claims, there are appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account, from amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $95,000,000. Amounts appropriated under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8. EXTENSION OF SECTION 508 RECLASSIFICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(a) of division B of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 1395 note), as amended by section 117 of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–173), section 124 of the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–275), and sections 3137(a) and 10317 of Public Law 111–148, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2010'' and inserting ''September 30, 2011''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 117(a)(3) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–173), is amended by inserting ''in fiscal years 2008 and 2009'' after ''For purposes of implementation of this subsection''.

SEC. 9. REVISION TO THE MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following subparagraphs:

''(A) fiscal year 2015, $0;

''(B) fiscal year 2016, $125,000,000; and''.

SEC. 10. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority is again bringing to the floor more fixes to the fatally flawed health care overhaul. The health care law was riddled with errors; some were oversights, the likes of which we are here today to address. However, the majority has failed to rectify the fundamentally flawed policies that threaten our economic stability and America's health care, all the while driving Federal and State budgets down a further unsustainable path.

Mr. Speaker, where is the fix for the up to 117 million Americans with health insurance from their employers that, by the administration's own estimates, will not be able to keep the plan they have and like? That promise was repeatedly made by President Obama and the Democratic majority to assure to the American people that health care overhaul would not force them into a one-size-fits-all government-approved insurance plan. Unfortunately, this has repeatedly proven to be false.

Where is the fix for the millions of small businesses that will be forced to file 1099 tax forms for each business from which they purchase more than $600 worth of goods and services during this year? The National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, describes these new requirements as crippling, and they will further divert investment away from jobs, which should be our number one concern.

Mr. Speaker, where is the fix for seniors whose Medicare coverage is threatened by the health care overhaul? Medicare's own actuaries found that the $500 billion in Medicare cuts could jeopardize access to care for seniors. Furthermore, the actuaries predict millions of seniors will lose their Medicare plan because massive cuts to the program will result in ''about 50 percent'' of seniors no longer being in a plan.

Unfortunately, the merits of today's legislation pale in comparison to the merits of addressing the needs of the millions of Americans losing the plan they have and like, the small businesses facing burdensome new costs and regulations, and seniors relying on Medicare. When will these pressing needs be addressed?

Mr. Speaker, while I support the bill before us, it is not enough. We must move beyond mere technical corrections and fix the fundamental flaws of the Democrats' health care law by repealing it and replacing it with solutions that work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. I reserve the balance of my time at this point.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5712. It's a small but important bill. It's fully paid for and contains time-sensitive, mostly technical changes that strengthen the programs that care for the health of our Nation's veterans, senior citizens, and children. I appreciate the support of my distinguished ranking member for this bill.

This bill is supported by the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the American Hospital Association, Federation of American Hospitals, and most of the health care groups. And we can proceed on issues concerning other matters at another time.

At this point, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce, as a representative of the Energy and Commerce Committee, that we are not opposed to this bill and we're pleased with this these corrections. It is especially important that our veterans' access to care is not impeded or delayed and that these other corrections will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of some of the programs that our citizens depend on the most.

This bill, as the gentleman from California mentioned, is budget neutral. In fact, there may even be as much as a $50 million savings if everything goes right here, which I think is important. It's a small number with regard to the trillion-dollar deficit that we've already hit by the end of June and the

$1.5 trillion deficit that we may experience for this year.

I would like to see a budget where—I think we're missing an opportunity with items like this where we can save $50 million here, hopefully save $50 million here. If we had a budget, it could be part of a master plan to reduce our deficits and empower the private sector to create jobs.

These are technical corrections that are necessary. But this is what happens when the majority works in secret, crafts legislation that doesn't receive the input from others, the minority side. And, frankly, I wouldn't be surprised that, after drastically altering the health care system so quickly, we'll have many more technical corrections necessary as time goes on.

□ 1140

The technical errors, however, are hardly the biggest problems facing this country's health care system. Far worse are the looming ill effects of the majority's basic policy mistakes. Who doesn't know the problems in that they refuse to exercise the fundamental responsibility of the House to conduct oversight hearings on how this is set up. And the grandfathering clause has already been very confusing. This is what we'll have to look out for as the health care bill proceeds.

Now, just for the record, let's consider some of the problems that we face from this bill. The law will cut $575 billion out of Medicare. Concerning me equally as much is that it's with no direction from Congress, leaving these decisions to Health and Human Services and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

In Nebraska, in my district, many of my seniors rely on Medicare Advantage as a program, but $145 billion will be taken from Medicare Advantage, reducing the enrollment, according to the nonpartisan estimates, by as much as 50 percent.

It will raise spending nearly 90 percent for States in Medicaid programs, squeezing State taxpayers and crippling State budgets.

Despite the claims that the bill would lower health care costs and deficits, the Chief Actuary of Medicine has since concluded that spending won't go down, it will actually go up, as many people believed.

And remember the promise that if you like your coverage, you can keep it? With the new grandfathering rules that are being rolled out, it is now estimated that, and this is the administration's estimate, that as many as 66 percent of small businesses will not be eligible to keep what they have and will have to accept something from the exchange which will be pre-approved by HHS.

We're also learning the recession might worsen now because employers are hesitant to expand. We're hearing from many employers, articles in the Wall Street Journal, that they're sitting on cash because they don't want to spend now, be hit with these higher costs, and then have to lay off later. So it's arresting investment and hiring of new workers because businesses don't know the costs of implementation of this health care bill.

Now, the Democrats at every level are in hiding mode. They don't want a new public debate on this. We had a recess appointment of Donald Berwick, Dr. Donald Berwick, who is a great intellectual on medical savings, particularly in a British system that says that a rationing-type of system relies on a mathematical formula of age, as well as comparative effectiveness. And the comparative effectiveness provision in this bill provides Dr. Berwick carte blanche to implement those type of British policies.

This is probably—this won't be the last time that we hear about health care, but probably we won't hear about it until after November 2. The American people know why. I can only hope that we choose to conduct oversight of the new health care law and fix its disastrous effects.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise to join everybody else who has spoken in favor of this bill and urge passage of H.R. 5712, the Veterans, Seniors and Children's Health Technical Corrections Act. It's a small set of noncontroversial changes to the law needed to provide for the smooth functioning of the Medicare, Medicaid, Child Health Insurance, or CHIP program, as well as the 340B program. The legislation has no cost.

One provision ensures that a special enrollment period into Medicare part B does not exclude some of the veterans for whom the policy was intended.

Another provision clarifies that the redistribution of unused Medicare-funded residency slots not inadvertently take slots away from hospitals that were cooperating with other hospitals to actually use these slots. This is a practice that occurs in 36 States, and they want this clarification.

We also have a clarification that children's hospitals will continue to have access to discounts on orphan drugs through the 340B program tape.

The bill would modify the payment system for nursing facilities in Medicare, ensuring smoother operations of that program.

And virtually all of these provisions have been passed by the House at least once. Many of them have been passed by the Senate as well. This legislation needs to be enacted now because it modifies provisions of law that are coming into effect now, or will come into effect within the next few months.

So the legislation is fully paid for, will not increase the deficit. It involves technical corrections only. It's a bipartisan bill, and I'd urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5712.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWING IMPORT RESTRICTIONS OF BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 83

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a ''renewal resolution'' for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3)(B)(i) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''August 17, 2018'' and inserting ''August 24, 2018''.

SEC. 3. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

The percentage under paragraph (2) of section 561 of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act is increased by 0.25 percentage points.

SEC. 4. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This joint resolution and the amendments made by this joint resolution shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2010, whichever occurs earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to thank my friend, Mr. BOUSTANY, for being here this morning and joining in this resolution.

I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 83, a measure to renew the ban on imports from the country of Burma. The renewal of this bill is extremely important in the struggle for human rights and democracy in Burma. This measure, and other sanctions on Burma, prevent hundreds of millions of American dollars from getting into the hands of the military regime and funding its illegal activities.

We must never forget that the inspiration for this measure came from a remarkable woman, Nobel Peace Prize recipient Aung San Suu Kyi. She's the world's only imprisoned Nobel Peace Prize recipient. She and her political party, the National League for Democracy, have called on freedom-loving people throughout the world saying, and I quote, ''Please use your liberty to promote ours.''

That's what makes these sanctions categorically different from many other situations. The people of Burma support these sanctions.

I believe it's also important to remember that Burma's military regime, or its junta, is not simply a government that is rough on its own people. It is among the most brutal, maybe even the most brutal, regime in the world today.

□ 1150

The regime operates with complete impunity. The Burmese regime has recruited thousands of child soldiers, by some estimates more than any other country in the world today. The regime has destroyed over 3,500 ethnic minority villages, forcing hundreds of thousands of people to flee their homes in terror. Millions of these refugees live in neighboring countries like Thailand and Bangladesh.

The regime uses rape as a weapon of war against innocent Burmese women. Over 2,000 innocent civilians remain locked behind bars as political prisoners. And it's important to note that many of these abuses are not just human rights abuses; these are crimes against humanity. That is why the United Nations investigator on human rights in Burma called for an international investigation into war crimes and crimes against humanity in Burma. This is something I have been calling for myself for a very, very long time.

It is long overdue that the world acknowledges the regime, the junta, is guilty of many heinous crimes, and we must lead the effort to hold it accountable. As a first step, I hope the United States will go on record in acknowledging that the Burmese regime has continued crimes against humanity. At the same time, I hope the administration fully implements all the provisions of the Block Burmese JADE Act that we passed in 2008, including the tough banking sanctions enumerated into law. That also includes imposing tough financial sanctions on banks and companies propping up Burma's military regime and junta, even if those companies are not based in the United States themselves.

By passing the JADE Act, we gave the administration the authority to impose tough sanctions. Now it's time to make it happen. We don't have any time to wait. The Burmese regime is planning a sham election for this year that, without strong international action, will result in a government that is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

The regime has stacked the deck against the people of Burma so that the exact same military junta will be in power after the election. In fact, it is not really an election at all since the results are preordained. Aung San Suu Kyi is specifically barred from taking part in these elections. It would be a disservice to those struggling for freedom in Burma to recognize the results of this undemocratic and illegitimate election process.

The administration has worked hard I know to reach out to Burma's military regime and has urged them to change their ways. I believe those efforts, while worthwhile and valuable, have been completely and utterly rejected by the junta. In fact, the situation in Burma has grown worse. That's why now is the time to crank up the pressure on Burma's military junta.

I urge my colleagues to pass House Joint Resolution 83.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague and friend on the Ways and Means Committee in strong support of H.J. Res. 83, which would continue the imposition of sanctions against the repressive regime in Burma for another year.

The purpose of imposing sanctions against Burma is to promote democracy, develop a respect for human rights, and improve living conditions for the Burmese people. Unfortunately, the ruling junta is still dedicated to working against, not toward those objectives. For that reason, I am in favor of continuing our practice of extending import sanctions against Burma for another year.

Burma's regime is one of the world's most repressive. And it continues to oppress democratic movements and humanitarian efforts. In reading the State Department's human rights report on Burma, I am appalled at the extent and scale of grave human rights violations. According to the State Department, this repugnant regime, in which military officers wield the ultimate authority at every level of government, routinely continues to abridge the right of citizens to change their government and commits to other severe human rights abuses. Specifically, government security forces allowed custodial deaths to occur, and committed extrajudicial killings, disappearances, rape, and torture. The regime detains civic activists indefinitely and without charge, and engages in harassment, abuse, and detention of human rights and pro-democracy activists.

Opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi is still being falsely detained by the regime. And as of March 2010, the regime held an estimated 2,100 political prisoners. The army attacks ethnic minority villages. Violence and societal discrimination against women, recruitment of child soldiers, and trafficking in persons have continued. The regime also severely restricts freedom of assembly, expression, association, movement, and religion.

In addition, I am very concerned that the regime has taken steps that seem to guarantee that the elections that will be held in Burma later this year will not, in the words of the State Department, be transparent, inclusive, or credible. And I am still disappointed that there has not been additional multilateral pressure against this regime.

I strongly urge the administration to put more pressure on our trading partners and the United Nations to put the leaders of this regime and its cronies under targeted economic pressure that denies them access to personal wealth and sources of revenue. I call on the United Nations, Burma's Southeast Asian neighbors in ASEAN, and the People's Republic of China to step up engagement considerably.

I am pleased that this Congress amplified our sanctions 2 years ago to eliminate trade in jewelry containing Burmese rubies and jadeite, even if the jewelry was made in and exported from a third country. The expansion was designed to bring about multilateral pressure on the regime through the United Nations and World Trade Organization, similar to successful legislation on conflict diamonds. We are still in the process of assessing the effectiveness of that law.

The General Accountability Office reported to us several months ago on the effectiveness of the expanded sanctions, and we are considering its recommendations for improving the administration of the program and assuring that legitimate trade in these stones is not constrained. I must be clear that I generally view import sanctions with great skepticism. However, if there is a right way to impose sanctions, I think these Burma sanctions are crafted to maximize their ability to effect change.

For example, they require the administration to issue annual reports on

Burma that include whether U.S. national security, economic, and foreign policy interests are being served so we can make an informed decision. Perhaps the most critical aspect of the Burma sanctions program is that they require us to redirect our attention every summer to the question of whether these sanctions should be continued. They are not self-executing. We here in Congress must consider this issue and vote to continue them on an annual basis.

I continue to believe that our greatest hope for effecting real change in Burma is multilateralism. The whole world, particularly China and the ASEAN countries, must put economic pressure on this regime. I support this resolution because it increases our chances to bring about this multilateral effect.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And I couldn't agree with him more that we do need to see more of a multilateral impact on Burma, particularly China, India, and the surrounding countries of Bangladesh and Thailand and such. And it's my hope that we will continue to see further isolation of Burma. And I think we continue to stretch out a hand to encourage the regime, but they continue to keep slapping it back. And I think now is not the time for recognition; now is the time for further isolation.

So I appreciate the comments of my colleague and friend from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), and I know of his support for this.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members wishing to speak on this issue, and I am prepared to yield back my time. I look forward to working with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee in this effort to hopefully change this regime's behavior.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I appreciate my colleague's willingness to work with us in the future, and look forward to that as well on this and many other issues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 83, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: ''Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1722, TELEWORK IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1509

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform 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 of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, 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 Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 1496 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1509.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1509 provides for consideration of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate controlled by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order the substitute reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as modified by an amendment printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule also provides one motion to recommit the bill with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying bill. Even in this July heat, it is hard to forget the historic snowfall that blanketed the Washington region this past winter. OMB estimated that for each day the Federal Government was shut down during the storms, the government lost $71 million worth of productivity. Had some agencies not allowed their employees to telecommute, the cost of lost productivity would have been $100 million.

With today's mobile technology, we can do better to ensure that Federal employees can effectively telecommute regardless of weather conditions. The Telework Improvements Act will provide a framework to expand the current telecommuting program so that all Federal employees can enjoy the benefits. Telecommuting also helps to reduce traffic congestion. I don't think you will find too many Federal employees complaining about missing out on rush-hour traffic in metro D.C.

Now, some may argue that telecommuting will just allow lazy employees to sit at home and pretend to work. That's simply not the case. This bill requires agencies to establish a telecommuting policy that authorizes employees to telecommute to the maximum amount possible only to the extent that it doesn't diminish employee performance or agency operations.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the General Services Administration have already established efficient and effective telework policies.

For those concerned about the deficit, the bill is deficit neutral and, therefore, PAYGO compliant. CBO's estimated cost of $30 million over 5 years pales in comparison to the $71 million per day the government lost due to snow last winter.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind all of my colleagues that a bipartisan majority of them supported this bill when it came to the floor under suspension in May of this year. I urge them to once again support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as has become routine in this Congress, it's my sad duty to come before you yet again today to speak in opposition to spending this House's valuable time to consider a bill that would do absolutely nothing to respond to the very real concerns facing Americans every day.

Here we are with a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, the largest deficit in our history, and the national debt at almost $14 trillion. The response of the

liberal Democratic leadership? A bill making it easier for Federal employees to stay at home to work and creating more government union jobs.

Here we are with a financial crisis of global proportions resulting from an unprecedented expansion of government. The response of liberal Democratic leadership? A resolution recognizing National Train Day.

Here we are with a torrent of oil gushing into the gulf day after day, depriving untold numbers of people of their livelihoods. The liberal Democratic response? A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month to recognize and honor a hundred years of the enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States.

In fact, this Congress so far has considered no fewer than 73 bills naming post offices, 36 measures recognizing sporting events and achievements, and 145 designations or recognitions for various days, weeks, months, or years.

Despite these very real problems, the liberal Democrats ruling Congress are running around the country trying to convince the American people that everything is just fine and they don't need to worry because the Democrats are solving their problems. While government employees and their union handlers might be satisfied with the liberal Democrat jobs agenda, try asking the small business men forced to close their doors or the 7 million private business employees who've lost their jobs since the liberal Democrats took control of Congress in 2007 and want to get back to work. This is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentlelady mentioned the deficit and how concerned she is about the deficit. It's somewhat puzzling to me then that she hasn't been out front wanting to pay for the Bush tax cuts that cost hundreds of billions of dollars, that there's been no effort on the other side to want to pay for the George Bush prescription drug bill which cost hundreds of billions of dollars all on to our credit card, that there is no effort on the other side to want to pay for these wars which have now cost $1 trillion—$1 trillion in borrowed money.

I should say, with one exception. The minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, suggested that we could pay for the wars with the Social Security Trust Fund, that we should raise the retirement age and whatever savings we have should not go into the Social Security Trust Fund, should go to pay for our wars so our senior citizens who have paid into the system year after year after year should be robbed of a solid program and, instead, that money should go to pay for the wars.

When they talk about deficits and debt, it is laughable, because they inherited from Bill Clinton one of the biggest surpluses in history and they squandered it on tax cuts that weren't paid for—mostly for the rich, mostly for their big contributors—and on wars that were not paid for.

And what this President and this Congress is trying to do is clean up their mess. And I'm sorry that that bothers some of my friends on the other side, but we're going to clean up their mess, and we're going to move this economy forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I have said before on the floor here to my colleagues who want to rewrite history, they can't blame everything on President Bush. They can't continue to do that. And they want to give President Clinton all the credit.

But, of course, the Congress was controlled by the Republicans for 6 of the 8 years that President Clinton was in office. It's the Congress that controls the spending. Our Democratic colleagues know that. They simply choose to ignore it when it suits their arguments.

□ 1210

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal article of the 13th of July. It's very recent, so my colleagues may not have seen it.

The Bush Tax Cuts and the Deficit Myth—and I won't read the entire article; but, Madam Speaker, I insert the entire article into the RECORD.

Let me read again a little bit from it: In short, it's all President Bush's fault. But Mr. Obama's assertion fails on three grounds.

First, the wars, tax cuts and the prescription drug program were implemented in the early 2000s, yet by 2007 the deficit stood at only $161 billion.

When our colleagues across the aisle took over the Congress, the deficit stood at $161 billion. I go back to quote: How could these stable policies have suddenly caused trillion-dollar deficits beginning in 2009? Obviously, what happened was collapsing revenues from the recession along with stimulus spending.

Second, the President's $8 trillion figure minimizes the problem. Recent CBO data indicate a 10-year baseline deficit closer to $13 trillion if Washington maintains today's tax-and-spend policies, whereby discretionary spending grows with the economy, war spending winds down, ObamaCare is implemented, and Congress extends all the Bush tax cuts, the alternative minimum tax patch and the Medicare doc fix, i.e., no reimbursement cuts.

Under this realistic baseline, the 10-year cost of extending the Bush tax cuts, $3.2 trillion, the Medicare drug entitlement and Iraq and Afghanistan spending add up to $4.7 trillion. That's approximately one-third of the $13 trillion in baseline deficits, far from the majority the President claims.

Third and most importantly, the White House methodology is arbitrary. With Washington set to tax $33 trillion and spend $46 trillion over the next decade, how does one determine which policies ''caused'' the $13 trillion deficit? Mr. Obama could have just as easily singled out Social Security, $9.2 trillion over 10 years; anti-poverty programs, $7 trillion; other Medicare spending, $5.4 trillion; net interest on the debt, $6.1 trillion; and the article goes on and on with nondefense discretionary spending.

Madam Speaker, I have a chart here which we have put together which I think does a very good job of showing deficit spending as a percent of GDP. That's what really is the way we should look at this; and let me point out that in 1992 under Democrat control the deficit as a percent of GDP is this line; 1993, this line; 1994. Republicans then take over the Congress in 1995, and look how the deficit goes down, significantly goes down. It does go up some in 2002 under a Republican Congress and Republican President but we go into war in 2003, 2004, and then what happens when the Democrats take back over? It shoots back up. The red lines are the projected deficits as percent of GDP.

Madam Speaker, this argument just won't hold. Our friends very selectively come up with numbers, and we're going to point out the facts each time that they try to make up facts.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FOXX. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I'm really struck having seen that chart with a fascinating juxtaposition that I've pointed out a couple of times here on the House floor.

There is a requirement for membership in the European Union. The requirement for a new country to join the European Union, Madam Speaker, is that they not have a debt that exceeds 60 percent of the gross domestic product of that country. Now, what does that mean? As we look at that chart today, the United States of America, Madam Speaker, interestingly enough, could not qualify for membership in the European Union because of that debt burden which is continuing to be passed on and on and on to our children and future generations.

Ms. FOXX. Reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for pointing out the very important issue of the percentage of debt to the GDP because it is an important issue and our friends across the aisle have created much of that problem along with our President. They have been in charge since January 2007, and that's where the problem comes from.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2010]

THE BUSH TAX CUTS AND THE DEFICIT MYTH

(By Brian Riedl)

President Obama and congressional Democrats are blaming their trillion-dollar budget deficits on the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. Letting these tax cuts expire is their answer.

Yet the data flatly contradict this ''tax cuts caused the deficits'' narrative. Consider the three most persistent myths:

The Bush tax cuts wiped out last decade's budget surpluses. Sen. John Kerry (D–Mass), for example, has long blamed the tax cuts for having ''taken a $5.6 trillion surplus and turned it into deficits as far as the eye can see.'' That $5.6 trillion surplus never existed. It was a projection by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) in January 2001 to cover the next decade. It assumed that late-1990s economic growth and the stockmarket bubble (which had already peaked) would continue forever and generate record-high tax revenues. It assumed no recessions, no terrorist attacks, no wars, no natural disasters, and that all discretionary spending would fall to 1930s levels.

The projected $5.6 trillion surplus between 2002 and 2011 will more likely be a $6.1 trillion deficit through September 2011. So what was the cause of this dizzying, $11.7 trillion swing? I've analyzed CBO's 28 subsequent budget baseline updates since January 2001. These updates reveal that the much-maligned Bush tax cuts, at $1.7 trillion, caused just 14% of the swing from projected surpluses to actual deficits (and that is according to a ''static'' analysis, excluding any revenues recovered from faster economic growth induced by the cuts).

The bulk of the swing resulted from economic and technical revisions (33%), other new spending (32%), net interest on the debt (12%), the 2009 stimulus (6%) and other tax cuts (3%). Specifically, the tax cuts for those earning more than $250,000 are responsible for just 4% of the swing. If there were no Bush tax cuts, runaway spending and economic factors would have guaranteed more than $4 trillion in deficits over the decade and kept the budget in deficit every year except 2007.

The next decade's deficits are the result of the previous administration's profligacy. Mr. Obama asserted in his January State of the Union Address that by the time he took office, ''we had a one-year deficit of over $1 trillion and projected deficits of $8 trillion over the next decade. Most of this was the result of not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and an expensive prescription drug program.''

In short, it's all President Bush's fault. But Mr. Obama's assertion fails on three grounds.

First, the wars, tax cuts and the prescription drug program were implemented in the early 2000s, yet by 2007 the deficit stood at only $161 billion. How could these stable policies have suddenly caused trillion-dollar deficits beginning in 2009? (Obviously what happened was collapsing revenues from the recession along with stimulus spending.)

Second, the president's $8 trillion figure minimizes the problem. Recent CBO data indicate a 10-year baseline deficit closer to $13 trillion if Washington maintains today's tax-and-spend policies—whereby discretionary spending grows with the economy, war spending winds down, ObamaCare is implemented, and Congress extends all the Bush tax cuts, the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) patch, and the Medicare ''doc fix'' (i.e., no reimbursement cuts).

Under this realistic baseline, the 10-year cost of extending the Bush tax cuts ($3.2 trillion), the Medicare drug entitlement ($1 trillion), and Iraq and Afghanistan spending ($515 billion) add up to $4.7 trillion. That's approximately one-third of the $13 trillion in baseline deficits—far from the majority the president claims.

Third and most importantly, the White House methodology is arbitrary. With Washington set to tax $33 trillion and spend $46 trillion over the next decade, how does one determine which policies ''caused'' the $13 trillion deficit? Mr. Obama could have just as easily singled out Social Security ($9.2 trillion over 10 years), antipoverty programs ($7 trillion), other Medicare spending ($5.4 trillion), net interest on the debt ($6.1 trillion), or nondefense discretionary spending ($7.5 trillion).

There's no legitimate reason to single out the $4.7 trillion in tax cuts, war funding and the Medicare drug entitlement. A better methodology would focus on which programs are expanding and pushing the next decade's deficit up.

Declining revenues are driving future deficits. The fact is that rapidly increasing spending will cause 100% of rising long-term deficits. Over the past 50 years, tax revenues have deviated little from their 18% of gross domestic product (GDP) average. Despite a temporary recession-induced dip, CBO projects that even if all Bush tax cuts are extended and the AMT is patched, tax revenues will rebound to 18.2% of GDP by 2020—slightly above the historical average. They will continue growing afterwards.

Spending—which has averaged 20.3% of GDP over the past 50 years—won't remain as stable. Using the budget baseline deficit of $13 trillion for the next decade as described above, CBO figures show spending surging to a peacetime record 26.5% of GDP by 2020 and also rising steeply thereafter.

Putting this together, the budget deficit, historically 2.3% of GDP, is projected to leap to 8.3% of GDP by 2020 under current policies. This will result from Washington taxing at 0.2% of GDP above the historical average but spending 6.2% above its historical average.

Entitlements and other obligations are driving the deficits. Specifically, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and net interest costs are projected to rise by 5.4% of GDP between 2008 and 2020. The Bush tax cuts are a convenient scapegoat for past and future budget woes. But it is the dramatic upward arc of federal spending that is the root of the problem.

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

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

My friends on the other side of the aisle can pull out all their charts and artwork that their Republican National Committee wants to put together for them; but some facts are undeniable, and that is, that when this President came to office, he inherited from George W. Bush the worst economy since the Great Depression. That is undeniable. This economy was in a tail spin, and if it wasn't for the stimulus package, this economy would have continued to go further down the tubes. There was no question about that.

When they talk about deficits, they conveniently leave out the fact that hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit spending went to pay for their tax cuts for their rich friends. That's what they did when they were in power, tax breaks, tax loopholes, all kinds of special interest breaks, for oil companies, for the wealthiest people in this country, and we went deeper and deeper into debt and they didn't care.

Two wars, none of it paid for. None of it paid for, and it should be paid for. The only people sacrificing in these wars are our soldiers and their families. The rest of us are asked to do nothing, and the only possible solution to that that we heard from the other side of the aisle came from the minority leader who said that we should raise the retirement age for those receiving Social Security and take that money and pay for the war. Our senior citizens should pay for these wars? Shouldn't we want to protect Social Security, and shouldn't we find other ways to pay for these wars?

In today's Washington Post, the editorial entitled, ''GOP has no problem extending tax cuts for the rich,'' let me quote from a couple of lines in this editorial: ''Senate Republicans, committed as they are to preventing the debt from mounting further, can't approve an extension of unemployment benefits because it would cost $35 billion. But they are untroubled by the notion of digging the hole $678 billion deeper by extending President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.''

And this is how the editorial ends: ''The issue is whether the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should be extended, adding another $678 billion to the deficit over the next decade. The tax cuts, it's worth remembering, passed originally in 2001 with the argument that the surplus was so large that rates could be cut with budgetary room to spare. Now that the fiscal picture has deteriorated so badly, the questions remains: How are you going to pay the $678 billion? And if you don't, how are you going to justify the added damage to an already grim fiscal outlook?''

I insert this article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 2010]

GOP HAS NO PROBLEM EXTENDING TAX CUTS FOR THE RICH

Senate Republicans, committed as they are to preventing the debt from mounting further, can't approve an extension of unemployment benefits because it would cost $35 billion. But they are untroubled by the notion of digging the hole $678 billion deeper by extending President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. On Fox News Sunday, Chris Wallace asked Republican Whip Jon Kyl (R–Ariz.) about this contradiction. Mr. Kyl's response is worth examining because of what it says about the GOP's refusal to practice the fiscal responsibility it preaches.

Mr. Kyl's first line of defense was to dismiss Mr. Wallace's query as ''a loaded question'' because ''the Bush tax cuts applied to every single American.'' Mr. Wallace pointed out that he was only referring to the top tax brackets, but Mr. Kyl persisted in his refusal to answer. ''So let's, first of all, start with those that don't apply to the wealthy. Shouldn't those be extended?'' Never mind that no one in a policymaking position—not President Obama, not Democrats in Congress—is arguing against extending those tax cuts, at least temporarily. So when Mr. Kyl contends that ''all of that goes away,'' he is just blowing smoke.

Eventually, Mr. Kyl trotted out the tired and unsubstantiated argument that the tax cuts for the wealthy must be extended because otherwise ''you're going to clobber small business.'' Mr. Wallace persisted: ''But,

sir, . . . how are you going to pay the $678 billion?''—at which point Mr. Kyl descended into nonsense. ''You should never raise taxes in order to cut taxes,'' he declared. ''Surely Congress has the authority, and it would be right to, if we decide we want to cut taxes to spur the economy, not to have to raise taxes in order to offset those costs. You do need to offset the cost of increased spending, and that's what Republicans object to. But you should never have to offset [the] cost of a deliberate decision to reduce tax rates on Americans.''

Huh? No one's talking about cutting taxes on the wealthy to stimulate the economy. The issue is whether the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should be extended, adding another $678 billion to the deficit over the next decade. The tax cuts, it's worth remembering, passed originally in 2001 with the argument that the surplus was so large that rates could be cut with budgetary room to spare. Now that the fiscal picture has deteriorated so badly, the questions remains: How are you going to pay the $678 billion? And if you don't, how are you going to justify the added damage to an already grim fiscal outlook?

Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle have been fighting with all their might to deny Americans who have lost their jobs, mostly through no fault of their own, they have been fighting with all their energy to deny them unemployment benefits during this very difficult time where people who can't get these benefits and whose savings are drying up are not going to be able to afford to pay their bills, be able to keep their home; and my friends on the other side of the aisle say we can't afford that, we can't afford that, notwithstanding the fact it's a one-time expenditure.

But you know, when it comes to the wars, let's vote to add another $33 billion in borrowed money on to our children's credit card and no questions asked.

I'd like to do a little nation building, Madam Speaker, here in the United States. I think we have an obligation to take care of the people here in this country, and so I'm all for working on trying to reduce our deficit and our debt. That's what the Democratic Party is dedicated to. The President is dedicated to that. He's formed a bipartisan commission, but to come on the floor and to say that somehow the policies of the previous President, the tax cuts for the rich, billions and billions and billions of dollars in added deficit spending, the war, the prescription drug benefit bill, not even paid for, to suggest that that didn't occur is ludicrous.

The bottom line is that you delivered to this President, my friends on the other side of the aisle delivered to this President, the worst economy since the Great Depression and he has been working overtime to try to dig this country out of the ditch that the Republicans dug, and we need to continue to move forward.

I will add one other thing, Madam Speaker, and that is, during the first year of President Obama's administration more jobs were created than during the 8 years of George W. Bush, and that's a fact.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

□ 1220

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to quickly respond to two things that my colleague from Massachusetts said.

He talks about the fact that the Federal Government is paying for wars. Well, let me say that the Constitution of the United States says, ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare,'' et cetera. It is the role of the Federal Government to protect us in this country. It is the only entity in our country who can do that. It is our role.

The other comment he makes is ''tax cuts for the rich.'' My colleague, just like almost all my colleagues across the aisle, have an assumption that all the money that is generated in this country belongs to the government and that if there is a tax cut provided, that that is a gift from the government to the people getting the tax cut.

No, Madam Speaker, that is not right. The government is not in control in this country. The people are in control. And for them to have that assumption is the biggest part of the problem that we have here right now.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me at the outset say I twice asked my friend from Worcester to yield, and I will say that at any time during my remarks that he would like to challenge me, I look forward to yielding to him.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me say first and foremost that this issue of who is in fact responsible for the security of the United States of America, my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, is absolutely right. The five most important words in the middle of that preamble to the Constitution that she just read are ''provide for the common defence.'' Virtually everything else that we do can be dealt with by individuals, families, churches or synagogues, cities, counties or States. But the national security of the United States of America can only be dealt with by the Federal Government, and we should never forget that.

Now, as we listen to some of the specious charges that have been coming from the other side of the aisle, like this chart that my colleague on the Rules Committee offered, saying that this was from the Republican National Committee, this is from usgovernmentspending.com, a completely nonpartisan entity and they are facts. We have seen a dramatic increase in spending.

My friend regularly talks about the fact that this administration, this President, inherited a bad economy. We all acknowledge that. But what is it that has happened since then, Madam Speaker? Contrary to what my friend just said, we have seen the economy get worse and worse and worse.

We were promised, and I will be happy to yield to my friend if he would like to, we were promised that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent if we were to pass the $1 trillion stimulus bill. Where is it today? At 9.5 percent.

Across the country, many of us are hosting job fairs. There are people who are hurting. In the area that I represent, Madam Speaker, part of it has an unemployment rate that exceeds 14 percent.

The American people know one thing that they have learned over the past year-and-a-half, and that is you cannot spend your way to prosperity.

Now, Madam Speaker, what is it that we are trying to do? We want to ensure that future generations are not saddled with this tremendous debt burden that has been imposed.

This morning I had the opportunity to meet a young man who is very, very inspiring with what he has done over the past 39 days. He visited me. His name is Joseph Machado, and he is here with his parents and his brother Robert and his sister Mercedes. What this young man did, 13 years of age, having gone through tremendous physical adversity, having suffered over the past few years because of an accident, he has been wheelchair-bound. But what has he done over the past 39 days, Madam Speaker? He rode a bicycle from Southern California to the White House. He came here, I met him this morning here in the Capitol, and he has been doing this to raise money and focus resources on the challenges that young people are dealing with.

Now, I raise the name of Joseph Machado to say that as we look at this 13-year-old boy and the challenges that he has gone through, the idea that we will be thrusting on to his shoulders and his brother Robert and his sister Mercedes the responsibility of paying for such profligate spending that has been going on is just plain wrong.

We feel strongly about the need to ensure that we do not do that, that we do everything we can to decrease that. That is one of the reasons that we are going to urge our colleagues today to vote no on the previous question, and in voting no on the previous question we will allow the House to have a chance to vote on a proposal that our colleague from Peoria, Mr. SHOCK, has offered that is going to deal with training to rein in spending.

The people of this country have driven around, and I laugh, I mean sadly laugh, when I see the signs along the side of the road that credit the Reinvestment Act with the job creation that is supposedly going on in dealing with infrastructure issues. Millions and

millions of dollars are being expended putting up the signs along the side of the road. The burden of those is going to be passed on to Joseph Machado and other young people in this country, and we believe that that is an example that the American people can get so they don't have to see signs that they are paying for along the side of the road.

Every Member of this House, Madam Speaker, is going to have an opportunity to vote no, to say that we shouldn't be continuing to spend millions of dollars on road signs crediting the stimulus bill for the construction that is taking place on those roads.

So I am going to join in urging my colleagues under this YouCut proposal to vote ''no'' on the previous question, because that vote in and of itself will allow us the opportunity to consider this measure.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule, because this is a completely closed rule, having had this measure considered under suspension of the rules.

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

Let me remind my colleagues, Madam Speaker, that when President Obama came to office, he inherited an economy that was losing on average 750,000 jobs a month. That is what President Obama was left with.

My friends talk about the fact that the economy is still struggling. It is still struggling. But the June numbers, as much as we wish they were better, we were told that 83,000 private sector jobs were created and 9,000 manufacturing jobs. I would rather be creating jobs, again, I would like to create 100 times more jobs than we were able to do in June, but I would rather be creating jobs than going back to where we were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month.

My friend mentioned job fairs, all my colleagues are doing job fairs. What I find particularly ironic is that my colleagues are hosting job fairs touting stimulus money. The distinguished minority whip on the Republican side from Virginia has been one of the Recovery Act's most vocal critics, uniformly whipping the Republican Caucus into opposing the stimulus. But despite his withering attacks and despite the withering attacks of others on the other side, they continue to host job fairs filled with employers hiring directly because of stimulus grants and programs.

We are told that over half the GOP Caucus, 114 lawmakers who voted to kill the stimulus, then took credit for its success, hosting job fairs, touting the stimulus, doing press releases every time a stimulus award was announced.

So, I guess they want to have it both ways. They want to be out here criticizing the Recovery Act, but when they go home, they are standing and posing for pictures, handing checks to their constituents and small businesses with stimulus money.

So I would again urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to at least be consistent. If you are going to oppose the Stimulus Act, the American Recovery Act, don't go home and take credit for it. Don't go home and say ''I did this for you'' when you were here in Washington and you voted to deny your communities the very money that is helping to create some jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I can assure my colleague across the aisle that I wasn't one of those people who went home to take credit for the Stimulus Act. So he needs to take that issue up with those who have done it and not paint us all with the same brush.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill proposes spending $30 million creating a variety of initiatives promoting telework opportunities to allow Federal employees to work at home. This bill would require each Federal agency to create a teleworking managing officer. But there are many people who wonder if creating this kind of a situation is going to improve efficiency among Federal employees, and it may even reduce the productivity of the Federal Government.

While the 3 million Americans who have lost their jobs since President Obama took office are asking, Where are the jobs we were promised, the Congress is pushing this initiative to make it easier for Federal employees who already have it much better than the rest of the country to avoid coming to work. So why is this bill so popular with the ruling liberal Democrats? Perhaps it has something to do with their longstanding subservience to labor unions.

New data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that a majority of American union members now work for the government. That's 52 percent of all union members now work for the Federal, State, or local government, representing a sharp increase from the 49 percent in 2008. A full 37.4 percent of government employees belonged to the unions in 2009, up six-tenths of a percent from 2008. This shift toward representing government employees has changed the union movement's priorities, as unions now campaign for higher taxes on Americans to fund more government spending.

These changes in union membership are certainly not surprising, as unionized companies do poorly in the marketplace and lose jobs relative to their nonunion competitors. Government employees, however, face no competition, as the government never goes out of business. The recession has left union bosses looking for new membership targets—and where better to look than in the government, which they see as having the deepest of all pockets and a host of sympathetic liberal Democratic politicians eager to please their political base. In fact, as reported by USA Today, overall, Federal workers earned an average salary of $67,691 in 2008 for occupations that exist both in government and the private sector, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. The average pay for the same mix of jobs in the private sector was $60,000. These salary figures don't include the value of health, pension, and other benefits, which average $40,785 per Federal employee in 2008 versus $9,882 per private worker, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. So the average Federal employee's benefits are worth four times what the average benefits are worth in the private sector.

A March 26, 2010, Wall Street Journal editorial entitled ''The Government Pay Boom'' reveals that ''the real windfall for government workers is in benefits.'' And it goes on to talk about how these benefits are growing, growing, growing. We know that the number of Federal employees making over $100,000 has increased by almost 5 percent since 2007, since the Democrats took over in Congress. Currently, there are more people in the Federal Government making in excess of $100,000 than those making $40,000.

Since the recession began in 2007, public worker pay has risen 7.8 percent, while private-sector wages remain stagnant. The 2010 pay increase for Federal civilian employees was 2 percent. In 2009, the average Federal employee received a pay raise of 3.9 percent, and an average pay increase of 3.5 percent in 2008. In 2007, the Department of Transportation had only one employee making over $170,000. At the end of last year, it had 1,690 employees making that amount.

Madam Speaker, we are growing the Federal Government while we have a 9.7 percent unemployment rate in the private sector. This is unacceptable to the American people. That's why we should vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on this bill, because we are not heeding what the American people want us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think the gentlelady from North Carolina kind of just summed it all up. The Republican message to workers all across the country is, We don't want you to have good wages; we don't want you to have good benefits; we don't want you to have good retirement. We want to go back to the days when you get paid less; when one job doesn't earn enough for you to be able to support your family. I've never heard anybody get up before and talk about and advocate lower wages for people. They're all upset that a researcher at NIH trying to find a cure for cancer or a cure to Alzheimer's disease or Parkinson's disease is somehow being overpaid. I've heard a lot of things on this floor, but I've never had anyone come out and

decry the fact that workers in this country should be paid less.

My friend from North Carolina always likes to talk about the fact that government should act more like a business. Well, I want to remind her that the bill that we are talking about here today, the telework bill—telework practices have been adopted by the private sector all throughout the country. I will give you an example. Teleworking allows IBM to reduce office space and save $56 million per year every year. Well, it works in the private sector. Why don't we take that example of where the private sector is able to save some money and bring it to the government sector where we may be able to save some money. If we can save tens of millions of dollars each year, that is a good thing. Maybe we can take that money and put it toward deficit reduction. But the idea to come out here and to be against this bill because of unions and all this other stuff, I think, is ridiculous.

This is a commonsense measure that's going to save the American taxpayer a lot of money. I urge all my colleagues, Democratic and Republican alike, to support this commonsense measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask Members to join me in voting ''no'' on the previous question. For the past couple of years, the American people have been forced to make some extremely difficult budgeting decisions. Because when times are tough and your back is up against the wall, you have no choice but to rein in your expenditures and pare down your debts.

This vote today on the previous question, the reason why we're standing in opposition, is because Republicans would like to see us include in this rule the opportunity to vote on this week's winning YouCut proposal. This proposal would prohibit funding for the droves of puzzling and flamboyant signs attributing various projects to last year's stimulus bill. Often visible along highways, these signs do not provide any meaningful information and do not create any jobs. They are the public face of an administration PR campaign that taxpayers are unwittingly financing. While the precise cost of these signs is unknown, press reports peg it in the tens of millions of dollars.

The painful sacrifice borne by families and small businesses are hugely disconnected from the status quo here in Washington. Inside this Chamber of Congress, the excessive, untargeted, and ineffective spending binge that gives us the failed stimulus is alive and kicking. But now, Madam Speaker, the American people are fed up. Across the country, from big cities to quiet suburbs to rural towns, Americans of all backgrounds are demanding that Washington stop the wasteful spending.

Today, here in this body we will hold the seventh YouCut vote—and the American people will once again be able to see which Member of Congress hears their plea and gets the message. This week's proposal, by Representative SCHOCK of Illinois, would require agencies to report on the amount already spent on the signs. And it would recapture those funds by reducing the agencies' administrative expenses by that same amount.

Madam Speaker, America is at a crossroads. The Federal Government needs to stop spending our country out of prosperity and into a quicksand of unsustainable debt. We need to change the culture in Washington and tip the balance in the direction of savings. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to bring this week's YouCut proposal to a vote before the full House.

□ 1240

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

Madam Speaker, this is laughable. If we're talking about trying to reduce the deficit and get the debt under control, this is the best that we can get, you know, not putting up signs? I mean, how about paying for the tax cuts for the rich that my friends on the other side of the aisle passed? Hundreds of billions of dollars in debt that you put on the backs of my kids and my grandkids so that the wealthiest of the wealthy in this country can get a tax break? Why don't you pay for that, if you want to get this deficit or this debt under control? Signs, that's the best we can do?

Again, with respect to the distinguished minority whip, who I heard again beat up on the stimulus package, it's funny that he beats up on the stimulus package here, but when he goes home, he holds a job fair that so everybody can take advantage of the of the stimulus package. Employer after employer after employer in the gentleman from Virginia's district has received money from the stimulus package so they can create more jobs, and the gentleman takes credit for it, and so do a great many people on the other side of the aisle.

I find it somewhat hypocritical that on one hand we're here saying, ''We don't like it,'' but when you go back home, you tell everybody, ''Oh, this is what I'm doing for you.''

But if you want to get serious about reducing our deficit, we have a bipartisan commission set up to try to make recommendations to this Congress. We need to do it holistically. It's going to be tough. We all want to do it. But to come up and say, ''Oh, you know, our suggestion is to eliminate the signs on projects that benefit from money from the Recovery and Reinvestment Act,'' I think that's just silly.

I would urge my colleagues again to remember the underlying bill that we're talking about, this telework bill, will save tens of millions of dollars for the taxpayers. Those tens of millions of dollars I would bet is a lot more than the signs and could be put toward deficit reduction or could be put toward what I think needs to happen right now, which is that we need to extend unemployment benefits to those who are struggling in this difficult economy. Unfortunately, my Republican friends don't agree to that, and they are blocking it in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I will invite my colleague from Massachusetts, when he speaks again, to give us the citation for the study that he's talking about that shows that this bill will save tens of millions of dollars. I have done a little research on it myself, and I will be talking about that study. But I would invite him to prove to the American people that this will save money.

And I want to point out to him that he's poking fun at Republicans on recommending that we save money on signs, but what he was really doing is poking fun at the American people. It wasn't the Republicans on this side of the aisle who came up with this. It's the American people who voted on this, and the American people understand the biblical admonition, If you are a good steward of small things, you will be a good steward of big things. We should start where we can save money. And I agree with the people. This is a good place to start.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank my good friend, Dr. FOXX, for the time here today.

Madam Speaker, at the President's first news conference after his first official Cabinet meeting, he addressed the Nation, and he said that he was asking his agency heads to come together and collectively come up with $100 million in savings that they could bring forward for this next budget year to eliminate over last year's spending. His quote was, ''We've got to earn their trust.'' The President said, ''They've got to feel confident that their dollars are being spent wisely.'' I couldn't agree with the President any more.

So that is really what today is about. We bring forward House Resolution 5679, which is really quite simple. It says we don't need to tell the American people with propaganda signs that we're spending their tax dollars wisely. More specifically, we don't need to put up road signs all over the country when we're doing paving projects at the tune of hundreds, sometimes thousands. We've found signs that cost over $10,000 apiece simply to say this is your tax dollars at work.

First of all, I would suggest to you that it's an insult to the intelligence of my taxpayers to suggest that they drive by a public works project and think that anyone other than they, as taxpayers, are paying for it. Second, I

would suggest to you that this is a dangerous precedent. Think if every unit of government, from your school board, your township officials, your State government, your Federal Government put a label on everything that they were using to spend your tax dollars on. The unnecessary bureaucratic expense, the unnecessary overhead that it creates.

We have found in 1 year since the stimulus bill was passed that we have spent over $20 million just on signs. The Illinois Department of Transportation, in my home State, has spent over $650,000 on signs. The State of Ohio reports they've spent over $1 million just on signs—not creating jobs, not the infrastructure that was promised, not to lower unemployment, but rather a bunch of sheet metal along the road.

This is not only the financially smart thing to do. I would argue it's the environmentally right thing to do. And then my friends on the other side of the aisle stand up and suggest, well, gee, you know, AARON, it's only $20 million. The estimates, if we don't stop doing this, are that by the time the stimulus program has run its course, we will spend $192 million on these signs. Now, I don't know about you, but whether you supported the stimulus program or you voted against the stimulus program, I hope we can come together and say, You know what? At the end of the day, this $192 million, this $20 million that's already been spent, would better be spent on road projects, on filling potholes, on fixing bridges, on something that we can show for that we're going to ask the next generation of Americans to pay for. And that's all we're doing. We're saying, from this day forward, you can't spend money on signs. Put it into the infrastructure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again, I am always interested in what my colleagues have to say today. But where were they when President Bush and the administration sent out a press release on the prescription drug bill that they didn't pay for that cost millions and millions of dollars to all the senior citizens of this country? There was silence. And if we want to have a serious discussion about deficit reduction, which I think we should, this is where we begin? Why don't we talk about paying for the Bush tax cuts for the rich? Why not offset those tax cuts? Why not pay for them? Why not have that discussion? My friends talk about the deficit, but they didn't have any problem adding hundreds of billions of dollars onto the credit card for the prescription drug bill. They didn't think it was important to pay for it.

Under the Democratic leadership, we're abiding by PAYGO. We're paying for things as we go forward. My friends on the other side of the aisle, when they were in charge, they didn't do that. That's one of the reasons why we're in such trouble right now. But if you really want to reduce the deficit in this country, if you really want to get at the debt, if you really want to do this right, then we need a serious discussion; and the President, I think, has taken the first step toward that discussion by putting together a bipartisan commission to figure out how we do this.

And you know what? The recommendations are going to be such that none of us are going to like them, and we are going to have to make some tough decisions, and hopefully we'll do it together. If not, we'll do it alone. But I think the fact of the matter is getting the deficit under control is a priority. But I'll tell you this: You're not going to get the deficit under control unless you get the economy back on track, unless you put people back to work.

And I really regret that my friends on the other side of the aisle, every chance they get, try to undercut this President's economic agenda to try to create and incentivize more jobs. Every chance, every single chance, they object or they try to obstruct. Again, I will go back to what I said earlier. They come on the floor and they decry the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but then they go back to their districts and they do press conferences and they do press releases and they take all kinds of bows for all the money that they voted against. A lot of that money, Madam Speaker, is creating jobs in their districts. And the reason why, I guess, they're taking bows is because they see that some of the help to some of the small businesses and to some of their manufacturers and to some of the States and cities and towns for building their infrastructure is important to job creation.

So, again, let's get back to what we're here to talk about, which is this telework bill, which I think will save the Federal Government a great deal of money. I'm not the only one who thinks that. There are others in the private sector and in the public sector that have made the argument that if we do this right, we could save not just tens of millions of dollars but maybe hundreds of millions of dollars, and I think that's a good step for us to take. If my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to take that step, fine. They can do what they usually do and obstruct everything. But this is good for the taxpayers of this country, and I hope that it passes with an overwhelming margin.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts that the Republicans can't obstruct the President's effort because we are in the minority. And we don't have to obstruct him anyway because they've all failed. Nothing has worked that the President and our friends across the aisle have tried, and so they're going to fail of their own weight.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts that we need to get this economy back on track, but you don't get it back on track by creating the great uncertainty that your side has created in the economy, raising health care costs, raising energy costs—potentially raising energy costs—raising taxes. Businesses aren't going to invest when there's this much uncertainty out there. And I hear it every single day from my colleagues from around the country, from businesses that I speak to.

But what we can do is start to find out ways to cut wasteful spending. And I support Mr. SCHOCK from Illinois's proposal today to cut the wasteful spending on these signs that are across this country. $20 million. They're not creating a single job. They're not improving safety in this country. In fact, as my colleague said, I find it silly that this administration is spending $20 million on signs.

In my State of Pennsylvania, which has more structurally deficient bridges than any other State in the Nation, we could take these $20 million and apply it to some of these bridges in Pennsylvania and across this country. And I'll just point out three of them in Pennsylvania, while I'm sure there are hundreds if not thousands across this country:

$1.1 million to replace the Bolden Ridge Bridge in Fayette County, a project that would create 33 jobs and improve safety for the traveling public;

$3 million to replace the Fair Grounds Bridge in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, a project that would create 92 jobs and, again, improve safety for our citizens;

And, finally, $5.5 million to repair a sinkhole that's occurring in Huntington County, Pennsylvania, that is going to pose a serious risk to the traveling public in Huntington County, Pennsylvania, and those people that cross that road. $5.5 million will create 167 jobs, and it will make our roadways safer.

These projects will create jobs. They will improve our infrastructure. And most importantly, they'll improve safety.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side to stand up with us today and say, let's stop this silliness. Let's stop spending $20 million on these signs that aren't creating jobs and are nothing more than propaganda. So I ask them to support my colleague's, Mr. SCHOCK, H.R. 5679.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I'm a little bit confused. I don't know whether the gentleman supports the stimulus package or opposes the stimulus package.

On one hand, you know, Pennsylvania was one of the top recipients of aid from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. A lot of bridges are

being repaired; a lot of highways are being fixed. Does the gentleman want to take that money back? Does he think that the people who worked on constructing those bridges and building those roads are somehow, those jobs aren't worth it?

The fact of the matter is, you know, it's another example of where, on one hand, my colleagues are saying we want more money for bridges and roads and infrastructure. And the very bill that delivered a lot more money for bridges and roads, they all voted against.

So I would again urge my colleagues to be consistent. And I would also urge them to support the underlying bill, this telework bill, which I think will save the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHUSTER. When we did the stimulus bill, we spent money on all different kinds of programs, many of which don't create jobs. Only 8 percent went to infrastructure in this country, 8 percent, which is a very small amount.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time. But the fact of the matter is a lot of infrastructure projects are going on in Pennsylvania right now. And the people who are working on those jobs are happy to have a job. And the people who run the State are happy that they are able to make some improvements because States have been suffering greatly as a result of this economy.

So, you know, I would also point out again that, for all the talk of jobs, when they were in charge, we were losing on average 750,000 jobs a month; 750,000 jobs a month we were losing when they were in charge.

We're now gaining jobs, not as many as we would like, but we're moving in a different direction. I don't want to go backwards. I don't want to go backwards to 22 consecutive months of job loss.

Barack Obama has created more jobs in 1 year than George Bush created in 8 years, and that is a fact. And so to all my colleagues who are talking about jobs, here's your choice: you can go backwards and experience once again historic job losses, or you can stick with this economic agenda, get through this difficult time, put people back to work, get this economy moving again and start paying down our debt.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleague again is very selectively using statistics. He knows that he cannot back up the data that says that in the first year of President Obama's administration he has created more jobs than in all the Bush administration.

I have this chart which shows the unemployment rate under President Obama, under President Bush; and, again, we had many more jobs created under President Bush than have been created under President Obama, because all we've done is lose jobs under President Obama and create government jobs.

That's the whole issue here, Madam Speaker. We've lost four million jobs since President Obama took office. That's it.

And, you know, my colleague across the aisle says we need to be consistent. Well, he should be consistent. This will bring savings immediately, what we're proposing. What he's talking about might bring savings 30 years down the road. In fact, the study that I asked him to talk about, there's no study, Madam Speaker. I asked for a copy of the study. You know what it is? An article that was in the newspaper last February when we shut the government down, or the Democrats shut the government down for a week. They were losing $100 million a day. But they found out 30 percent of the people were logging into their computers, so they call that a savings of $30 million per day.

Listen, the American people are tired of that kind of thing being passed off as a study. There is no study.

Madam Speaker, this bill does not need to be passed. This rule does not need to be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 20 seconds to finish her statement.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be placed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I won't take the full 8 minutes, but I again want to point out a couple of facts to my colleagues here. We are faced with a very difficult economy, and this is an economy that President Obama inherited. He is trying to dig this economy out of the ditch that my friends on the other side of the aisle dug us into. It is not easy, and it's not going to happen overnight.

But it is a fact that Barack Obama has created more jobs in 1 year than George Bush created in 8 years. We were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs on average each month when President Bush was in office. We are now gaining jobs; not as many as we would like, not as fast as we would like, but we are moving in a very different direction. We're moving in the direction where we are creating more jobs, and we're moving toward a healthier economy. That is just the fact.

And the question is, Do we try to work with this administration to get this economy back on a strong footing, or are we going to try to obstruct everything and root for failure?

I mean, my friends on the other side of the aisle, their whole kind of, their whole platform is based on this President failing, on this economy failing. How cynical can you get?

The fact is, we have a lot of work to do, and we need to focus on jobs. Jobs is the issue. We need to extend unemployment benefits to those who have lost their jobs, mostly through no fault of their own.

□ 1300

We need to help them get through this difficult time. I regret that my Republican friends in the Senate continue to obstruct the extension of unemployment benefits. I hope nobody goes home for an August recess until unemployment benefits are extended.

My friends say we can't afford to pay for it. Can't afford to pay to help people in our own country. Yet last week $33 billion in borrowed money for nation building that supports a corrupt government in Afghanistan. They all support it. No questions asked. All borrowed money. And I get it. You know, if you think it's important, fine. But if nation building in Afghanistan is important, a little bit more nation building here in the United States of America is important.

We have to take care of our people here who are experiencing very difficult times because of the troubled economy. We just can't sit here and bicker and bicker and bicker and let people lose their homes and let people not be able to pay their bills or put food on their table.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, this President has accomplished a great deal in a very short time. And my expectation is that if we continue to follow his economic agenda, that we will see this economy get on stronger footing. The bill that's before us, the telework bill, I think is a good bill. It will save the taxpayers lots of money. IBM, a private-sector company, says it saved them tens of millions of dollars each year. If it can save IBM tens of millions of dollars each year, it ought to save the Federal Government hundreds of millions. Let us take that money, put it toward deficit reduction or put it toward helping our people who are in deep trouble as this economy tries to recover.

Madam Speaker, I would close by urging my colleagues to support the rule. I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1509 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the 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. 5679) to prevent funding from the American Recovery

and Reinvestment Act of 2009 from being used for physical signage indicating that a project is funded by such Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5679.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

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 Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, 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.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will 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 definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

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 Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 1509, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2864.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—232

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam

Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus
Capuano
Cummings
Delahunt
Deutch
Garamendi
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Marshall
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt
Whitfield

□ 1329

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. BARTON of Texas, CRENSHAW, LUETKEMEYER, and ISSA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 180, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—238

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachus
Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Marshall
McKeon
McMahon
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Tiahrt
Whitfield

□ 1338

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. McMAHON. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 438, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AUTHORIZING HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES FOR LOSS OF ICE IN ARCTIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2864) to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring of coastal changes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—420

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews
Bachus
Brady (TX)
Conyers
Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1346

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, on July 14, 2010, I missed rollcall votes 437, 438 and 439 while visiting with World War II veterans from my district at the National World War II Memorial as part of the Birmingham Honor Flight program. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on Nos. 437 and 438 and voted "yea" on No. 439.

TELEWORK IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1509, I call up the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1509, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 111–535, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1722

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Telework Improvements Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. TELEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 63 the following:

''CHAPTER 65—TELEWORK

''Sec.
''6501. Definitions.
''6502. Governmentwide telework requirement.
''6503. Implementation.
''6504. Telework Managing Officer.
''6505. Evaluating telework in agencies.

''§ 6501. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'agency' means an Executive agency (as defined by section 105), except as otherwise provided in this chapter;

''(2) the term 'telework' or 'teleworking' refers to a work flexibility arrangement under which an employee performs the duties and responsibilities of such employee's position, and other authorized activities, from an approved worksite other than the location from which the employee would otherwise work;

''(3) the term 'continuity of operations', as used with respect to an agency, refers to measures designed to ensure that functions essential to the mission of the agency can continue to be performed during a wide range of emergencies, including localized acts of nature, accidents, public health emergencies, and technological or attack-related emergencies; and

''(4) the term 'Telework Managing Officer' means, with respect to an agency, the Telework Managing Officer of the agency designated under section 6504.

''§ 6502. Governmentwide telework requirement

''(a) TELEWORK REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the head of each agency shall establish a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework, subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b).

''(2) AGENCY POLICIES.—The head of each agency shall ensure—

''(A) that the telework policy established under this section—

''(i) conforms to the regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 6503, and

''(ii) authorizes employees to telework to the maximum extent possible without diminishing agency operations and performance; and

''(B) that information on whether a position is eligible for telework is included in descriptions of available positions and recruiting materials.''.

''(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be considered—

''(1) to require the head of an agency to authorize teleworking in the case of an employee whose duties and responsibilities—

''(A) require daily direct handling of classified information; or

''(B) are such that their performance requires on-site activity which cannot be carried out from a site removed from the employee's regular place of employment; or

''(2) to prevent the temporary denial of permission for an employee to telework if, in the judgment of the agency head, the employee is needed to respond to an emergency.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this chapter shall—

''(1) be considered to require any employee to telework;

''(2) prevent an agency from permitting an employee to telework as part of a continuity of operations plan; or

''(3) authorize telework by an employee who has been officially disciplined for violations of subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography.''.

''§ 6503. Implementation

''(a) RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCIES.—The head of each agency shall ensure that—

''(1) appropriate training is provided to supervisors and managers, and to all employees who are authorized to telework, as directed by the Telework Managing Officer of such agency;

''(2) the training covers the information security guidelines issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under this section;

''(3) no distinction is made between teleworkers and nonteleworkers for purposes of—

''(A) periodic appraisals of job performance of employees,

''(B) training, rewarding, reassigning, promoting, reducing in grade, retaining, or removing employees,

''(C) work requirements, or

''(D) other acts involving managerial discretion;

''(4) in determining what constitutes diminished performance in the case of an employee who teleworks, the agency shall consult the performance management guidelines of the Office of Personnel Management; and

''(5) in the case of an agency which is named in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 901(b) of title 31, the agency incorporates telework in its continuity of operations plans and uses telework in response to emergencies.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF OPM.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this chapter, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, promulgate regulations necessary to carry out this chapter, except that such regulations shall not apply with respect to the Government Accountability Office;

''(2) provide advice, assistance, and any necessary training to agencies with respect to the requirements of this chapter, including with respect to—

''(A) questions of eligibility to telework, such as the effect of employee performance on eligibility, and

''(B) making telework part of the agency's goals, including those of individual supervisors and managers; and

''(3) in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, maintain a central, publicly available telework website that includes—

''(A) any regulations relating to telework and any other information the Director considers appropriate,

''(B) an e-mail address which may be used to submit comments to the Director on agency telework programs or agreements, and

''(C) a copy of all reports issued under section 6505(a).

''(c) SECURITY GUIDELINES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall issue guidelines not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this chapter to ensure the adequacy of information and security protections for information and information systems used while teleworking. Such guidelines shall, at a minimum, include requirements necessary—

''(1) to control access to agency information and information systems;

''(2) to protect agency information (including personally identifiable information) and information systems;

''(3) to limit the introduction of vulnerabilities;

''(4) to protect information systems not under the control of the agency that are used for teleworking;

''(5) to safeguard wireless and other telecommunications capabilities that are used for teleworking; and

''(6) to prevent inappropriate use of official time or resources that violates subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch by viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography.''.

''§ 6504. Telework Managing Officer

''(a) DESIGNATION AND COMPENSATION.—Each agency shall designate an officer, to be known as the 'Telework Managing Officer'. The Telework Managing Officer of an agency shall be designated—

''(1) by the Chief Human Capital Officer of such agency; or

''(2) if the agency does not have a Chief Human Capital Officer, by the head of such agency.

''(b) STATUS WITHIN AGENCY.—The Telework Managing Officer of an agency shall be a senior official of the agency who has direct access to the head of the agency.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—An individual may not hold the position of Telework Managing Officer as a noncareer appointee (as defined in section 3132(a)(7)), and such position may not be considered or determined to be of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy advocating character.

''(d) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each Telework Managing Officer of an agency shall—

''(1) provide advice on teleworking to the head of such agency and to the Chief Human Capital Officer of such agency (if any);

''(2) serve as a resource on teleworking for supervisors, managers, and employees of such agency;

''(3) serve as the primary point of contact on telework matters for agency employees and (with respect to such agency) for Congress and other agencies;

''(4) work with senior management of the agency to develop and implement a plan to incorporate telework into the agency's regular business strategies and its continuity of operations strategies, taking into consideration factors such as—

''(A) cost-effectiveness,

''(B) equipment,

''(C) training, and

''(D) data collection;

''(5) ensure that the agency's telework policy is communicated effectively to employees;

''(6) ensure that electronic or written notification is provided to each employee of specific telework programs and the agency's telework policy, including authorization criteria and application procedures;

''(7) develop and administer a tracking system for compliance with Governmentwide telework reporting requirements;

''(8) provide to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and the Comptroller General such information as such individuals may require to prepare the reports required under section 6505, including the techniques used to verify and validate data on telework, except that this paragraph shall not apply with respect to the Government Accountability Office;

''(9) establish a system for receiving feedback from agency employees on the telework policy of the agency;

''(10) develop and implement a program to identify and remove barriers to telework and to maximize telework opportunities in the agency;

''(11) track and retain information on all denials of permission to telework for employees who are authorized to telework, and report such information on an annual basis to—

''(A) the Chief Human Capital Officer of such agency (or, if the agency does not have a Chief Human Capital Officer, the head of such agency), and

''(B) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, for purposes of preparing the reports required under section 6505(a), except that this subparagraph shall not apply with respect to the Government Accountability Office;

''(12) ensure that employees are notified of grievance procedures available to them (if any) with respect to any disputes that relate to telework; and

''(13) perform such other duties and responsibilities relating to telework as the head of the agency may require.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING STATUS OF TELEWORK MANAGING OFFICER.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an individual who holds another office or position in an agency from serving as the Telework Managing Officer for the agency under this chapter.

''§ 6505. Evaluating telework in agencies

''(a) ANNUAL REPORT BY OPM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Comptroller General and the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating the extent to which each agency is in compliance with this chapter with respect to the period covered by the report, and shall include in the report an evaluation of each of the following:

''(A) The degree of participation by employees of the agency in teleworking during the period. In the case of an agency which is an Executive department, the evaluation will include the degree of participation by employees of each component within the department, including—

''(i) the total number of employees in the agency;

''(ii) the number and percentage of such employees who are eligible to telework; and

''(iii) the number and percentage of such employees who do telework, broken down by the number and percentage who telework 3 or more days per week, one or two days per week, and less frequently than one day per week.

''(B) The method the agency uses to gather data on telework and the techniques used to verify and validate such data.

''(C) Whether the total number of employees who telework is at least 10% higher or lower than the number who teleworked during the previous reporting period and the reasons identified for any such change.

''(D) The agency's goal for increasing the number of employees who telework in the next reporting period.

''(E) The extent to which the agency met the goal described in subparagraph (D) for its previous report, and, if the agency failed to meet the goal, the actions the agency plans to take to meet the goal for the next reporting period.

''(F) The best practices in agency telework programs.

''(G) In the case of an agency which is named in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 901(b) of title 31, the extent to which the agency incorporated telework in its continuity of operations plans and used telework in response to emergencies.

''(2) MINIMUM REQUIREMENT FOR COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of the reports required under this subsection, the Director shall determine that an agency is in compliance with the requirements of this chapter if the Director finds that the agency—

''(A) reported the requested data accurately and in a timely manner; and

''(B) either met or exceeded the agency's established telework goals, or provided explanations as to why the goals were not met as well as the steps the agency is taking to meet the goals.

''(3) REPORTING PERIOD; TIMING.—The Director shall submit a report under this subsection with respect to the first 1-year period for which the regulations promulgated by the Director under section 6503(b) are in effect and each of the 4 succeeding 1-year periods, and shall submit the report with respect to a period not later than 6 months after the last day of the period to which the report relates.

''(4) EXCLUSION OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—The Director shall not submit a report under this subsection with respect to the Government Accountability Office.

''(b) REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

''(1) EVALUATIONS OF REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF OPM.—Not later than 6 months after the Director submits a report under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall review the report and submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress. The report shall evaluate the compliance of the Office of Personnel Management and agencies with this chapter and address the overall progress of agencies in carrying out this chapter, and shall include such other information and recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

''(2) REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—The Comptroller General shall submit a report with respect to the Government Accountability Office in the same manner and in accordance with the same requirements applicable to a report submitted by the Director with respect to any other agency under subsection (a).

''(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means—

''(1) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

''(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 63 the following:

''65. Telework ..... 6501''.

(2) Section 622 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005, as contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (5 U.S.C. 6120 note) is amended by striking ''designate a 'Telework Coordinator' to be'' and inserting ''designate a Telework Managing Officer or designate the Chief Human Capital Officer or other career employee to be''.

SEC. 3. POLICY GUIDANCE.

Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue policy guidance requiring each Executive agency (as such term is defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code), when purchasing computer systems, to purchase computer systems that enable and support telework, unless the head of the agency determines that there is a mission-specific reason not to do so.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY FOR TELEWORK TRAVEL EXPENSE TEST PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5711. Authority for telework travel expense test programs

''(a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, under a test program which the Administrator of General Services determines to be in the interest of the Government and approves, an employing agency may pay through the proper disbursing official any necessary travel expenses in lieu of any payment otherwise authorized or required under this subchapter for employees participating in a telework program. Under an approved test program, an agency may provide an employee with the option to waive any payment authorized or required under this subchapter. An agency shall include in any request to the Administrator for approval of such a test program an analysis of the expected costs and benefits and a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

''(2) Any test program operated under this section shall be designed to enhance cost savings or other efficiencies that accrue to the Government.

''(3) Under any test program operated under this section, if an agency employee voluntarily relocates from the pre-existing duty station of that employee, the Administrator may authorize the employing agency to establish a reasonable maximum number of occasional visits to the pre-existing duty station before that employee is eligible for payment of any accrued travel expenses by that agency.

''(4) Nothing in this section is intended to limit the authority of any agency to conduct test programs.

''(b) The Administrator shall transmit a description of any test program approved by the Administrator under this section, and the rationale for approval, to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days before the effective date of the program.

''(c)(1) An agency authorized to conduct a test program under this section shall provide to the Administrator, the Telework Managing Officer of that agency, and the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the program not later than 3 months after completion of the program.

''(2) The results in a report described under paragraph (1) may include—

''(A) the number of visits an employee makes to the pre-existing duty station of that employee;

''(B) the travel expenses paid by the agency;

''(C) the travel expenses paid by the employee; or

''(D) any other information the agency determines useful to aid the Administrator, Telework Managing Officer, and Congress in understanding the test program and the impact of the program.

''(d) No more than 10 test programs under this section may be conducted simultaneously.

''(e) The authority to conduct test programs under this section shall expire 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Telework Improvements Act of 2010.

''(f) In this section, the term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 5711 Authority for telework travel expense test programs.''.

SEC. 5. TELEWORK RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH BY OPM ON TELEWORK.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) conduct studies on the utilization of telework by public and private sector entities that identify best practices and recommendations for the Federal government;

(2) review the outcomes associated with an increase in telework, including the effects of telework on energy consumption, the environment, job creation and availability, urban transportation patterns, and the ability to anticipate the dispersal of work during periods of emergency; and

(3) make any studies or reviews performed under this subsection available to the public.

(b) USE OF CONTRACT TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may carry out subsection (a) pursuant to a contract entered into by the Director using competitive procedures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Federal workforce, postal service, and the District of Columbia, I'm pleased to offer H.R. 1722 for consideration. This legislation seeks to improve and expand access to telework for Federal employees in the executive branch.

The bipartisan measure before us today was introduced by Congressman JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, along with myself and Representatives FRANK WOLF, GERRY CONNOLLY of Virginia, JIM MORAN of Virginia, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER of Maryland, and DANNY DAVIS of Illinois back in March 2009. The bill was then amended and ordered reported favorably by our subcommittee on March 24, and again shortly thereafter by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on April 14, 2010.

□ 1350

Madam Speaker, despite the evolving nature of the way the Federal Government conducts its affairs, telework, which allows an employee to regularly perform work from a remote location other than their usual workplace, continues to be underutilized by Federal agencies. Experience has consistently demonstrated that the private and public sector employers who utilize telework experience increased productivity and retention rates. More specifically, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the Defense Information Systems Agency have successfully used telework programs, which shows potentially how telework can transform and enhance agencies' customer service offerings for our citizens and do so with greater efficiency and lower costs.

H.R. 1722 provides for improvements to increase the number of Federal employees that participate in telework programs by requiring agencies to develop comprehensive telework policies within 1 year that allow authorized employees to telework and by directing the Office of Personnel Management to develop regulations on overall telework policies and to annually evaluate agency telework programs.

H.R. 1722 also seeks to elevate the importance of incorporating telework into the continuity of operations planning for our Federal agencies. For example, Office of Personnel Management Director John Berry estimated that the use of telework reduced the estimated cost of lost productivity during the recent snowstorms this past winter in the District of Columbia by approximately $30 million per day.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of moving telework forward by passing H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvement Act. This legislation has long enjoyed bipartisan support in the Oversight Committee and in the House over several Congresses and will help ensure the government operates more efficiently and effectively as a modern-day employer.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise with serious concerns with H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvement Act. This began as a bipartisan bill, and if our one opportunity, a motion to recommit, is passed, it will have an opportunity to end as a bipartisan bill. There is no

question in my mind that telework is the future. It, in fact, is the present. Virtually every Member of Congress has remote access. Virtually every Member of Congress and many of their staff carry BlackBerrys and use other tools so that we can work here and around the world. It would be just about impossible for a Member of Congress and their key staff to bounce back and forth between their far-away districts, here on the Hill, and various meetings if we didn't have the ability to be portable in our information access. So we are not here to talk about telework as though it is a bad thing, because it can be an extremely effective tool.

We do have concerns. One of our specific concerns in the underlying legislation is, at a time in which we're borrowing nearly 40 percent of the operating cash of our government—put in another way, once you get past entitlements, everything we spend is borrowed—it would seem ridiculous that something that can save money, that is argued to save money, in fact, is not required to be at least neutral in its expenditure. This bill is expected to cost millions of dollars per year and, like most government estimates, is likely to cost far more than that if it's expanded to its logical conclusion.

So, Madam Speaker, it is my hope that as we begin offering what we were not allowed to offer under the rule, which would be any amendments that would curtail the millions of dollars in costs over 5 years or to deal with the reality that if you're going to claim that you can save the construction of office buildings, you should be required to show that you are saving it. If you claim that you are going to be more efficient by not having a commute time, you should at least be required to show it. Additionally, we are very concerned that recent discoveries have shown that there are vulnerabilities which have not been properly cared for in this bill. The bill authorizes it but does not require it.

I am, however, pleased that in a number of areas, the majority has made improvements and has taken many suggestions. The committee did work, as you would expect us to, in favor of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal workforce in getting this bill as far as we could go. It is my sincere hope that one and only one opportunity to further amend would be accepted and that this will be a broadly bipartisan bill at the end.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. For the record, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks with respect to H.R. 1722.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the lead sponsor of this measure, Mr. SARBANES of Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his work in shepherding this through the process of bringing it to the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted that we are going to be voting today on the Telework Improvements Act of 2010, a bill that I introduced some time ago with bipartisan cosponsorship. And I want to acknowledge Congresswoman NORTON, who is here, Congressman DAVIS, Congressman CONNOLLY, JIM MORAN of Virginia, and other cosponsors.

I do also want to salute the fact that we had bipartisan support for this from the outset—Congressman WITTMAN, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO and, of course, FRANK WOLF, who has really been a leader on this issue from the get-go. He was working on telework before I even came to Congress and understood what a valuable contribution telework could make to our Federal workforce and its productivity.

What this bill will do is expand the Federal telework policy, which was begun in a nascent way. There was just a survey done that indicated about 10 percent of the Federal workforce is now teleworking at least 1 day a week, but it can take that up to the next level by establishing a policy across our Federal agencies that promote telework and make it clear to employees how they can go about taking advantage of that opportunity. It would instruct the Office of Personnel Management to develop telework regulations, a uniform governmentwide telework policy for Federal employees. And that's important because, if you look at the different agencies, some of them have been very successful in pushing telework forward. Others have not been as attentive to it.

What this is going to do is it's going to establish an expectation to cut across our Federal workforce and encourage this opportunity. Critical to that is to designate a telework managing officer within each agency who takes responsibility, who has accountability for making sure that the telework policy is being distributed broadly within that agency, is helping to evaluate it, make sure that it's working properly.

There will be greater access provided, as a result of this bill, to telework training and education to more employees and supervisors. And the Office of Personnel Management is also going to make sure, in cooperation with the Government Accountability Office, that there's a periodic evaluation conducted so that we can see how this telework policy is advancing forward.

So these are some of the key elements of the bill that is on the floor today. I'm appreciative that Congressman ISSA recognizes the inherent value of pursuing telework. And as I said, we did have bipartisan support at every step along the way.

Why is it important to do teleworking? I would say this is a win times five when you look at. First of all, it's going to help the Federal workforce recruit better out in the market. The private sector is doing this, and they're recruiting people, using this as an opportunity for more flexible work arrangements. The Federal workforce should be doing the same thing.

It will help to improve productivity and morale among the workforce. Those agencies that have taken full advantage of teleworking have shown that productivity has been enhanced within their agency.

□ 1400

And, frankly, it leads to more of a culture of looking at performance and delivery of important functions in the workplace, so that you're seeing that productivity rise, not just among those who are teleworking, but across an entire agency where teleworking is being implemented in a meaningful way.

At one point in the evolution of this legislation, we actually were going to attach it to an energy bill because it will have the effect of reducing the carbon footprint of the Federal Government. People won't need to be in their cars as much going back and forth to work if they can take advantage of teleworking opportunities to some extent. So that's a third win here.

A fourth win, very important, is the continuity of operations. We've seen situations where the Federal Government may be forced to shut down. If you've got telework in place, you can continue to run the operations of these agencies, even in that situation. And the best example of this we had this past winter was when we had a snowstorm that shut down the Federal Government, except 30 percent of the work force was able to engage in their operations.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), one of the cosponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill. But let me just say, Mr. ISSA said that the Republicans wanted to be part of this. And I think we've got to start doing things in this institution in a bipartisan way. Quite frankly, I skimmed the motion to recommit, and it looks like it's pretty good. So the more we can kind of work together, the better, the better it will be for all of us. And so I appreciate the gentleman giving me this time.

I've been involved in this issue for a number of years. IBM—in fact, many times I hear Members on both sides say we should be more like the private sector. IBM has 115,000 employees every day teleworking. And if you want the government to be like the private sector, allow the Federal employees to do

the same. And it saves them roughly $450 million a year.

There's nothing magic about strapping yourselves into a metal box and driving 25 and 35 miles a day to a place and sitting before a laptop when you can do it at home.

Simon and Garfunkel, in the song called ''The Boxer,'' says: ''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.'' This Congress on both sides many times only hears what it wants to hear and more often than not disregards the rest.

Let me tell you, 9/11, if you were here on 9/11, nothing worked. If you couldn't have teleworked, or if we had more telework, we could have had a continuity of government. The government shut down. It shut down. Would you rather have somebody not working at home and getting paid or working?

Secondly, the earthquake in California, the so-called World Series earthquake. Do you remember that? Norm Mineta was Secretary of Transportation. That's when telework really took off, because had they had to go into work, the people of California wouldn't have had highways. They wouldn't have been able to get search and rescue people there.

Continuity of government. Hurricanes. Has anyone ever heard of Katrina?

You want to shut down the government in the South, Louisiana and Texas, and say go home and we'll pay you? Or do you want them to telework at home, where they can do, where they can get and connect to a Veterans Administration, someone's who's having a difficult problem, maybe some who has prostate cancer: How can I connect? How can I get my treatment?

Telework. Telework makes all the difference in a tornado. As tornadoes hit and destroy, telework gives you that ability to do it.

Continuity of government, saving money. So man hears what he wants to hear. But what you're disregarding, this is important. This is a good ''yes'' vote for continuity of government. This a good ''yes'' vote so you can serve your constituents. This is a good ''yes'' vote if you really want to save money. The vote to save money today, the vote that will save money will be the vote for this bill.

I want to thank, again, Mr. ISSA. And I would urge you, Mr. Chairman, if you can take—I think the motion to recommit has a lot of good things. But I think it's more important that we come together and find some things that we can come together and work in a bipartisan way.

But for continuity of government and to save money, I ask for a ''yea'' vote on this bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), the full committee chairman, energetic and wise chairman of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me thank you, Mr. LYNCH, for the hard work that you have done on this bill.

And let me begin by saying to the other side, I hope we're talking about the same legislation here, because in the committee, the only—as I remember very vividly—the only amendment that was offered was accepted. We accepted the amendment. And of course, the committee voice voted the legislation out.

Now I hear about this motion to recommit. And I understand working together. I do believe in that, and I think you accomplish a whole lot more when you do that.

But the point is, we have not even seen the motion to recommit. So, therefore, you're talking about working together and sharing information but, at the same time, you're withholding information. That, to me, I find very, very strange.

This is a committee that would welcome ideas and suggestions. But the point is that we can't go through a whole process and then, at the end of the process, you complain about the fact that I did not have an opportunity.

I want you to know that we recognize the importance of amendments, and if they strengthened the legislation we would have accepted it.

So I want to thank all the folks that worked on this. And it seems hard, I understand now, to imagine with the sweltering summer heat that has arrived, but during February's record-breaking snowstorm, the Federal Government in the D.C. area shut down for nearly an entire work week. We now have almost forgotten that. The government's lost productivity was significantly reduced because so many employees were not able to get to work. After the storm, OPM Director John Berry reported that the government saved approximately $30 million—and I repeat that—saved almost $30 million a day in the productivity costs because of the growing number of teleworking employees. H.R. 1722 will help the government do even better. And I think that we should not lose sight of that.

The legislation builds on the government's current telework capability and will strengthen it by requiring the head of each agency to establish a telework policy. The legislation also holds agencies accountable for successful implementation of their telework policy.

I should note that similar bipartisan legislation sponsored by Senator DANIEL AKAKA and, of course, GEORGE VOINOVICH, passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent as well.

I am pleased to offer my support for this bipartisan, good-government bill that will save the taxpayers money while reducing energy consumption, air pollution, and traffic congestion. It will promote more flexibility for Federal employees and allow the government to attract top talent from every State and every district in the country.

This is win-win-win legislation. I urge all Members to support the bill.

And of course I say to my colleagues, let's move forward. Let's not look back. Let's move forward. We know what we need to do.

And of course, again, let me say that any amendment that was offered was accepted.

□ 1410

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member ISSA for his great work on this bill. I appreciate your words and Congressman WOLF's words concerning the things that we need to do. Telework is a nonpartisan issue. It just make sense. It's how do we create efficiencies? And these days we want to be able to do more with less in what is definitely a resource-challenged environment.

Despite the fact there are numerous benefits of teleworking, such as reduced traffic congestion and reduced energy consumption, cost savings, competitive hiring and retention, and emergency preparedness, as we saw during the snowstorm, many Federal agencies continue to underutilize telework. And this bill is going to help ensure that Federal employees who are eligible to telework are able to do so without diminishing agency operations and performance.

Under this legislation, Federal employees handling classified information, though, would not be eligible to telework. And folks, that's a group of people that we are missing out on. There's a great opportunity there to bring those folks that work in secure networks to the table to participate in telework. And I offered an amendment that was rejected by the Rules Committee that would have required the Office of Personnel Management to report on the status of any programs for teleworking by Federal employees whose primary duties require access to secure networks, and to identify at least two sites for a possible teleworking pilot program. And I look forward in the future to working with my colleagues to further explore the potential for secure teleworking.

We all know in this region there are a number of agencies that have their employees working on secure networks. We ought to make sure we are looking at bringing those folks in. We saw during the snowstorm $30 million of efficiency we picked up during that period of time. So this truly is a nonpartisan issue of looking at increased efficiencies. We ought to be looking across the board at all the ways that we can lift telework up, make it available for every different aspect of Federal work operations to make sure we are doing all we can to increase efficiencies, folks. And this is entirely possible.

We have had conversations with folks within the agencies. They are ready, willing, and able to pursue this. We need to give them the mechanism to get this done. The desire is there. The need is there. Whenever we match

those two together, we have the ability to get this done. So again, this is a nonpartisan issue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this, and let this be the first step to making sure we have telework as an opportunity for the entire Federal workforce.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his thoughtful comments.

At this time I yield 1 minute to our distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank Mr. LYNCH and certainly my colleague from Maryland, Congressman SARBANES, for his leadership and for his efforts on this bill. I also want to thank those members of the subcommittee and Mr. ISSA for facilitating this bill coming to the floor.

I have been working on this issue along with FRANK WOLF for a very long time, indeed over two decades. Congressman WOLF and I, Congressman WOLF from Virginia, a Republican, and myself served on the Treasury and Postal Committee, which is now called the Financial Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. That committee many, many years ago, and interesting enough John Berry, who is now the director of the Office of Personnel Management, was on my staff at that point in time. And we worked on this issue of telework, which makes so much sense for so many reasons. It saves gas. That's an important issue. It helps the environment in doing so. Reduces road congestion, lowers commuting costs for all drivers, helps employees balance work and family, and saves employers money.

Now, let me speak about the family aspect of this. Think to yourself the average commuter certainly in the Washington metropolitan area spends some 35 minutes on the road. If you are in my district, you spend 45 minutes to an hour on the road. Mr. CONNOLLY is shaking his head. Many of his constituents do the same. The gentleman from Virginia is in the same aspect. Think of that time that is not necessarily very productive, but could be family time. And a less stressed-out worker could be performing their services, when now we deal with so much work being done from a technology aspect where you don't need to be at a given site. That is what this legislation seeks to enhance.

And again, I congratulate Mr. SARBANES from my State for his leadership and for the bipartisan leadership. It would bring flexibility to 21st-century Federal workers by creating guidelines for increased teleworking, or telecommuting as some call it.

With today's technology, many employees perform at least some of their work, and indeed some all of their work, functions at their homes or at an alternate worksite closer to their homes, eliminating or reducing the need to commute. That's what the gentleman from Virginia was talking about in terms of a secure site, which could be—we had one in Prince Frederick. We have one at the community college in Waldorf, Maryland. I don't know whether they are secure sites. I think they are not. But a secure site for a group of employees who need such a secure site closer to their home effects all of the same kinds of efficiencies that I have talked about.

That's why this bill is such an important encouragement to the Federal Government, one of the world's largest employers, to effect this efficiency. It is also I think a lesson that we have learned from the private sector, many of whom telecommute or telework. Many insurance agencies, when you call your insurance agent for information, you have no idea where they are sitting, and don't care. All you want to know is that they respond to the question you have and can access the information you need, which of course they can do on their computer. So this is a very effective, efficient, family friendly, environmentally friendly action for us to take.

I commend Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LYNCH and the committee for their leadership on this, and I commend Mr. ISSA as well for his leadership.

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

The chairman and the majority leader both make good points, and I would like to address them for just a moment. The chairman, who I have had a good working relationship with, made the point that this passed out of committee without anything left unresolved. And to a certain extent I would agree with him. Except of course we didn't have a score on this. We never do. We didn't know what this bill was going to cost. And when we discovered that this was going to cost millions of dollars every year, we made it clear before the last round of a request for a vote that we would have to find an offset or we would have to modify the bill to ensure that it would not cause the taxpayers to look at this as simply a perk for government.

Because ultimately we can talk about morale, but the Federal workforce makes on the average $60,000 more than their private-sector counterparts. So morale should already be good in an organization the size of the government that has added a quarter of a million new workers since we went into a recession.

There is no question that telework can justify this if it's done properly. Our amendment is going to seek, our one motion to recommit—we weren't allowed any amendments—to try to at least trim around the edges to have our Members be able to go home and say of course we supported telework, but we made sure there were some safeguards of the American people's money.

The amendments that we tried to offer to what was known in advance to be a closed rule, a please do not suggest, create a process problem that I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will be sensitive, along with the American people, to. Our committee has 40 or so members. That's roughly one-tenth of the Congress. So 9 out of 10 Members of the House never get an opportunity to be there. As a matter of fact, including the Delegates, it works out just exactly as 10 percent. So 400 people didn't have input when we were working this through committee.

Some may have noticed the bill, but as the majority leader said, he has been working on this for 20 years. Who would have thought it would come to the floor now? So can we as a body deny the process of 400 people, 400 voters, if you will, or representatives of voters, including yourself, Mr. Speaker? How can we deny you the ability to look at something when it's going to become a bill on the floor and offer constructive amendments?

The process of the Rules Committee is supposed to deal with germaneness. It's supposed to deal with whether or not your amendment is properly written, whether it seeks to amend a portion of the bill allowed to be amended. That's not the way it is here in the House right now. We had amendments perfectly allowable, and they simply were ruled out because you could. So we will use our one opportunity, our motion to recommit. We trust that we have written it properly, and that it will be found to be in order. And we trust that both sides will see that it is modest, it's moderate, it's intended simply to deal with cost and other concerns in the bill.

There is no killer in this bill. There's nothing the American people would not be happy with in this bill the way it is. And there is nothing they will be unhappy with if the motion to recommit passes. We structured it that way. We would like to have something that started off as bipartisan end as bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe we are going to have that opportunity. I would hope that everyone in this body will view it that way, look at it carefully, come to the same conclusion, and we will leave here today on a bipartisan basis.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask for a clarification, did the gentleman say that the Federal employees make an average of $60,000 more than their counterparts?

Mr. ISSA. If the gentleman would yield, that's correct.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. It's pay and benefits.

□ 1420

Mr. LYNCH. Sixty thousand dollars more.

Mr. ISSA. At $175,000, one Congressman to another, yes. The typical American making $35,000 or $40,000 understands we make a lot more.

Mr. LYNCH. The typical Federal employee makes $60,000 more?

Mr. ISSA. In pay and benefits.

Mr. LYNCH. If the gentleman would produce some type of—that fact's not

in evidence at all. I'm sure that we have kids that are working for $30,000, $40,000 a year. How are they making $60,000 more than their counterparts?

Mr. ISSA. Even though it's not germane to today, I'll be glad to make that available to the gentleman.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding, but I particularly thank him for his leadership on many issues in our subcommittee, not the least of which is this issue which he has shepherded to the floor so rapidly. And I certainly want to thank Mr. SARBANES, add my kudos to those he's already heard from the leadership, what he has shown when he was a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing more than give us a presumption in favor of teleworking, and I believe that's the most important thing the bill does. You have heard we have been doing something called teleworking for decades, but that was whatever agency chose to move forward, whatever employees chose to participate.

I can't imagine what the ranking member is talking about when he says millions of dollars this is going to cost the Federal Government. Mr. WOLF, from his side, essentially rebutted that by getting up and talking about how much money it saved and citing examples.

Let me cite an example of something that is almost intuitive. I had occasion to speak to a practitioner, small practitioner, and he was glowing about how his practice has, in fact, developed and expanded. He didn't have to have an office anymore. He has a tiny hole on Tenth Street, and he's got about 15 lawyers working out of their homes.

In a real sense, the Federal Government is behind. There is no case to be made that when you allow people to work at home, you somehow are costing the government more money. Perhaps it costs a few dollars in administrative costs, transaction costs to set up the system, but anybody from the private sector hearing a Federal official get up and say, ''Oh, we're going to teleworking and boy is that going to cost us an arm and a leg'' will scratch his head and say, ''What is he talking about? Don't they know this is one of the first and most important things the private sector has done, invested money in doing, precisely to save money?'' They look at the bottom line. That's the conclusion they reached long before today.

When I speak of the presumption in favor of telework, notice that an agency has a 20 percent goal every 2 weeks of doing telework. We wouldn't have set that goal if they were already doing it. And the fact that you have to do it gives us a some uniformity across the government, and with the appropriate exceptions allows many, many workers, many, many employees to buy into what has now become essentially a workforce practice everywhere with a workforce as large as ours.

The bill, it's very careful. Managers are going to have to be trained. Many are old-school managers. They do not know perhaps as well do I feel instinctively as at home with employees under their supervision who telework. They're going to have to learn how it's done. And importantly, teleworking, as opposed to coming in, does not affect your job performance evaluation. So people are not going to have to think, if I'm in the boss's face for 8 or 9 hours a day, I've got to do better than this mother who is at home and producing as much work as I do.

Continuitive operations has been talked about here.

Post 9/11, the closest thing we have even had to continuity of operations is the kind of teleworking that goes on anyway in the Federal Government. Everybody in the Federal Government at certain levels does teleworking. They take their work home. Employees have been voting with their feet. Managers have been allowing them to vote with their feet and take the work home.

The flexibility, we cannot say enough about the flexibility. We're in an era where fathers and mothers feel responsibility for their children and where, because they are adept at technology, they are able to get as much done and more done. They're doing it at home rather than spending what in this region could easily be an hour or so back and forth each way.

Everybody teleworked in the snowstorm. There weren't a lot of people just sitting at home. We are doing it anyway. We are just not doing it systematically. We are doing it episodically. Doing it that way, we are, in fact, wasting money. Let's, in fact, save money by making sure that as many as are capable are doing what they can given the new technology.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I note the gentlelady acts as though already everybody teleworks. It's very clear that the people who were able to telework, that, quote, saved us $30 million during that snowstorm, were the people who have redundant activities, for the most part, people who had a duplicate computer, duplicate capacity. That costs money. That is an item that we simply want to make sure is cost justified.

You know, many people on the other side of the aisle, including the next speaker, have talked about the private sector. Well, I, for one, came from the private sector, and I very much understand that we do a cost benefit.

The previous speaker talked about insurance salesmen. You don't care where they are. That's right. An insurance salesman is usually a commission person. It's somebody who's very accountable for their pay because it's earned and justified against revenue. More importantly, even their package of perks is figured into that.

So, in the private sector, if somebody costs, if you will, $190,000 dollars—or as the average Federal worker costs, nonuniformed, $119,000 per worker versus $59,000 in the private sector—in the private sector they know what their sales or revenues or profits are relative to that cost. In the public sector, we don't.

All we're seeking to do, all we're talking about here today is we want telework to be used and rolled out extensively where it can be at least revenue or cost-neutral relative to alternatives of bringing people in. That's all we're asking for. We believe it's reasonable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I do want to note that we do have one study here that I think is probably the most extensive one done on comparing private sector jobs to Federal jobs, and that is by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and they compared occupation to occupation. They took an engineer in private sector versus an engineer working for the Federal Government, and they have reported that Federal employees are paid 22 percent less than their private sector counterparts.

At this point, I yield 5 minutes to an energetic and diligent member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for his outstanding leadership on this and so many other issues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I also thank the ranking member, Mr. ISSA, for his friendship and his leadership on our committee as well.

□ 1430

I particularly want to thank my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) who's been a long-time leader in telework, and my colleague and friend from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for his leadership on this legislation. Without that leadership, we wouldn't be here today and relief wouldn't be on the way to our Federal workforce and hard-pressed commuters in the national capital region.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I represented a major jurisdiction in the national capital region, Fairfax County, for 14 years, the last five being its chairman; and I, like Mr. ISSA, came from the private sector. I spent the last 20 years of my career before coming here working for a number of information technology companies, and I saw firsthand the value of telework in the private sector.

One of the major employers in my district, for example, is AT&T. I went and visited a major facility they have in my district. Thirty-three percent of their workforce teleworks regularly, 33 percent; and their estimated cost savings in terms of reduced absenteeism is $2,000 per employee. So, if we took that kind of statistic and superimposed it

on the Federal workforce, we would obviously save a lot more than whatever the implementation costs of this bill might be.

I believe, like my colleagues who have spoken before, this is critical. This is critical for Federal operations. Every Federal agency now needs to have a continuity of operations plan in place; and in the national capital region, tragically, that is underscored.

FRANK WOLF, my colleague from Virginia, talked about 9/11. He was here in Congress while I was a supervisor in Fairfax County. My office was in the fire station, Fire Station 30 in Merrifield, and my men and women in that fire station were backup to the Arlington Fire Department at the Pentagon the day it was attacked, the second worst terrorist attack in American history. And I saw what they went through, and I know what happened to this region that day. A continuity of operations plan, if we needed a reminder, a tragic reminder, of how critical that is to our national security, 9/11 was it.

Subsequently, we've had lots of natural events here in the national capital region that have further reminded us of how important it is that the largest single employer in our region, the Federal Government, have a vigorous telework program in place because, without that, there is no continuity of operations plan of any meaning.

So for national security reasons and in service to the taxpayers we serve through the Federal agencies, we must have a vigorous telework program in place.

In the national capital region, if we could reach 20 percent of our daily commuters of 2.5 million people teleworking at least 1 day a week, we could take 4 to 6 percent of the cars off the road every day, improving air quality, improving congestion, and improving productivity. The Federal Government being the largest employer has a special responsibility. I mentioned AT&T has 33 percent teleworking in its workforce. The average in the Federal Government ranges from 6 to 10 percent, far below what the private sector is, in fact, doing. We can and must do better. The Federal workforce lends itself to telework in some ways that are unique to the Federal workforce, and we know the benefits.

We've heard some arguments here that only 10 percent of the Congress sits in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and, therefore, we need more time to make sure that we can examine this legislation and its costs. I will argue there are no net costs to this bill. I would argue that this bill has been scored before in many incarnations, in legislation that was before the previous Congress and voted on, in legislation in the other body. So it's not like we didn't know, and we know that the productivity gains and savings are considerable but more than wipe out any potential implementation costs. Whatever costs there are can and will be absorbed by the implementing Federal agencies, and we know that. That ought not to be an excuse for inaction.

This is something that can bring us together on a bipartisan basis. I do find it a little ironic, however, to hear about the need to come together and maybe we can use the motion to recommit to do that when our side of the aisle has not seen the motion to recommit, and obviously we can't buy something in the hopes that it's going to do something positive, and I would urge my colleagues to share the motion to recommit so that perhaps we can come to common ground on that.

But at the end of the day, this legislation is critical to the future workforce of the Federal Government and, frankly, for the national security of the national capital region.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Virginia was accurate in almost everything he said, but the one part that I'd like to correct is we don't need more time. We had sufficient time, once the scoring was in, to figure out what needed to be changed among the various hundred or so Republicans who were not on the committee, and we offered them. And the gentleman from Virginia is not on the Rules Committee so he's not part of that hidden hand that simply doesn't allow any dissent or any amendments or any corrections once a decision has been made by the majority. So, you know, I appreciate the fact he has been good to work with and that he is not somebody who would have limited that, and we would be happy to share all of our amendments if we had a chance of having them ruled in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who has been a long-time advocate on this issue.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. This legislation is similar to a bill I introduced last Congress that passed the House with bipartisan support by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate never acted on that bill so I am pleased that we once again have the opportunity to move telework legislation forward with the leadership of Representative SARBANES.

We currently know that telework continues to be underutilized by Federal agencies and improvements are needed to allow more Federal employees to participate in telework programs.

Telework provides numerous benefits including increased flexibilities for both employers and employees, continuity of operations during emergency events—as noted by the massive snow storms that shut down the government during February, yet saved the government an estimated $30 million each day and decreased energy use and air pollution by minimizing the amount of congestion on the roads.

Study after study has shown these benefits to be paramount to making the Federal Government more efficient, productive, and prepared. However, a top information security officer at the State Department recently stated: "the real national security issue is if we had something that disrupted the ability of the Federal workforce to get to the office, could we continue to provide the services of government? I think you'd find that many departments and agencies would have problems." This speaks to the need and importance of the passage of this bill.

In addition, according to a survey of Patent and Trademark Office employees, 80 percent of employees who telework report that the flexibility of working at home has allowed them to decrease the amount of sick leave used by at least 8 hours per year.

Since the 109th Congress, my office has aggressively participated in the Telework program and created a more worker friendly environment for our working families.

The attributes of teleworking alone allows greater flexibility for these parents while increasing a better work attitude and work product. I encourage all Members of Congress to get more involved in the Telework program in the future as we move to make a more efficient and productive government.

I am pleased to join Representative SARBANES in supporting H.R. 1722.

Plus, we've heard the tremendous cost savings that exist, as well as the anti-pollution measures that take place, but I feel very fortunate in my office to have had individuals who have effectively used telework, I guess to the nth degree; and it has proven to be not only cost savings, but it also has provided them the opportunity to spend time with young children, with their families to the extent they needed to do. This gives us an opportunity to recruit the best and the brightest and have them be productive. It is a great measure. I am pleased to support it.

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

As I begin, my staff is bringing over to the chairman a copy of something I am going to include in the RECORD from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce. The chairman may recognize the Department of Commerce is part of the administration and part of government.

Their assessment in 2008—and it has only become greater—is that we have as Federal workers against average—this is not against average of job per job but just against the working stiff, whatever they do in the outside world versus the working stiff in government, $29,169.63 of additional wages. What makes the huge difference the American people don't always see is that in the private sector, a typical benefit package is about $9,881. Well, a civilian Federal Government employee has a benefit package on the average worth about $40,784 or $30,900 more.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do have the Department of Commerce currently, during the Obama administration, telling us very clearly—not that engineer versus engineer. I appreciate the way

you can match up various jobs, but the Federal workforce is a highly skilled and highly paid workforce, and we should understand that if we are going to have telework go greater and greater—and I approve of it doing it—we have two reasons to do it.

One is continuity of government, and sometimes continuity of government can cost more. It can be for redundant computers, redundant centers and so on, no question at all. But often it is, and as it is justified in this bill by many of the people speaking on it on both sides of the aisle, it is also about avoiding traffic, avoiding building new buildings, avoiding heating and air conditioning, avoiding costs. All the minority would like to make sure is that this expansion meets one of those requirements or the other. If it is necessity and it costs more, fine. Of course you can have redundant facilities; but if it is intended to be cost savings, let's make sure it's cost savings.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1440

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the sheet, but I do want to note this does not compare job-to-job, nor does it indicate that there is anything close to a $60,000 delta between the private and the public employee.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES), who also has been an energetic worker on this issue.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2010. This bill will modernize the Federal Government and establish our Federal agencies as a model for telework.

During the month of February, when snowstorms shut down D.C. and other parts of the east coast, telework was used to keep our government operating at an optimum level. However, according to the Office of Personnel Management, only 56 percent of government agencies have formally introduced telework in their continuity of operations plans.

Teleworking benefits are economic, social, and environmental. The Congressional Budget Office scored this legislation as deficit neutral, and telework produces savings from reduced office space as well as increased productivity during emergencies in inclement weather.

H.R. 1722 would allow employees more flexibility and create a higher quality of life. Also this legislation would reduce traffic congestion. Traffic congestion costs our Nation billions of dollars in wasted fuel, time, and productivity.

Congestion is very prevalent in my district in New Jersey, which is just across the river from New York. However, it also is a problem that is growing in rural areas throughout this country. Transportation contributes nearly 28 percent of the greenhouse gasses emitted in the United States, and teleworking can act as a tool to lower this number.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1722.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. A sincere thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. We have heard articulated today a set of very powerful arguments around security, around productivity and around cost savings for the passage of this measure.

I would like to note that I represent, like my friend from New Jersey, a district whose economic vitality is compromised by the commuting situation. Many of my constituents spend otherwise what could be productive hours looking at the taillights of other cars on 95 and on the Merritt Parkway as it runs through Connecticut.

One additional reason why the Federal Government should lead and why we should pass this act today is that the Federal Government should lead on telecommuting, on increasing not just its productivity, but increasing the productivity of the private sector in places like Connecticut, which I represent.

I am a strong backer of the Telecommuter Tax Fairness Act, H.R. 2600, and a variety of other measures that will help with telecommuting. I appreciate the leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, although we have 12 minutes left on our side in debate, I don't intend to use it. I also don't intend to continue to have the American people hear haggling on the House floor about how much one side gets paid or another. For that reason, I will today post at republicans.oversight.house.gov the Department of Commerce report in sufficient detail for people to realize that $60,072.97 is roughly the additional amount in pay and benefits that Federal employees receive than the average private sector.

But the interesting thing about the Federal workforce versus the gentleman who was talking about commuting from Bridgeport and other parts in his State, is they are not laid off. They are not suffering. As a matter of fact, they have been net-hired. The growth that has occurred over the last 2 years has been in government. The pay increases have been in government. The benefit increases have been in government.

Now, we are not talking about telework as a benefit, although some speakers have talked about family time because you can telework and so on. We are talking about telework for one of two reasons that are justified, and Republicans will today, I hope, vote for the motion to recommit and then vote for final passage, because it either is part of the job of government, the sustainability, the continuity of government, and we want to make sure we use telework in order to advance that, or remote access, if you will, or it saves the taxpayers dollars.

If someone doesn't drive for an hour and they work an hour more remotely, that is a good thing. But if we are simply improving quality of life, having redundant computers at a cost of several thousand dollars plus several more thousand dollars in maintenance and overhead and renewal and software support, Mr. Speaker, we are not doing what the American people expect us to do.

The American people expect us to start being safeguarders of their precious money, which isn't even current but the money we are going to have to take from them in the future to pay back what we are borrowing today.

If we don't start counting the pennies, the nickles and the dollars and make sure they are well spent, then it is very clear we will never get to any kind of an affordable government, a balanced budget, and there will be an inevitably that the United States will look too much like Greece and not enough like the country that we were so proud of this past Fourth of July.

We have a great tradition, a tradition of small government and large private sector. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that our government works more efficiently so we can have a smaller government that meets the basic requirements, not that we simply expand government with one after another programs.

With that, I fully expect that we will make this bill better, that we will continue to work on telework being to the advantage of the American taxpayer and not simply an additional item to be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again would like to express my strong support for the passage of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2010. I would like to thank Mr. SARBANES, our lead sponsor on this measure which is before us today, which promotes good and common sense governance policy which will ensure a more efficient, responsive Federal government, especially in times of national security and weather-related emergencies.

Moreover, H.R. 1722 will allow executive branch agencies to act more like other 21st century employers, particularly private sector employers, which for years have utilized and reaped the benefits of telework in terms of increased job productivity as well as employee moral.

I want to paraphrase the words of my Republican colleague, Mr. WOLF of Virginia, who said that the vote for saving money and the vote for cutting costs here is a ''yes'' vote on this measure.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1722.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to have the opportunity to support H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2009. I would like to thank Representative SARBANES, Representative LYNCH, Chairman TOWNS and Representative WOLF for their leadership on this legislation and for working to improve the lives of government employees across the country. Giving people the flexibility to work from home, when possible, makes the federal government a more productive and environmentally responsible employer by saving money, decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, decreasing congestion and improving productivity.

Currently only 10 percent of eligible federal employees telework on a regular basis, even though many federal jobs would be well suited to teleworking. 95 percent of federal government employees expressed interest in teleworking, but the majority of these workers said there was not adequate support from their agency to do so. This bill will give federal workers the flexibility to telework when appropriate. There are many private companies, such as Intel in my home state of Oregon, where up to one third of employees telework regularly, and these companies have seen increased employee satisfaction, employee retention, and an average savings of $4,500 a year per employee in transportation costs and time savings.

Unfortunately, teleworking is a case where the federal government has missed the opportunity to lead by example, and now we need to catch up. Federal government employees should be able to take advantage of the same technology for workplace flexibility, time savings, and environmental benefits that private sector employees do.

This winter, the federal government was essentially shut down for a week because of snowstorms. Even with the minimal support in place for teleworking, estimates suggest that the federal government saved $30 million a day, because of teleworking.

Finally, we cannot discuss the importance of telework without looking at the environmental impact. The Telework Exchange estimates that if 20 percent of Americans were to telework, we could eliminate 67 million tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually and reduce Persian Gulf oil imports by 40 percent. More to the point for this legislation, if all eligible federal employees were to telework for two days per week, it would save 2.7 metric tons of pollution each year.

This bill is an important first step, and I would also like to encourage my colleagues to look at the telework provisions in legislation I have introduced. H.R. 3271, Green Routes to Work, is a collection of green commuting tax incentives. The legislation promotes a variety of commuting methods, including transit, bicycling and walking, but it also provides a tax credit for qualified teleworking expenses. I hope that my colleagues will look at Green Routes to Work as another tool to incentivize teleworking.

Encouraging teleworking will help the federal government be a better partner as we look for ways to improve families' quality of life and make all communities safer, healthier and more economically secure. Putting money back in individuals' pockets, saving the federal government money, reducing carbon emissions and reducing time spent in traffic are important aspects of a livable community, and I am proud to support this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2009. I supported this legislation when it came to the House floor earlier this year, and I intend to vote in favor of it again today.

Technology plays an integral role in how our entire country works today. It has made workplace communication more efficient. It has eliminated borders across the globe to allow every aspect of the U.S. economy to flourish. It permits our first responders to stay connected during times of emergency and natural disasters. So many in the workforce already take advantage of the benefits of technology and the federal government should be able to as well.

The Telework Improvements Act will define telework for all federal agencies and establish a policy that authorizes employees to telework. This legislation will reduce the numbers of cars on the road, attract more talent to the federal workforce, and save taxpayer dollars over the long-term.

As a Member of the Intelligence Committee, I'm also pleased this legislation places a priority on ensuring the security of government information. We know all too well the dangers of data breaches, viruses, and cyberattacks to sensitive government information. H.R. 1722 requires the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with the National Institute on Standards and Technology to issue guidelines for information and security protections for telework.

I applaud the work of Representative SARBANES on this legislation and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act of 2009.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a district with a large number of federal employees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. I want to thank Chairmen TOWNS and LYNCH and Representative SARBANES for their leadership in crafting this important bi-partisan bill.

If passed, this measure will put the federal government on equal footing with many private sector employers and state governments which allow their employees to perform many of their duties and responsibilities from home or at another work site.

The Telework Improvements Act requires each executive agency to establish a policy that enables federal employees to telework in a way that does not diminish employee performance or agency operations, and that ensures that no distinction is made between teleworkers and non-teleworkers for performance appraisal and training purposes.

Having the option to telework will enhance the quality of life for many federal employees and save money for the taxpayers. For example, there is an effort underway to attract more young people to federal government service to offset the growing number of older employees who are retiring. Offering prospective employees the option to telework increases the possibility that those employees with families will join the federal workforce.

Telework also is smart fiscally. According to the Office of Personnel Management, during the blizzard that hit Washington, DC last winter, the government lost $71 million worth of productivity for each day it remained closed. This number might have been far larger had some federal workers not had the opportunity to work from home.

The Telework Improvements Act makes environmental, administrative and fiscal common sense. Increasing telework opportunities for employees of the country's largest employer means fewer cars on the roads as workers commute less; it means lower carbon emissions; it means better quality of life for workers and their families; and, it means reduced costs for taxpayers and higher government efficiency because of lower absenteeism.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 1509, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ISSA. I am, in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Issa moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1722 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 6, line 9, and insert the following:

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) CERTAIN EMPLOYEES NOT AUTHORIZED TO TELEWORK.—An employee may not telework under a policy established under this chapter if any of the following apply to the employee:

''(A) The employee has a seriously delinquent tax debt (as determined under paragraph (2)).

''(B) The employee has been officially disciplined for violations of subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography, on a Federal Government computer or while performing official Federal Government duties.

''(C) The employee received a payment under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) but was ineligible to receive the payment under the criteria described in section 2605(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(2)).

''(D) The employee has been officially disciplined for being absent without permission for more than 5 days in any calendar year.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a 'seriously delinquent tax debt' means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of such Code, except that such term does not include—

''(i) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code;

''(ii) a debt with respect to which a levy has been issued under section 6331 of such Code upon accrued salary or wages (or, in the case of an applicant for employment, a debt with respect to which the applicant agrees to be subject to a levy issued under such section upon accrued salary or wages); and

''(iii) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code, or relief under subsection (a), (b), or (f) of section 6015 of such Code, is requested or pending.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall, for purposes of carrying out this paragraph, prescribe any regulations which the Office considers necessary, except that such regulations shall provide that an individual shall be given a reasonable amount of time to demonstrate that the individual's debt is described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A).

''(3) CERTIFICATION OF SAVINGS.—An agency may not permit employees to telework under a policy established under this chapter unless the head of the agency certifies to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management that the implementation of the policy will result in savings to the agency.

''(4) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be considered—

''(A) to require the head of an agency to authorize teleworking in the case of an employee whose duties and responsibilities—

''(i) require daily direct handling of classified information; or

''(ii) are such that their performance requires on-site activity which cannot be carried out from a site removed from the employee's regular place of employment; or

''(B) to prevent the temporary denial of permission for an employee to telework if, in the judgment of the agency head, the employee is needed to respond to an emergency.

''(c) PROHIBITING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACTIVITIES WHILE TELEWORKING.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 71, any time during which an employee teleworks may not be treated as 'official time' for purposes of the authority to carry out any activity under section 7131 of this title.

''(d) REQUIREMENT THAT PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS CREATED ON NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL OR SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS WHILE TELEWORKING BE COPIED TO OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL ACCOUNTS.—In the case of any employee who, while teleworking pursuant to a policy established under this chapter, creates or receives a Presidential record or Vice-Presidential record within the meaning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, through a non-official electronic mail account, a social media account, or any other method (electronic or otherwise), the employee shall electronically copy the record into the employee's official electronic mail account.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this chapter shall—

''(1) be considered to require any employee to telework; or

''(2) prevent an agency from permitting an employee to telework as part of a continuity of operations plan.''.

Mr. ISSA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I object.

I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward motion. It is a motion that, if passed, will cause the Republicans to vote for this, if not unanimously, virtually unanimously. If we take out the $30 million in cost by insisting that there be reasonable offsets, then we will in fact have fixed one of the problems that was unnecessary in the bill. Additionally, as was so well read by our Clerk just a moment ago, it is very, very clear that there are some small areas but meaningful areas. We do not want the American people to believe that telecommuters are downloading pornography full time the way $200,000-plus executives at SEC, the Securities and Exchange Commission, were doing.

Now, I wanted to include in the motion to recommit that if you're found downloading while telecommuting, you'd be fired, but it turns out, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prevent me from offering that. I am not allowed under the rules to insist on behalf of the American people that somebody be terminated if they've downloaded endless pornography while telecommuting. So instead we have simply said in the motion to recommit that if they're found downloading pornography, they can no longer telecommute.

Likewise, on a number of other areas we feel that the American people should know that there is accountability. Accountability as to the Presidential Records Act. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Presidential Records Act is extremely important. That if somebody is working offsite, we want to ensure that they do not use a Gmail account or in some other way go off system and have that lost for the rest of eternity. It is too important and it is too uniform a law to not make sure it is included in this Act. Additionally, the question of official business.

Now, often motions to recommit include poison pills. This is not one. We wanted to make sure that if there's a union contract in which there's union negotiation or other time allotted—official time—that it not be done clandestinely around telecommuting. The fact is that if a union leader who is also a Federal employee has a right to have so much time spent doing that, this would not stop them, but it would make it very clear that you can't simply be working out of your house and use that as collective bargaining time or other work that would not be manageable.

It's very clear that we were limited in this. This does not fix everything, Mr. Speaker. This does not fix everything I'd like to fix, but it simply makes the bill revenue neutral and in a couple of important areas assures the American people that their taxpayer dollars are not being misused while someone is telecommuting.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ISSA for offering this motion to recommit.

Since the stimulus passed last February, the private sector has shed over 3.2 million jobs and unemployment now stands at a staggering 9.5 percent. Now is not the time to give another perk to Federal employees while the rest of America is struggling to make ends meet.

By requiring Federal agencies to duplicate an existing law and spend 20 percent of their official time out of the office and on a mobile worksite, we're costing the taxpayers another $32 million while promoting an inefficient Federal workforce.

□ 1500

I'm proud that this motion to recommit corrects some of these problems. Thankfully, if adopted, this motion will require that each agency must certify to the Office of Personnel Management that the agency's telework program will save money, rather than increase spending. Furthermore, teleworking privileges will not be granted to employees that have been disciplined for poor work performance and behavior, such as viewing pornography on work computers, having a record of being absent without permission, or who are delinquent in paying their taxes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that this motion will prohibit Federal employees from engaging in union or collective bargaining activities while teleworking. OPM reported that in fiscal year 2008 alone, nearly 3 million official time hours were used in collective bargaining or arbitration of grievances against an employer, equating to over $120 million tax dollars spent on union activities. It's irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, to use these dollars for nonrelated official duties while on official time.

So, Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is necessary to save precious tax dollars and ensure the integrity of the Federal workforce. I commend Mr. ISSA for bringing this forward. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. ISSA. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LYNCH. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points here that I would like to make at the outset, and I appreciate the spirit in which the gentleman has offered these amendments.

Many of the concerns that the gentleman has raised in his motion to recommit have been addressed in the bill.

I would like to begin by saying that right now, with respect to tax delinquency and enforcing the tax laws against Federal employees, we have greater protections right now in place against those Federal employees than exist against any other employee in America today. We have the ability to remove them from their jobs. We have the ability to garnish their wages. We have the ability to demand of them compliance with the tax law that is much more difficult to implement against the average private sector employee. So I do not think that the measures here and the ''seriously delinquent'' category that does not exist under the IRS Tax Code well serves the underlying purpose of this bill.

I do want to say that prohibiting collective bargaining activity while teleworking is also a question of possible violation with other statutes that I believe may be infringed upon by this motion. So I would be very, very concerned about—obviously we were given this motion about a minute ago—well, a couple of minutes ago, so I'm not so sure how that would affect Taft-Hartley collective bargaining rights. But it would appear that they would do a carve-out here for those workers who are teleworking and yet unable to exercise the rights that otherwise might exist in those employees. So I am very, very concerned about that.

I understand the restrictions. Further, the amended version of H.R. 1722 already incorporates language to restrict allowing employees to telework based on previous disciplinary issues that might have been presented.

With respect to the concern raised by my friend and colleague with respect to accessing pornographic sites, I should note that history has shown us that those who rail against weaknesses of the human spirit are usually the very people who succumb to those very weaknesses. But we would certainly agree that that is inappropriate behavior and it should be punished. I tend to think that that is a point of agreement, but I think it's just a matter of how to implement that prohibition.

There is also a difficulty at the heart of this, which is that the gentleman's motion to reconsider requires us to demonstrate a savings now at this level. Here's the problem: We are not in an Appropriations Committee. We have not appropriated any money for this. We don't have the ability to do that. This is authorization. So how are we supposed to know where the break point on savings might be when we don't know, in this forum, how much money might be spent?

Those are structural flaws, I think, in the bill that prevent us from accepting the amendment at this time. However, I understand that some Members may see one or two of these issues as decisive on their behalf, and I would understand and respect the Members' rights to vote as they might on this measure. But because of the issues that I have raised—one, because it creates a level of impossibility for us to demonstrate savings when we don't know how much money is going to be used in implementing this measure. That will be decided by the appropriators. And, as well, we realize that to set this up, in order to establish the teleworking protocols, there will be an expenditure to begin with, but the savings will result at a later time. So I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1722, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on S. 1508.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 119, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—303

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hodes
Holden
Hunter
Inglis
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Ortiz
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—119

Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—10

Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt

□ 1537

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, FILNER, ELLISON, NEAL of Massachusetts, FATTAH, GEORGE MILLER of California, KUCINICH, GUTIERREZ, FARR, OBERSTAR, STARK, CLYBURN, MEEK of Florida, PAYNE, SERRANO, LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ORTIZ, HALL of New York, JACKSON of Illinois, BLUNT, ACKERMAN, WILSON of Ohio, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, HEINRICH, ETHERIDGE, COOPER, CONNOLLY of Virginia, WEINER, MOORE of Kansas, BACA, SCHIFF, Ms. HARMAN, Messrs. GONZALEZ, PASTOR of Arizona, CARDOZA, PERLMUTTER, BISHOP of New York, KIND, and BARTON of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 1722, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH:

Page 5, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 6, line 9, and insert the following:

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) CERTAIN EMPLOYEES NOT AUTHORIZED TO TELEWORK.—An employee may not telework under a policy established under this chapter if any of the following apply to the employee:

''(A) The employee has a seriously delinquent tax debt (as determined under paragraph (2)).

''(B) The employee has been officially disciplined for violations of subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography, on a Federal Government computer or while performing official Federal Government duties.

''(C) The employee received a payment under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) but was ineligible to receive the payment under the criteria described in section 2605(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(2)).

''(D) The employee has been officially disciplined for being absent without permission for more than 5 days in any calendar year.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a 'seriously delinquent tax debt' means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of such Code, except that such term does not include—

''(i) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code;

''(ii) a debt with respect to which a levy has been issued under section 6331 of such Code upon accrued salary or wages (or, in the case of an applicant for employment, a debt with respect to which the applicant agrees to be subject to a levy issued under such section upon accrued salary or wages); and

''(iii) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code, or relief under subsection (a), (b), or (f) of section 6015 of such Code, is requested or pending.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall, for purposes of carrying out this paragraph, prescribe any regulations which the Office considers necessary, except that such regulations shall provide that an individual shall be given a reasonable amount of time to demonstrate that the individual's debt is described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A).

''(3) CERTIFICATION OF SAVINGS.—An agency may not permit employees to telework under a policy established under this chapter unless the head of the agency certifies to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management that the implementation of the policy will result in savings to the agency.

''(4) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be considered—

''(A) to require the head of an agency to authorize teleworking in the case of an employee whose duties and responsibilities—

''(i) require daily direct handling of classified information; or

''(ii) are such that their performance requires on-site activity which cannot be carried out from a site removed from the employee's regular place of employment; or

''(B) to prevent the temporary denial of permission for an employee to telework if, in the judgment of the agency head, the employee is needed to respond to an emergency.

''(c) PROHIBITING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACTIVITIES WHILE TELEWORKING.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 71, any time during which an employee teleworks may not be treated as 'official time' for purposes of the authority to carry out any activity under section 7131 of this title.

''(d) REQUIREMENT THAT PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS CREATED ON NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL OR SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS WHILE TELEWORKING BE COPIED TO OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL ACCOUNTS.—In the case of any employee who, while teleworking pursuant to a policy established under this chapter, creates or receives a Presidential record or Vice-Presidential record within the meaning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, through a non-official electronic mail account, a social media account, or any other method (electronic or otherwise), the employee shall electronically copy the record into the employee's official electronic mail account.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this chapter shall—

''(1) be considered to require any employee to telework; or

''(2) prevent an agency from permitting an employee to telework as part of a continuity of operations plan.''.

Mr. LYNCH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. LYNCH. 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 290, nays 131, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—290

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)

Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—131

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Guthrie
Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver
Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1545

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require the head of each executive agency to establish and implement a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROPER PAYMENTS ELIMINATION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1508) to amend the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) in order to prevent the loss of billions in taxpayer dollars, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—414

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Carter
Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Mollohan
Olson
Owens
Sánchez, Linda T.
Shadegg
Teague
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1553

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5621

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 5621.

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

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC CRISIS CONTINUES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, as the massive Federal spending and overregulating continue, so does the ongoing economic crisis. The Labor Department reported this week that job openings dropped in May from the previous month and layoffs edged up. Businesses added a net total of only 83,000 jobs in June and 33,000 in May, after average net gains of 200,000 in March and April.

A major reason for this weak hiring is that small businesses, which create about 60 percent of new jobs, are having trouble getting the credit they need to expand and hire more workers. Meanwhile, in the middle of this recession, the liberal leadership in the House is about to unload another 2,500 pages of hundreds of new regulations on the very businesses that provide credit.

Madam Speaker, we need to act now to reverse course, to lower the tax burden on small firms and simplify the regulations in order to encourage job creation, and we need it now.

AMERICANS DON'T TRUST NATIONAL MEDIA

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, it's hard to find any organization that is less trusted than the national media. Just 8 percent of Americans trust the media, according to a new Zogby public opinion poll. Eighty-eight percent say they have little or no trust in the media—by far the worst rating of any organization mentioned. In comparison, the poll found that Americans trust major high-tech companies and even the social networking Web site Facebook more.

This is the latest of many recent polls showing the public has lost faith in the national media. If the media want to restore Americans' trust, they should stop the liberal spin and report the facts.

CHINESE TRADE DEFICIT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Press reports today show that our trade deficit with China has jumped to $22.3 billion dollars—in 1 month.

Now President Obama wants to double down on Afghanistan with a counterterrorism strategy for $30 billion that many of us believe won't work. But that's because he's a war-fighting President.

This is a war with China, it's a trade war, and we have surrendered to China. Secretary Geithner pretends they aren't manipulating their currency. Our Special Trade Representative pretends they aren't precluding American products with unfair trade barriers. We never file complaints against their unfair trade barriers precluding our products from getting into their country.

We are losing the trade war with China. We're losing our national manufacturing base. We need those jobs. We can't keep borrowing money from China to buy things that we used to make in America. That's not a sustainable system.

Wake up downtown at the White House, please.

RECOGNIZING SANDY MORRIS

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very distinguished businesswoman, Sandy Morris, the founder and CEO of Bradley Morris, Incorporated based in Kennesaw, Georgia. Sandy built Bradley Morris, Incorporated—BMI—from the ground up. Her goal was to create the biggest and best military recruiting firm in the country, and nearly 20 years later, I would say Sandy has more than surpassed her goal. BMI is now the largest military recruiting firm in the country and they have helped more than 20,000 military personnel find careers after serving our country.

Madam Speaker, Sandy's career—influenced by her father's service in World War II—has taken her all the way to the top 3 percent of all women-owned firms with revenues of $1 million or more. She is truly an impressive woman, and I wish her the best of luck.

RECOGNIZING ISRAELI HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS IN HAITI

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I am going to be putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the Annals of Internal Medicine entitled Early Disaster Response in Haiti: the Israeli Field Hospital Experience. It talks about how the Israeli Defense Forces Medical Corps Field Hospital was fully operational only 89 hours after the earthquake struck and was capable of providing sophisticated medical care. In the 10 days the hospital was operational, the Israelis treated over 1,100 patients, hospitalized 737 patients, and performed 244 operations. At the same time, the Iranians were shipping Scud missiles through Syria to Hezbollah to rearm them on the northern border of Israel; the Turks were trying to create an international incident with their ridiculous flotilla; the Iraqis, the Sunnis and the Shiites kept killing each other. In Pakistan, the government seems to be immobile when it comes to the terrorist attacks in that country. In Afghanistan, the Taliban keeps killing Americans; and Hamas continues to terrorize its own Palestinian people in the Gaza. All of that while the Israelis are actually doing something important for humanity. I think we ought to wake up and appreciate what the Israelis do.

[From Annals of Internal Medicine, May 4, 2010]

EARLY DISASTER RESPONSE IN HAITI: THE ISRAELI FIELD HOSPITAL EXPERIENCE

(By Yitshak Kreiss, MD, MHA, MPA; Ofer Merin, MD; Kobi Peleg, PhD, MPH; Gad Levy, MD; Shlomo Vinker, MD; Ram Sagi, MD; Avi Abargel, MD, MHA; Carmi Bartal, MD, MPH; Guy Lin, MD; Ariel Bar, MD, MHA; Elhanan Bar-On, MD; Mitchell J. Schwaber, MD, MSc; and Nachman Ash, MD, MS)

(The earthquake that struck Haiti in January 2010 caused an estimated 230,000 deaths and injured approximately 250,000 people. The Israel Defense Forces Medical Corps Field Hospital was fully operational on site only 89 hours after the earthquake struck and was capable of providing sophisticated medical care. During the 10 days the hospital was operational, its staff treated 1111 patients, hospitalized 737 patients, and performed 244 operations on 203 patients. The field hospital also served as a referral center for medical teams from other countries that were deployed in the surrounding areas.

The key factor that enabled rapid response during the early phase of the disaster from a distance of 6000 miles was a well-prepared and trained medical unit maintained on continuous alert. The prompt deployment of advanced-capability field hospitals is essential in disaster relief, especially in countries with minimal medical infrastructure. The changing medical requirements of people in an earthquake zone dictate that field hospitals be designed to operate with maximum flexibility and versatility regarding triage, staff positioning, treatment priorities, and hospitalization policies. Early coordination with local administrative bodies is indispensable.)

An earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter magnitude scale struck close to Port-au-Prince, Haiti, on 12 January 2010. The official death toll was set at 230,000, and local authorities estimated that 250,000 people were injured. This catastrophic event galvanized a strong and rapid response worldwide, and the Israeli government quickly decided to launch a medical humanitarian mission to provide medical care as advanced as possible under the circumstances.

Whereas the fate of patients with life-threatening internal-organ injuries is determined within the first hours of a disaster, early provision of treatment for the multitudes of patients with open fractures can prevent life-threatening sepsis and limb-threatening infections. In addition, situations involving substantial casualties combined with extensive damage to local medical facilities and infrastructure highlight

the need for a resourceful, experienced, and trained medical team backed by a logistics contingent. The Israel Defense Forces Medical Corps (IDF–MC) Field Hospital comprises such a unit.

The field hospital staff consisted of 121 servicemen and servicewomen (Appendix Table 1, available at www.annals.org) and was organized into medical, surgical, orthopedic, pediatric, gynecologic, and ambulatory care divisions, as well as auxiliary units (Appendix Figure, available at www.annals.org), with a capacity of 60 inpatient beds that could be expanded to 72.

To ensure maximum optic independence and to shorten the time to deployment, we brought all hospital supplies; a fully stocked pharmacy, including sufficient oral antibiotics to be distributed on discharge; imaging machinery; a laboratory that could perform blood tests and urine chemistry, hematology, blood gases, and microbiology analyses; and autoclaves for sterilization. Energy sources (generators) and accommodations (tents and latrines) were also brought from Israel. This crucial effort was carried out by a highly trained, skilled logistics unit of 109 personnel, including computer and communication specialists, security staff, kitchen staff, carpenters, plumbers, mechanics, electricians and a burial team.

BUSINESS ADVISORY TOUR

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, last week during the July 4th recess, I had the privilege of announcing my Economic Advisory Council as I toured each county in Georgia's Ninth Congressional District. During this time, business leaders in all 15 counties I represent took time from their busy day to join me to discuss ideas for job creation.

Do you know what was unanimous from each of these business leaders? It was stop the crazy spending that's going on here in Washington and start sending clear signals that Washington is serious about creating jobs through the expansion of the private sector and not expansion of government.

This starts with lowering taxes and stopping the runaway debt. We must stop cap and trade, repeal ObamaCare and get our house in order. In fact, Congress should block all tax increases, freeze discretionary spending to at least 2006 levels, and stop all proposed regulations that have any negative economic impact.

In other words, the business community in my district is saying loud and clear, ''Washington, you're not helping. Get out of the way and let the free market work.''

I couldn't agree with them more.

□ 1600

BUY AMERICA PROVISIONS WORKING

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, a few weeks ago I visited a company in my district, Integro, and through the enforcement of the Buy America clause, their business in making lighting for airstrips has almost doubled.

In visiting them, I found out that they then have increased their purchasing from other domestic firms. So earlier this week I visited a company in Plainville, Connecticut, Olson Brothers, who has seen their business increase 20 to 30 percent because of the purchasing done by Integro.

They buy their raw product from a company in Massachusetts, and hopefully later on during the August break I will get to visit them as well.

The point is when you enforce Buy America regulations, when we make sure that the things we buy for the Federal Government are bought from domestic firms, you don't just create business with one company, you create business with three companies, with five companies, with 10 companies. That is why Buy America works. That is why we should reinvest and strengthen that policy here in Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY SPECIALIST BRENDAN PATRICK NEENAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Army Specialist Brendan Patrick Neenan today. Specialist Neenan was killed in Afghanistan on June 7th by an improvised explosive device, otherwise known as an IED. He died while defending the country he loved so dearly. He was only 21 years of age.

A native of Enterprise, Alabama, Brendan was the third generation of his family to be a part of the 82nd Airborne Division. He was stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and a member of the 2nd Battalion, 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team.

After high school, Brendan enrolled at Enterprise State Community College, where I went to school, where, like his older brother Tim, he showed an interest in comedy. But Brendan had a higher calling and strongly believed he should serve his country first before doing anything else. Without question, he adhered to the concept of America first.

His brother Tim noted to the Southeast Sun newspaper in Enterprise, ''Brendan was a third generation 82nd Airborne. Him, my dad and my grandfather did the exact same thing in the military. He was very proud of being a third generation 82nd. He absolutely, not in a political way, but in an altruistic way, believed in doing something,'' and that something was serving his country.

Even when he was preparing to deploy to Afghanistan, Brendan was worried more about his family than himself. He told his sister Katie to keep her grades up. He encouraged his brother Tim to continue his career in comedy. His father Hugh Neenan said, ''He was a very gentle soul, the nicest soul you would ever want to meet, but he was a tough, tough young man.''

When Brendan passed away, the loss was not only for the Neenan family, but for the entire country. America lost a true hero, someone dedicated to standing up for the values we hold so dear. He was an outstanding young American.

When I spoke to Hugh Neenan shortly after his son's passing, Brendan's character shined through despite the fact that Mr. Neenan was understandably still distraught from losing a son. Brendan was simply performing his duty to his country, following a proud family tradition.

Madam Speaker, delivering these speeches is one of the toughest duties any Member of Congress has to do during his tenure or her tenure here, but what we do here pales in comparison to the brave actions of all of our men and women serving overseas. They are the true American heroes and they deserve our unending gratitude for their sacrifices.

Brendan was laid to rest on June 22nd in Arlington National Cemetery alongside 300,000 other American patriots. His tomb there will be an eternal reminder of his sacrifice to our country.

The loss of Brendan was a blow to his father Hugh, his stepmother Lesa, his brother Tim, his sister Katie, as well as the entire Wiregrass area in southeast Alabama. Enterprise and the area surrounding Fort Rucker, Alabama, have seen more than its fair share of loss over the last several years.

May our thoughts and prayers be with the entire Wiregrass community, as well as Brendan's family, during their time of mourning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1610

GOVERNMENT BORDER SECURITY PLAN: ERECT A FEW SIGNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I bring you news from the third front.

We have the first front in the war in Afghanistan, the second front is the war in Iraq, and the third front is the border with our neighbors to the south—Mexico. We are finally beginning to learn that there is concrete evidence of a new border plan by this administration. The administration's new plan is this. And let me show you. The plan is to put up warning signs—signs like this one right here. And I happen to have a photograph of one of these signs. It's on Interstate 8 in Arizona.

The Bureau of Land Management began posting these signs recently in locations along Interstate 8 between Casa Grande and Gila Bend in Arizona. It's an east-west stretch of highway about 60 miles long. Phoenix is 30 miles to the north. The border with Mexico is 80 to 100 miles to the south. About a dozen of these signs have been posted.

You probably can't see this, Madam Speaker, so let's go through it. Of course, at the top it's in red: Danger: Public Warning—Travel Not Recommended. The Federal Government, the administration, and its new border security plan is to tell us, Don't travel this highway. It's not recommended by the Federal Government. The administration has issued travel warnings to citizens to not travel in parts of America. It's just too dangerous for Americans to go through America.

The sign goes on and says some more. Right here, the first bullet point: Active Drug and Human Smuggling Area. So now we know why we're not to be in that part of Arizona—because it's not safe. There's an active area of drug smuggling and human trafficking. And so the remedy of the Federal Government is warning Americans to stay away.

Further, the sign says: Visitors May Encounter Armed Criminals and Smuggling Vehicles Traveling at High Rates of Speed. Another reason why Americans are encouraged not to go through America. It's just not safe.

Now, would those visitors be American? It must be because the sign is actually written in English, supposedly for Americans traveling this interstate highway across America.

The sign further gives some more warning comments: Stay Away from Trash, Clothing, Backpacks, and Abandoned Vehicles. We're not supposed to get near those items when we travel Interstate 8. You see, it continues to say: If You See Suspicious Activity—and this must be important because it is underlined—Do Not Confront. Move Away. Call 911.

Now let's go over this warning on this interstate highway sign telling Americans not to travel through America because it's just too dangerous because of the illegal activity in the area. It says, If you see something that you think is suspicious, don't confront those people. Move away and call 911.

Now let's go through this a little bit. Call 911. You pick up the phone, you call 911. Normally, when you call 911, you get local law enforcement to answer the phone. You don't get the Federal Government because they don't answer 911 calls.

So our government is suing Arizona and doesn't want Arizona local law enforcement to enforce immigration laws and border security, but local security—police officers—will answer 911. They will probably say, Well, we're not supposed to be enforcing immigration laws so we're going to turn you over to ICE. They connect you to ICE—Immigration and Customs Enforcement. And what are they going to say? If we actually get to the Federal Government, what will they say? They will probably say, Well, read the rest of the sign and move away, because we have really not tried to enforce the law along Interstate 8 in Arizona. Seems to be a little nonsense to me.

Here's my favorite one down here at the bottom. The last one says, The BLM—that's the Bureau of Land Management. They manage Federal lands in the United States to take care of us all. It says: The Bureau of Land Management Encourages Visitors to Use Public Lands North of Interstate 8. In other words, don't go south of Interstate 8, that 80 miles to 90 miles to Mexico. Go north of Interstate 8. Phoenix is only 30 miles from here, by the way.

So, are we ceding as a country land south of Interstate 8 to Mexico, the drug cartels, to the human smugglers, to the drug traffickers? Are we just giving that land back because our Federal Government says, Sorry, we're not protecting that part of America. We're not going to keep that safe.

That is unfortunate, giving this land over to the crime cartels. And so ceding the land to Mexico is not a border security plan at all. Our government's plan seems to be simple—erect a few signs, tell Americans to run and hide in their own country, and then sue the State of Arizona for trying to protect its citizens. That's not a plan. That's nonsense. The Federal Government is missing in action. We need to send the National Guard to the border and protect Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING OCEAN WATCH AND ITS CREW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the crew of the sailing ship Ocean Watch, a 60-foot sailboat, which just completed a 28,000-mile journey around the Americas. It's been a little more than a year ago that Mark Schrader, Herb McCormick, David Thoreson, and David Logan left Seattle and sailed north. They sailed around Alaska and then through the treacherous Northwest Passage, an area that's usually too full of ice to pass but is now navigable because of the rapidly warming Arctic.

After about a hundred days, the crew arrived safely in the waters of the Atlantic Ocean. From there, the Ocean Watch sailed south along the Atlantic coast of both continents to the challenging route around Cape Horn, where they once again met the waters of the Pacific. After traveling over a year and completing more than 28,000 nautical miles, they finished their expedition and returned home to Seattle. They set sail with the mission of inspiring, educating, and engaging the citizens throughout the Americas to protect our fragile oceans.

This amazing journey was envisioned by David Rockefeller, Jr., and Captain Mark Schrader of Stanwood, Washington. To implement their shared vision, Mr. Rockefeller enlisted the assistance of a nonprofit organization he helped to found, Sailors for the Sea, that encourages sailors to become more active stewards of the world's oceans. Over the course of their journey, the crew that included experienced sailors, photographers, journalists, educators, and scientists, visited 13 countries at 45 ports of call. In Alaska, they visited with the Namgis Indians of British Columbia and were themselves educated on the destruction of the local habitat by industrial logging and over-fishing. They docked in New York City for a presentation at the New York Yacht Club, where they shared their experience and mission to a standing-room only crowd.

At each stop, the crew shared their experiences and raised awareness of important ocean health issues like polar ice melt, ocean pollution, collapsing fisheries, acidification, and coastal erosion due to sea level rise. To aid in their mission, the Ocean Watch carried with it various instruments and cameras, coordinated data collection with various NASA and NOAA satellites, and took advantage of the unique opportunity to track and monitor global data from a single platform. In the true spirit of conservation and education, these measurements will be shared and used to complement other oceanographic, atmospheric, and climate research programs, the majority of which originated from the Applied Physics Lab and the Joint Institute for the Study of the Atmosphere and Oceans at the University of Washington. To help in accomplishing the educational goals of this project, they used a set of curricula and educational resources developed by Seattle's Pacific Science Center, and brought with them trained, bilingual educators who shared lessons linked to the onboard scientific research with the communities that they visited.

The completion of Ocean Watch's extraordinary voyage cannot come at a more critical time in our Nation's ecological history. As we watch helplessly as the oil gushes into the Gulf of Mexico and it devastates the region's ecosystem with the far-reaching potential of consequences that extend well into the Gulf, we need more advocates who

understand the importance of protecting our fragile oceans.

While the crew of the Ocean Watch successfully completed their voyage, their work has only just begin. After both the Exxon Valdez and the disaster in the Gulf, I'm not sure how many more wake-up calls we need, but I do know that we're going to need people like Mark Schrader and his crew to help educate us on what is happening to our oceans. I commend the crew of the Ocean Watch for moving us forward on this difficult path.

I recently read a quote by a British man named Thomas Fuller in 1732. He said, ''We never know the worth of water until the well is dry.'' I sincerely hope that with advocates like the crew of the Ocean Watch, we will prove Mr. Fuller wrong.

□ 1620

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the correct tally on roll call vote No. 440 was 303 yeas and 119 nays.

RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, when we were debating the issue of Afghanistan a couple of weeks ago, during the 3 minutes of time that I had, I brought up the issue of rules of engagement. These are the rules that our men and women in uniform in Afghanistan and Iraq have to follow if they're going to be confronted by the enemy.

Well, I have been very disappointed that we've put so many restrictions on our men and women in uniform that I, along with two other Members of the House—JEFF MILLER, a Congressman from California and DOUG LAMBORN, a Congressman from Colorado—wrote to Chairman IKE SKELTON and Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON, and we asked for a classified hearing on this issue of the rules of engagement.

And, Madam Speaker, in the letter that we wrote to the chairman and ranking member, we cited in there an article from The Washington Post that was entitled, ''This is not how you fight a war.'' One example, one of the United States Army officers serving in southern Afghanistan quoted in this article, ''Minimizing civilian casualties is a fine goal, but should it be the be-all and end-all of the policy? If we allow soldiers to die in Afghanistan at the hands of a leader who says, 'We're going to protect civilians rather than soldiers,' what's going to happen on the ground? The soldiers are not going to execute the mission to the best of their ability. They won't put their hearts into the mission. That's the kind of atmosphere we're building'' in Afghanistan.

Another soldier in the same article was quoted as saying, ''This is not how you fight a war, at least not in Kandahar! We've been handcuffed by our chained chain of command.''

Madam Speaker, also from that article, I would like to read another paragraph: ''For troops on the ground, the directive has lowered their morale and limited their ability to pursue insurgents. They note that Taliban fighters seem to understand the new rules and have taken to sniping at troops from inside homes or retreating inside houses after staging attacks.''

This is an ongoing issue and problem for our military. In fact, in a June article, there was a syndicated column by George Will, and I will read just one paragraph. In ''a recent email from a noncommissioned officer serving in Afghanistan'' . . . ''he explains why the rules of engagement for U.S. troops are too prohibitive for coalition forces to achieve sustained tactical successes.''

And, Madam Speaker, also during that debate a couple of weeks ago, I held up these two articles from Marine Times, ''left to die. They call for help. Negligent Army leadership refuse and abandon them on the battlefield. Four marines and one Army killed'' because they did not get the support that they needed because of rules of engagement.

I also have spoken to a father from Maine who was quoted in another Marine Times article, ''Caution killed my son. Marine families blast suicidal tactics in Afghanistan.'' The father said to me—he, himself, a retired marine—that my son and the platoon, if they had gotten the cover that they needed the day before when they saw Taliban soldiers going into a cave—they called for air support. The helo came over the gunship but did not fire into the cave because the pilot said, ''We cannot see the enemy,'' yet the young lieutenant had just reported to them, ''We saw the Taliban soldiers go into the cave.''

Madam Speaker, it is time to get out of Afghanistan. We have put our troops over there in harm's way, and we're not letting them fight as they should be able to fight.

Before I close, in a poll from CBS just 2 days ago, ''Should U.S. Set a Timetable for Withdrawing Troops from Afghanistan?'' 54 percent said ''yes,'' 41 percent said ''no,'' and 5 percent were undecided.

Madam Speaker, I want to close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, in Your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And three times—God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FUDGE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, two leading voices from both sides of the aisle outlined as clearly as ever the consequences of Washington's unrestrained spending. The cochairs of the nonpartisan Debt and Deficit Commission, former Republican Senator Alan Simpson and former Clinton administration Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles said that if the government stays on its current path, our crushing Federal debt will ''destroy the country from within.'' Bowles went on to describe it as a ''cancer'' on our Nation.

These are just the latest warnings of the disaster we face if Congress does not begin making the tough choices to restore fiscal discipline. Washington politicians have heard it from policy experts, from public servants, and, above all, from the people. When will they start to listen? How much plainer can we make the stakes? What more will it take to get the message through?

I was proud to fight for the strongest possible debt commission, and I will push Congress for an up-or-down vote on each of their recommendations. But the cochairs have already laid out what needs to be done to get our fiscal house in order, and this House must not waste any opportunity to take action.

As Members put together the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year, they should work creatively and aggressively to cut spending levels and do more with less. As I have proposed, they should start by reducing congressional pay by 5 percent. Congress needs to lead by example. Before they ask the rest of the Federal Government to make cuts, they must go on to find big and small ways to save billions of taxpayer dollars.

Paying down the debt and balancing the budget will not be easy. There will be politically unpopular decisions to be made. But as Senator Simpson and Mr. Bowles reminded us, leaving the hard calls for another day is no longer an option.

THE MIAMI VA'S CONTINUED PROBLEMS WITH COLONOSCOPIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, over a year ago, more than 3,000 veterans in the Miami Veterans Affairs Medical Center were notified that they could have been exposed to life-threatening diseases like HIV and hepatitis because the Miami VA was not properly sterilizing its equipment for colonoscopies. These are veterans who went in for routine screenings, who put

their trust in the medical professionals at the VA, and could have been possibly infected with any number of viruses. Our veterans who sacrificed so much for our country deserve better than this.

When this matter first came to light last year, immediate hearings into the matter were called. My colleagues and I were told multiple times that every veteran who underwent a colonoscopy during the risk period would be contacted and would be tested. During followup site visits at the Miami VA, I was again personally assured that the VA had informed every impacted veteran. Most importantly, both local and national VA officials were certain that real positive changes had been made to restore accountability and trust. Now, Madam Speaker, 1 year later, we find out that an additional 79 veterans might have been exposed to these life-threatening viruses but were, in fact, never notified of their risk.

Now, we are blessed to have excellent doctors, excellent nurses, excellent health care professionals working at the Miami VA, and I'm sure that they are saddened by this repeated problem. I thank this dedicated group of health care professionals for caring so deeply about our veterans. They should not be faulted for the problems of a few.

This most recent mistake was only discovered by the Miami VA when one of the veterans, himself, came forward. He wondered why the hospital had not contacted him about his colonoscopy which was performed during the risk period. Without his coming forward, these 79 potentially impacted patients could have easily gone completely unnoticed.

HIV and hepatitis are much more easily treated, and survivability is greatly enhanced, obviously, if the diseases are caught early. The failure of some in the Miami VA to identify those veterans is near unfathomable when considering the supposed microscope that the VA had promised they would be held under.

□ 1630

Yet 79 of the veterans still fell through the cracks. Nationally, the VA has promised to deliver on its pledge of greater management accountability and trust. The VA must follow basic procedures to protect its patients and implement a process for examining its faults and resolving them.

The Miami VA is again contacting every single patient who may have been exposed so that he can be tested and, if need be, treated. The VA must make sure that this tragedy is never repeated and that accountability and oversight are restored.

Our country is deeply indebted to the sacrifices made by our courageous men and woman who have served in our Armed Forces. We owe it to them to make sure that they are taken care of upon their return home.

This terrible mistake that led our veterans to being potentially impacted with life-threatening diseases cannot be repeated. To restore that lost credibility, the VA must enact new procedures to ensure that similar problems never occur in the future and make sure that there are proper mechanisms in place to resolve any issues that do arise.

I know that the Miami VA health care professionals have a lot of work ahead of them to rebuild the trust, and they will do so. They will re-establish that bond between each veteran and the most excellent Miami VA center.

Our veterans know that they deserve to know what went wrong and, more importantly, that it will never happen to a fellow veteran from here on out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PASSPORTS FOR THE IROQUOIS LACROSSE TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I rise to give the House an update on the situation concerning the Iroquois Nationals lacrosse team trying to travel to the 2010 World Lacrosse Championship in Great Britain.

Madam Speaker, I rose this morning to talk about how this team is trying to travel to this. They are traveling on their own passports as an indigenous people, and they were not allowed to board the plane multiple times.

Since I last reported to the House, the State Department, because of the direct intervention of the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton has become involved; and they have issued an assurance to the British Government that indeed this team, who have already subjected themselves to all the security considerations, including a full bio-scan, fingerprints and other background checks, that this team would be allowed back in the United States and was, indeed, a legitimate team.

However, Madam Speaker, the British have not yet decided whether or not to let the team into this international competition.

Madam Speaker, the 2010 World Lacrosse Championships are being hosted in Great Britain. This team, the Iroquois Nationals, that represent the six nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, or as they call it, the Hodnashone People, this team was invited, not to compete for the United States or Canada or any other country other than the Iroquois Country. They were invited because of their own national identity. And so it seems particularly odd and contradictory that the British Government would require them to have passports of a country that they don't feel that they're representing.

Now, we do have many examples of times in our history when we've had people who've stood up to principle and have not been able to compete. In 1924, a Scottish Olympic star named Eric Liddell did not want to compete on the Sabbath. He was told that he would not be able to participate in the 1924 Olympics because of that.

In the movie ''Chariots of Fire,'' which was an Academy Award-winning movie in 1981, this was chronicled; and he was called in that movie a true man of principle, a true athlete. His speed is a mere extension of his life, it's force; and we sought to sever his running from himself.

Madam Speaker, if the British, or any national entity, seek to sever this Iroquois National team from their own national identity, then they are asking them to not be the athletes that they are.

I urge the British Government to do everything in their power to make sure that once safety considerations are considered, that this team be allowed to go to travel to Great Britain and to be allowed to compete. These Iroquois, or Hodnashone, were the inventors of the game of lacrosse. It would be an international embarrassment if they're not allowed to compete. And they have been allowed to compete in other countries such as Australia and Japan.

We cannot lose the forest for the trees. We cannot look at some bureaucratic excuse, particularly for the country that's allegedly hosting the Olympics in 2012 in London. If they're going to host an international game, they have to be ready to welcome an international team.

RECOGNIZING CONSTITUTING AMERICA'S ''WE THE PEOPLE 9/17 CONTEST''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It was John Adams who once wrote, ''Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge of the people.'' And when I first came to Congress, I resolved that promoting knowledge of the U.S. Constitution would be one of my primary responsibilities and priorities. And to that end, I founded and continue to this day to chair the Congressional Constitution Caucus.

I come here to the floor tonight just to say that I'm not alone in this effort in working to preserve our freedoms through education and specifically of the U.S. Constitution. And so tonight I would just like to recognize a group whose mission is to inform America's youth and her citizens about the importance of the U.S. Constitution and the foundation it sets forth regarding our freedoms and rights.

The name of this group is Constituting America. And I commend the efforts of the two founders, and that is

Janine Turner and Cathy Gillespie. It is these two women, along with Janine's daughter, Juliette, who are trying and working hard to inspire students across this country to learn more about this fundamental, primary document, the U.S. Constitution. And they're doing it by launching the first ever annual ''We the People 9/17 Contest.''

Students had until just last week, that was July 4, to submit either a poem or an essay, a song or even a short film or any other type of creative work. I come here tonight to offer to every one of the participants my heartfelt congratulations for their hard work in this endeavor.

This contest, and the creation of Constituting America, really fittingly represents the genius of the American Republic, for we are a civilization that prizes individual freedom, that prizes personal responsibility, continuing education, great innovation and, most importantly, civic virtue.

So I thank Janine and Cathy for providing a relevant means to further our understanding of our Nation's values, our history, and our founding documents. The American story is filled with great intrigue and bravery; and remembering its past, remembering and having an understanding of these founding documents of the U.S. Constitution will help secure us as we write the next chapter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OUR INCONSISTENT POLICY TOWARD ILLEGAL ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I get a little concerned sometimes when there's a real inconsistency in our policy toward illegal aliens in this country. The administration and the Justice Department have said they're going to take the State of Arizona to court because the State of Arizona has passed a law which deals with stopping illegal immigration, and it parallels, it mirrors almost exactly the Federal statute.

So the Federal Government is not doing what it should in enforcing the law dealing with our southern border. And so Arizona, who's dealing with drug traffickers, criminals, illegal aliens and possibly terrorists coming across the border, they have decided to do what the Federal Government won't. The Federal Government is supposed to do what Arizona is doing, and because Arizona is doing it, the Federal Government is suing them.

□ 1640

Now, at the same time we have what's called sanctuary cities, cities where illegals are encouraged to go, and they are in effect being protected. That is against the law. And so here you have the Federal Government, the Justice Department and the President saying we're not going to go after the sanctuary cities who are protecting illegal aliens that are in this country, and at the same time they're not going to enforce the law which says that we've got to protect the border against illegals coming in in the first place. It really is a real inconsistency, and it bothers almost everybody who thinks about it to say we're not enforcing one law and we're opposing another law.

The government of the United States, the Justice Department, is opposing the very law that they're suing Arizona for in trying to protect that southern border. And at the same time, there is a law that deals with illegal aliens in sanctuary cities, and the Federal Government will not go after them. And the appearance is the Federal Government under the President, President Obama, and the Justice Department wants to protect those who are here illegally in sanctuary cities, but they do not want to police the border as prescribed by law. That is just dead wrong. It's an inconsistency. And the Justice Department and the administration should be taken to task for this.

If I were talking to the American people, I would tell them to contact their Congressman if they are concerned about illegal immigration. We've got 12 to 15 million illegals in this country, and they are being protected in sanctuary cities against the law, and the Justice Department will do nothing about it, and the administration will do nothing about it. And at the same time, because Arizona is experiencing a real tragic situation down there, and they passed a law that is consistent with Federal statutes, the Federal Government is going after them.

It makes absolutely no sense. And it begs the issue and the question about whether or not this administration and this Justice Department does want to protect our borders from illegal aliens. It doesn't appear that they really want to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING THE LATE SENATOR DAVE COX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the late California State senator and former California Assembly Republican Leader Dave Cox, who passed away at his home yesterday, surrounded by his loving family.

I had the great pleasure of working with Dave, and I admired not only his energy, but his tireless service to the people he represented. I was pleased that I was able to represent some of those same people in my congressional district, which overlapped his State senate district.

He constantly strove to make government work better for people, and I do believe he accomplished this mission. His public service spanned more than two decades, and it goes without saying that he will be sorely missed across the entire Sacramento region.

Dave served on the Sacramento Municipal Utility District Board, and was a 6-year Sacramento County supervisor before joining the California Assembly in 1998, and then the California Senate in 2004.

Much can be said about Dave Cox the public servant, but let us remember that he was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather as well. Dave, along with his wife, Maggie, raised three daughters, and were the proud grandparents of six grandchildren.

I was pleased to be able to speak with him just a few weeks ago, when he had returned from receiving some treatment for the cancer. And he told me that he was going to return to the State senate, which he did several days later. Here was yet another example of a man serving the people he loved until the very end. He said to me at that time, well, he was only about 90 percent. And I said, ''Well, 90 percent of Dave Cox is better than a hundred percent of most of the people in public service.''

I am honored to remember my friend, the late Senator Dave Cox, a devoted family man, an exemplary public servant, and a trusted colleague. Eternal rest, grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace.

A DISCUSSION ABOUT JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, thank you.

Following on Congressman LUNGREN, my colleague from the neighboring district, I didn't realize that Senator Dave Cox had died. I join him in the eulogy that he so graciously gave here on the floor. An extraordinary individual, represented my mother in the mountain counties, and was dedicated, as was said, to the betterment of California. So I will start with that.

What I intended to discuss here today was jobs, American jobs, and the situation we are faced with today and the extraordinary burden that's placed upon so many Americans who have lost their jobs in the last years of this great recession.

What I wanted to really start with was to try to get a sense of what has happened over the last 3 years, 2½, almost 3 years now. Beginning in December of 2007, the great American recession began during the George W. Bush period. And we began to lose jobs, largely as a result of the subprime mortgage, the lack of regulation that was going on, loans being made to people that didn't qualify, and all the games of Wall Street that began to unravel and to cause the American economy to literally crash.

As that Wall Street problem magnified and grew, the number of jobs that were lost grew, so between December of 2007, when there is actually some modest job growth, and December of 2008, we saw an extraordinary decline in jobs. So that in December 2008 you are looking at over 750,000 jobs lost.

Now, in January, at the end of January, the Obama administration came in, and again in January we faced another 700,000 jobs lost. But almost all that period of time was the previous administration. And the new Obama administration did not have any opportunity until the last 5 days of the month to even take over the administration of government.

Thereafter, and most every month since then we have seen a decline in the number of jobs lost, so that now in the fall of 2009 we actually began to see the first signs of job growth. So that in September, October of 2009 there is actually a small, very modest increase in jobs, followed the next month by again a decline. But then in the following months since the fall of 2009 to this period, we have actually seen a growth in the number of jobs in America. And that's good news.

We're not anywhere near where we need to be. And I think we all need to understand what has been done to—the effect of all of this job loss. So if I might just go to another chart here so that we can set the foundation for what we're going to talk about, you know, the numbers basically lay it out there.

During the Great Recession, beginning in the fall of 2007 and then continuing on until the fall of 2009, 8 million jobs were lost. Nearly all of those were lost during the George W. Bush administration. For the Americans that depended on their savings, their retirement accounts, $17 trillion in retirement savings were lost during this period of time.

You just compare that to the previous 8 years of the Clinton administration, when 22 million jobs were created during the Clinton administration. The question arises, why? What was the difference? What happened that caused during the last years of the George W. Bush administration the loss of these some 8 million jobs compared to 22 million jobs that were created under the Clinton administration? We're going to come to that during this discussion. And it's a fundamental question, because it is the question of national policy.

□ 1650

During the prior period of the Bush administration, by contrast, 1 million jobs were created in America. Again, enormous difference—22 versus 1. Why? What's the reason for this? And the policy decisions that were made that led to this enormous difference here.

I'd tell you what we'd like to do for the remainder of this year is create some 900,000 jobs, and we're on course to do that. It's going to take a lot of work. It's going to take a lot of changes in policy.

Beginning with the Obama administration, a series of pieces of legislation were put into place, and I'd like to just review those pieces of legislation and what they were doing. Many of these were designed specifically to deal with the great recession and to prevent the American economy from falling into a 1930 Depression. We were on the edge. We were teetering on the edge of that.

Some of this was done in the last days of the George W. Bush administration, which was the bailout of Wall Street, the TARP program. That program pumped some $700-plus billion into Wall Street. A lot of controversy about it. Other nations around the world were doing the same thing. And the result was a stabilization of the financial industry. For me, I would have liked to have seen it done differently, but it was done that way during the Bush administration, and it did actually stabilize the economy. Now, because of bills that have been passed since that time, we're seeing a good portion of that money returned to the American Treasury.

Now, beginning with the Obama administration, immediate action was taken here on the floor of this House and in the Senate to try to stabilize the job market to try to put Americans back to work. And the very first bill that was enacted, I believe, within the first 30 days was the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Now, economists looking at that today have said that that legislation alone created 2.8 million jobs, including teachers, police, firemen, construction workers, and the like. It also provided the American middle class with the largest tax cut ever for the middle class. Ninety-eight percent of Americans received a reduction in their taxes as a result of that, so that today the amount of money collected from the American taxpayers is at a rate that is as low as it was in the 1950s.

There was also a major element of it that was called rebuilding America with clean energy jobs and with infrastructure. So 2.8 million jobs were enacted.

I'm going to quickly go through these others. I'll come back to them during the course of this discussion. But also I want to just tell you the way we're going to do this, and that is we're going to talk about what's going on in various parts of America.

So, from time to time, I'll come back and talk about the other six fundamental pieces of legislation that have been signed into law by President Obama, passed by this House. All seven, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, have created jobs in America and turned around the American economy. So we're growing. Not as much as we should and not as much as necessary, but we're growing.

I'd like now to reach out—well, I guess I'm a Californian, but basically I'm from northern California. I represent a district in the San Francisco Bay Area east of the San Francisco Bay. But there's another part of California that is rather big. That would be the Los Angeles Basin. And specifically, joining me from Orange County is the gentlewoman from Orange County, LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Can you talk to us about what's happening there and the nature of the economy and the job situation.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Absolutely.

As you know, I live in an incredibly wonderful area called Orange County, the OC that many of you have seen on television before. It's not clearly the way it's depicted there, but it is a beautiful place. We're the home of Disneyland, of the Anaheim Angels. We have one of the largest concert arenas in the Nation. We also have a beautiful coastline that so many people want to come to in Newport Beach and Laguna Beach, and it's just a very, very special place.

But the housing issue affected Orange County in a dramatic way. We had, in Orange County, four of the six largest subprime lenders across the Nation were in Orange County. So almost overnight we lost 40,000 jobs just to the housing issue.

Well, I would like to let people know that it was reported in today's Los Angeles Times that housing is coming back in California. And specifically it noted, of course, this whole tax issue, because my colleague, my wonderful colleague from the northern portion of our State noted the tax cuts that we had in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, in particular.

For people who say that Democrats—and I am a Democrat—never liked tax cuts, that's just not true. The fact of the matter in the stimulus package, in the American Recovery Act, we actually have a third of the moneys go to tax cuts. But we put them to specific areas to help people get an education, to help them keep their homes, to help them, encourage them to buy homes, to keep the economy going. And so today we have found in the newspaper that there is a 7.2 percent jump in

southern California home sales. And Orange County, out of any place in the Nation, leads the way in selling homes, putting homes on the market, getting new families excited to get into these new homes. Yes, a lot of the people that I represent have lost their homes. Right next door to my home there's a foreclosure. And so it is difficult.

But in order to keep people in their homes, we've also passed legislation that would help modify some of those home loans so that people would actually get a chance to stay in their homes. And if they did have to leave their home before we could get somebody else in to buy that home, we also passed funds to help cities, for example, $10 million and $6 million to the cities of Santa Ana and Anaheim that I represent, to make sure that homes were taken care of as we transitioned them from one family or person to the next.

So we have actually passed quite a few pieces of legislation that have helped the housing market. And in helping the housing market, this is beginning to create some of the jobs that we see, especially in Orange County.

So I'm so glad that my colleague has taken this hour to talk a little bit about how, slowly, we are beginning to come back and the effects of that very important piece of legislation we passed a year ago, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and the additional pieces that we have passed to help.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So thank you so very much for talking about down home and what's going on there.

I will note that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which the economists suggest has created 2.8 million jobs, provided the largest middle class tax cut ever, and also did the infrastructure—streets, roads, sanitation facilities—and renewable green energy programs. Not one Republican voted for that.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Absolutely. And if my colleague will just give me a little bit more time, I will say to him, we have felt that in Orange County, $2.2 billion for the first piece of the high speed rail that will connect Anaheim all the way up to San Francisco, to your area, that $2.2 billion given to the Anaheim/Los Angeles portion of that high-speed rail.

So looking to the future, other pieces of that legislation—research in the greening of America, research in new technologies for energy independence, and also research and to change over our hospitals to electronic filing rather than to have paperwork being shuffled between doctors. So it carried a lot of future-looking pieces.

And, of course, when you look at innovation, that is what California is about. That is what is going to lead us out of a bad economy, and that is what we will, in fact, sell to the rest of the world after we establish those new areas of innovation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for bringing up the question of innovation and research. It was a very big portion of that. I'm going to come back a little later to another piece of legislation that has passed this House, yet to pass the Senate. But with regard to the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, once again, it was the Democrats that carried the ball that shouldered the burden and passed and provided the votes. Not one Republican vote.

You mentioned the home-buying situation in Orange County. The first-time home buyer credit, I think it's $6,000, was made available through a piece of legislation that once again was pushed forward by the Democrats in this House and over in the Senate. And 93 percent of the Republicans on this floor voted against that provision that gives first-time home buyers that additional money that they needed for that down payment so they could buy that home.

□ 1700

It goes on and on and on. One of the issues that confronts us, since we're not back where we need to be with our employment, is the unemployment insurance situation.

Now, representing a part of the Nation that has been really harmed by the loss of manufacturing jobs is the Ohio Valley region. Representative CHARLIE WILSON is from the Youngstown area, and I invite him here to talk to us about his situation in the Ohio Valley and the Youngstown region. Welcome. Thank you.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Thank you for convening this important discussion about our economy and our need to create jobs. I appreciate both of my colleagues from the California area and say that I represent the Ohio River Valley area that runs from Youngstown down through Steubenville, Athens, Marietta-Athens, and on down. So it's all along the Ohio River where we have had for many years and generations steel workers and people that have helped to move this economy and our country forward.

But by July 17 over 112,000 people in the State of Ohio will lose their unemployment benefits. This is due to the Senate's inaction to extend unemployment benefits which contribute to the important every-day expenses like paying your mortgage, health care bills, utility bills, and cost of food where there isn't a paycheck coming in. The American people are hurting, and they want to work. Until we can get everyone who wants a job working again, I believe that it is important that we continue to support unemployment insurance.

On July 1, I was proud to vote in favor of the House-passed legislation to extend unemployment benefits for millions of American families. This 6-month extension of benefits will not only help families looking for work, but it is a proven fact that it will boost our economy also.

In a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll, more than 6 in 10 Americans support congressional action to extend unemployment benefits for jobless workers. And The Washington Post agrees, stating in a recent article that passing the extension of unemployment insurance is both the right thing to do and the fiscally prudent thing to do.

I would like to quote The Washington Post editorial: ''Drawing the deficit line at additional unemployment benefits is shortsighted, because, if anything, the economy could benefit from more stimulus spending, not less. Unemployment benefits, which are most apt to be immediately plowed back into the economy, are about the most stimulative form of spending. Extending them is both fiscally sensible and morally decent.

''Unemployment benefits . . . are an essential lifeline. The Senate needs to extend them.''

In fact, the analysis from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office suggests that extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate our economy. It's not just the CBO. Many economists agree that extending these benefits decreases the chances of slipping back into a double-dip recession.

As a matter of fact, I have here from Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, a former economist to Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who says for every dollar that is invested in unemployment insurance $1.61 is pumped back into the American economy. I hope that all of us can see the need for extending these unemployment benefits and move quickly to get our people voted back to be able to have the Senate do the right thing and pass unemployment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very, very much for the view from the great Ohio Valley.

Before we started this 1 hour, you and I were chatting off the floor, and you raised another point and maybe the two of us can kind of talk about this for a second.

We're really faced with a choice. First of all, this is unemployment insurance. This has always been a program in which over time employers pay into a fund for insurance if their workers become unemployed. Because of the downturn in the economy, the Federal Government has had to backstop that insurance program. Presumably over time, we get the economy going, some of that will be refunded. I know it certainly will be at the State level because the States are obligated to make it back up.

But with regard to the individuals involved here, their unemployment insurance has run out. They have not received a check now I think for the last 2 weeks. If this is not extended, what happens to them?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Well, it is sad because what will happen is they will go down to the welfare level. They have to be able to have food and some way to be able to survive, and I think it is

the biggest part of cruelty and, secondly, I believe that the States are already scraping by with just not having the proper funding that they need. So to push this down to the State level would be catastrophic for a State like Ohio.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And a person that was working, was receiving insurance, is now going to be on welfare.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. That's correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So there is no win in this, and once again, where's the Senate? I know what happened in this House. The Democrats almost universally voted for this. We were able to get 29 Republicans to vote for this unemployment insurance program, and only 29 Republicans did so. We were able to pass it; 153 Republicans voted ''no.''

So what's the sense of all this? It really raises the question in my mind because as we go through these bills that have been passed from this House, some of which have been signed into law, passed the Senate, signed into law, the Republicans universally vote ''no'' on these jobs bills and even on unemployment insurance. I don't quite get it. We were talking earlier about the workers, the first-time homeowner buyers, tax relief for small businesses, emergency relief for American families. That bill passed here with only 7 percent of Republicans voting ''yes'' and 93 voting ''no.''

Even on student aid, we're talking about men and women that want to go back to school, that want to be able to continue their education, and one of the most important ways to stimulate the future economy is to have a well-educated workforce; but in that case, that particular piece of legislation that passed this House would have increased the Pell Grants so that kids and adults could afford to go to school. What did the Republicans do? Not one Republican voted for student aid to help students go to school, to continue in school.

I'm curious what's going on here. I just noticed that my colleague from Connecticut has arrived here, JOHN LARSON. Maybe you can answer this or just tell us what is going on in Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. First of all, let me thank the gentleman from California for organizing this hour, along with the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and join with you, well, frankly, out of frustration in terms of the kind of opposition that we're seeing in the United States Senate on an issue that's so important to people who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves in a situation where they are unemployed.

I think during this Bush recession as we persevere through the Bush wars and the Bush financial collapse, when unemployment has hit this country hard, when America loses $17 trillion in wealth and assets from March of 2007 to February of 2009, you begin to see why Americans are so frustrated with these circumstances, and while this administration under Barack Obama has created 6 million new jobs, the frustration remains amongst the American people.

In the midst of all of this, to deny unemployment benefits to those who are most in need, especially as the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out when we know that every dollar we spend in unemployment benefits creates $1.61 in the economy because the need is there to spend.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said it best about our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They are frozen in the ice of their own indifference; frozen in the ice of their indifference to people who are without work; frozen in their icy indifference between the need to invest in America and make things here in America and put this country back to work; frozen in an indifference that has them preoccupied politically and obsessed with blocking every item of the Obama agenda, even if it means providing unemployment to those who need it, even if it means providing health care to those who have had their policies rescinded or have found themselves in a situation because of a preexisting condition where they were denied coverage.

This is the kind of thing that has frustrated Americans. I am proud to be associated with the gentlemen who have come to this floor this evening to speak out on behalf of their constituents, speak out on behalf of the administration, and point down the Hall where they need to come and work. More than 314 bills that have passed the House of Representatives have gone unattended to down in the United States Senate and, most importantly, including unemployment benefits.

Stay in over the weekend. Do your work. Put America back to work. Provide those with the benefits that need them so that we can keep this economy going and so that we can restore the faith in the American people and their government.

I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this important hour on this very timely and important issue and thank the gentleman from Ohio for joining him.

□ 1710

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. LARSON, thank you so very much. You've brought a great deal of passion to this. I know it's in your heart. I know that you see this problem in your own district among friends and others who are there.

I want to turn back to my colleagues from Ohio and California in a moment. I said there were seven pieces of legislation that have passed and have been signed into law. I'm going to go through them quickly because in their own way each one of these has created economic growth and jobs here in California, in Ohio and in other States across the Nation.

I mentioned the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We talked about the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act; First Time Homebuyers. The gentleman from Connecticut talked briefly about insurance reform, the way in which the insurance system discriminates against women, against people who have preexisting conditions. That insurance reform was embodied in the Health Insurance Reform Act that passed this floor and not one Republican voted for it. There will be a day of reckoning when somebody out there says, My 23-year-old daughter can stay on insurance now because the Democrats and President Obama passed the Health Insurance Reform Act.

Student aid. We talked about that a moment ago. It is extremely important, so that adults can go on to school, can stay there, improve their employability, learn new skills; and as the economy is coming back, will be able to get a job.

This one I found to be personally very upsetting because my old clunker didn't qualify. I actually did not register it in California. By the time you passed this, I wasn't here. It wasn't registered and I couldn't get rid of my clunker. But 700,000 cars were sold as a direct result of the clunker law and it really did help American automobile manufacturing. I know that a lot of people say that Toyota got more than its share, and it did, but a lot of that share were Corollas that were manufactured in Fremont, California; Toyotas to be sure, but nonetheless they were manufactured in California.

We talked about the HIRE Act. Incidentally, 95 percent of Republicans voted against the Cash for Clunkers law. The Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act, the HIRE Act, created 300,000 jobs. Created. Not some wish list but actually created 300,000 jobs and unleashed billions of dollars of infrastructure across the United States—streets, roads, sanitation facilities. Cut taxes for businesses that hire new workers that had been unemployed and cracked down on offshore tax havens.

Oh, this one I love. I'm going to come back to this one.

Again, 97 percent of Republicans voted against that program. Three hundred thousand jobs. They voted against it. What are you guys doing? We need to put people to work.

Finally, one that most of the Republican leadership opposed, eventually it did become law and many, many Republicans voted against this one, which was the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights. Which one of us has not been ripped off by some credit card scheme or scam? But this really gives those of us that have credit cards—and I've got more than I'd like to say in my pocket right now—gives us at least a little bit of an equal footing here on that.

So here are seven bills, all of them in one way or another providing in this case credit, the opportunity to get reasonable credit; hire people; cash for

clunkers, education; health care and other kinds of stimulus. Democrats in this side took it upon themselves to shoulder the burden, to pass the legislation necessary to put people to work.

My final point before I turn back to my colleagues is that the argument that I keep hearing is that it will raise the deficit. Yes. But we ought to understand where the deficit really came from, and we'll go through that. The deficit was really created as a result of three things. Keep in mind that when Clinton left office, this Nation was in a surplus. We were running a surplus of over half a trillion dollars. George W. Bush came in and did three things that created as he left office for the next 10 years, an $11 trillion deficit:

One, he started two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan, and didn't pay for them; really the first time in American history. Secondly, he started Medicare part D, the drug benefit, I think 700 to $800 billion in 10 years, not paid for. And thirdly the great recession with the financial collapse. Those three things added up, beginning the day that Obama took office, he was handed a $1.3 trillion debt, given to him by the Bush administration. And if you look at the years out, continuing the Bush policy, that would add up to an $11 trillion deficit.

We've got to put people to work. The question that I always ask is, do you want tax takers, welfare recipients, who cannot get a job, cannot get unemployment insurance, or do you want taxpayers? The Democratic House has voted consistently to put people to work so that they could become taxpayers.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. If the gentleman will yield just for a minute, when we as Democrats look at what is it that we can do, if we are going to spend money, we should spend money to invest in America. There are four major things in Economics 101, or any other book you read on economics, that will tell you how to increase the productivity and the innovation of a nation, because that is how we compete, by increasing the productivity of Americans. The first is, you have to have an educated workforce. Some of the bills that my colleagues mentioned are about education, education, education.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me. If I might interrupt, there is some House business that needs to be attended to. I notice our colleague arriving from the Rules Committee to take care of some House business.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5114, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM PRIORITIES ACT OF 2010

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–537) on the resolution (H. Res. 1517) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5114) to extend the authorization for the national flood insurance program, to identify priorities essential to reform and ongoing stable functioning of the program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A DISCUSSION ABOUT JOBS—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FUDGE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Please continue.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. As I was saying, there are four basic things that you can do to increase the productivity of your people, to increase innovation, if you will, of our Nation. The first is to educate your people. We have been putting money into that, including the GI Bill that we passed over a year ago. Health. If your workers aren't healthy, they can't go to work. So the health care reform. Incredibly important. Transportation. How do you move people and goods? That was part of the Recovery Act, when we said, let's build high speed rail; when we said, let's put in systems of water and sanitation that work for our people. And, number four, communication, investing in innovation and communication for people; in broadband that we've been putting across our Nation.

So that is the way we increase the productivity of our people. I have to say that on this side, on the Democratic side, even though people have been saying that we have been deficit spending, I say to them, anytime that you can invest in the American people, the American people will pay you back four or five or tenfold on that investment.

□ 1720

So I am again proud to stand here with you and talk about the accomplishments of this Congress.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's turn to Ohio, and we will continue on with the story of jobs and what it means in our local districts.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. In addition to supporting those that are out of work with unemployment benefits, we need to support small business so that they can create more job opportunities for our workforce.

Why aren't small businesses hiring? On NPR this morning, one small business owner said it as clearly as anyone can say: Small businesses are not hiring because they don't have to. We need to create an economic environment that makes it necessary for small business to hire.

As we all know, 60 to 80 percent of the new jobs come from small businesses. Most Americans get their first jobs at a small business. I know I did. And the small businesses on Main Street are the ones that will lead our economic comeback, not the big businesses on Wall Street.

So what can we do here in Congress to help small business? Access to credit is one of small business's biggest challenges. For small firms to play their job-creation role, they need the right tools to work with, and without the access to capital, small businesses have a tough time staying afloat. According to the SBA, without access to affordable credit, small enterprises are twice as likely to fail compared to businesses that can find credit. They must be able to access capital to be able to get their new venture off the ground or expand their operations.

Given how tight credit markets are, that is a challenge that every business in every community is encountering. That is why Congress has taken steps to address these problems.

Legislation that Congress passed in February strengthened the SBA lending programs and made them even more usable for small business. This important new law does a number of things to help small business. It provides interest-free loans of $35,000, giving that shot in the arm, the immediate cash to cover existing business obligations.

It makes it easier for small business owners to get small business SBA loans, and that is cutting away much of the redtape. So many people have stayed away from SBA because of the redtape that has been cut back significantly or eliminated in many cases.

This will reduce the cost of loans. It helps small firms raise equity and capital. In total, the new law will generate $21 billion in new lending and investment for small business.

These programs, when paired with existing programs at the Small Business Administration, will help business to continue and America's small business weather the storm and lead us back to prosperity.

In addition, I support the Small Business Lending Funding Act. The bill would boost funding to small business by investing capital in community and smaller banks. The more that participating banks increase their total loans to small business, the more favorable the terms become.

Finally, I also support the Small Business Jobs Tax Relief Act. It is a companion measure to the Small Business Lending Fund that will help small business grow and create new jobs through, number one, 100 percent exclusive of small business capital gains, small business penalty relief and increased deductions for startup expenditures.

Again, I would like to thank Congressman GARAMENDI of California for convening this session, and I am happy to be with you and share with you some of the problems and issues and solutions we have in Ohio.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very, very much for raising the critical role of small business in creating jobs. It is where many of the jobs are created, as you so correctly stated.

You also referred to two bills that passed this House, H.R. 5297, which was the small business lending program,

and it did all of the things you said. There is actually $30 billion in that that would be available to community banks to deliver loans to small businesses, $30 billion made available to them.

There is also a requirement that they would have 10 years to pay back those funds. So it would go on the books of the bank as a loan, but it would be a long-term loan so that they would have the capital. I am told by the small businesses in our area that they were able to get $1 million of capital, which this provided up to $30 billion to small banks. If they could get $1 million of capital, they could then make $10 million of loans. So there is that kind of leverage involved here.

That bill passed this House with 98 percent of the Republicans voting no. Now, I don't know how many times I have sat here on the floor and listened to our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle talk about their support for small businesses. But here where they had a concrete chance to help community banks and small businesses, 98 percent of them voted no.

You mentioned the small business tax incentive program, $3.5 billion of tax incentives for small businesses to specifically help small businesses weather the storm. It also granted tax relief from penalties that they may have had from mistakes that were made in the past. Again, a bill specifically designed to help small businesses.

Ninety-seven percent of our Republican colleagues voted no on that. So don't come to the floor and say you are for small businesses when you had a chance to vote for legislation that would specifically help small businesses.

There is another one that just came to me. We actually passed it and it is a good bill, it is important for many reasons. But I got a phone call last Saturday from a friend who was—''was'' is the right word—was a home builder in California. He built many homes, high quality homes, was deeply involved in making those homes as green as possible, large energy conservation in solar and the like.

He said, JOHN, you have got to make sure that the HOME STAR programs that provide an incentive for homeowners to upgrade their home so that they can install triple pane windows, insulation, the cash for caulker things. They are really important, because it gives the homeowner a chance to reduce their annual energy bill, whether it is heating in the winter or air conditioning in the summer.

He said, beside that, it is my new business. It is my new business. I am not building homes for a while because of the market in the area in which he was working, but he said I am going to existing homes and giving them the chance to make their homes energy efficient. I can make some money, they will make some money.

There are other programs that are out there that provide additional assistance such as tax credits, and I want to come to that in a few moments.

So when that bill was on the floor, what happened? Where do you stand? Do you stand with homeowners and small businesses such as I just described, or are you standing for Wall Street?

Well, let's find out. Ninety-three percent of the Republicans on this floor voted against the HOME STAR energy program. I don't get it. I don't get it. We are saving energy, helping us consume less energy, giving people an opportunity to work and homeowners an opportunity to reduce their energy bill.

I don't know what that means in Ohio, but I do know what it means in California. It is a chance for a small contractor to change his business model and to move in a direction that is good for him, good for the homeowner, and good for America.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I believe that we have seen examples of this back in my district in Ohio also. We have seen a roofing company that we just visited last week, and they have come up with a new type of roof that is a green roof that actually has vegetation growing on it. It not only keeps the inside of the building cooler, but it is much more pleasant to look at.

Another option they had was a white roof instead of a second, and I was amazed. With that white roof, Congressman, you could hold your hand out like this and just feel the heat reflecting back off that roof versus going into the building. These are the type of energy efficiencies that we are going to have to look at as we move forward in our country to become the leader again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. These are the kinds of jobs that really don't require a Ph.D. People can take these jobs that were working on the line in a manufacturing industry or working in the housing industry. They may already have some skills that are available to them. But there is an enormous, enormous potential here. And the other pieces of legislation provide for a tax credit to the homeowner to put in these systems. So we need to really move along on these kinds of things.

I am going to just run through another series of bills here that are very important to us, I believe. Again, this is the Jobs For Main Street Act that creates jobs for firefighters, for teachers, and to rebuild highways and the like, extending health care benefits for those who had lost their insurance because of the downturn, something as sensible as keeping teachers employed, something as sensible as making sure that firefighters are still there.

Yes, it is the Federal Government helping local governments. It is true. And it is a deficit issue. But what if we don't have teachers? What if there are teachers being laid off and the classroom size goes from 20 to 30? What about the next generation's ability to compete internationally, their educational opportunities are stifled? That is not a what-if. That is my daughter's classroom. She is a teacher, first grade. She has gone from 20 to 30.

The economy is down. The State of California is in financial trouble. The Federal Government has the ability to help here, to keep people employed, teachers in this case, others in schools, and, more importantly, make the most fundamental investment, which is the investment in the education of our children.

You may be seeing something like that in Ohio. I know it is a major problem all across this Nation.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. We are seeing that in Ohio, and we are working on our education. We are trying more than ever to get the reading programs going as best we can.

What we found out, Congressman, is that when a child can read and comprehend, the science and math scores go up and the discipline problems go down. So the education and the development and work that we have going on in the State of Ohio is something that our governor has been very firm about, and is not giving up the fight for a better education for our children.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, these things are critically important.

One more bill that I want to take up before I turn to what we can do next is a bill that dealt with the fundamental reason that the American economy crashed in 2007–8, and that was the meltdown of Wall Street.

□ 1730

The extraordinary greed, the games that were being played, the gamble that was being made with our money by Wall Street led to the collapse. Obviously, the housing industry, the subprime mortgage market, the collateralized debt obligations, the derivatives, all of those games were being played on Wall Street. For more than a year—almost 2 years now—this House, the Democrats, have fought to rein in Wall Street; to force Wall Street to operate with rigorous rules that hold them accountable and responsible. We finally succeeded late last year to pass a Wall Street Reform Act. It went over to the Senate. It took almost 9 months for the Senate to gestate a bill. Conference committee took place. The conferees met. The bill came to this floor. And we added a few provisions to the—the bill came to the floor and it passed with provisions that were added during the conference committee. A good bill. It does rein in Wall Street, does set clear rules. It makes it impossible for a bank to fail and for taxpayers to bail out a bank—a big bank. There are things in it that went beyond that. Providing opportunities for small banks. Some of the additional benefit to small banks. They were given a break so that the heavy-duty regulations that were imposed on the major banks were not imposed on the small banks.

Where do you stand? Do you stand to rein in Wall Street and finally bring to

heel the bankers that brought this Nation's economy to its knees and doggone near tanked the economy, putting us into a Depression equal to 1930? Do you stand with that kind of regulation or do you stand with the Wall Street bankers that said say, Oh, trust us. We'll never do it again.

The Democrats in this House carried the burden of reining in Wall Street, setting in place the regulations, setting in place the rules of the road going forward, hopefully preventing, and I think will prevent, the kind of meltdown that we had. Our colleagues on the Republican side to a person voted ''no'' when it came time to discipline Wall Street. They voted ''no'' when it came time to discipline Wall Street. You know where you stand when you vote here in this House. In this case, do you stand with the regulation of Wall Street or let them continue doing what they did? It's clear where we stood as Democrats.

Now, Representative WILSON, would you like to add to that?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Yes, I would. Thank you. I believe that the other thing that needs to be said here, too, is Democrats stood strong for financial reform by making sure that we never get in the position where the taxpayers have to bail out a bank again. There's no such thing as too big to fail anymore. There are further amounts I would like to have seen done. But in order to get it through, we had to lighten up some——

Mr. GARAMENDI. A compromise.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Yes, some compromise. But that being said, I truly believe that now we have taken the risk away from the taxpayers having to pay for really the reckless gambling and things that went on with the derivatives and how they accounted for them and how they were able to be manipulated. And really oversight is now on Wall Street—and it needed to be there all along. I truly believe we would have not had the meltdown we had had it been there in the first place. It is there now, and it will continue to help us in the future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was back in the district over the Fourth of July week and somebody said, Well, it's kind of like an NFL football game. I said, What do you mean by that? He said, Well, you used to play football at the University of California Berkley and you could have been in the NFL but you decided to go in the Peace Corps. I said, Yeah, it was a good decision. But what's the point here? He said, Well, you know, this Wall Street bunch, before your reform, it was like an NFL football game without any rules, and the referees were sent into the locker room. And you can kind of imagine what the outcome would be. Wild chaos and a lot of mayhem. He said, That's exactly what happened on Wall Street. The regulators during the Bush period stepped out of the room. The rules were not there to prevent the kind of excesses—if there were rules, there was nobody to make them obey it. And we wound up with the problem we had.

Let's move to the future here. So what are we going to do next? In the financial reform, Wall Street reform, there was a provision, and in another bill that we passed earlier there was a provision that is extraordinarily important to the American worker. In existing law today and for the last couple of decades there's been a tax break for corporations who offshore jobs—a tax break that literally gives a tax reduction when an American corporation sends jobs offshore.

You say, Excuse me, did I hear what you said, Congressman? You did hear what I said. What I said is, in the law today there is a tax break for sending jobs offshore. We have twice passed on this floor legislation that would end that tax break and annually restore to the American Treasury $14.5 billion that now sits in the popular corporations that have offshored American jobs. Must stop. It's got to be over. The Republicans voted with the corporations to keep that tax break in place. I'm not there. And I suspect you're not there, Mr. WILSON, either.

So we need to make sure that that bill that's sitting over there in the Senate where the power of one senator can simply stop everything, that it is busted loose and comes back so that corporations—American corporations—no longer get a tax break when they send American jobs overseas. Issue one. Let's get with it, Senate.

Secondly, this one really drives me crazy because this is really California. We've got solar in California. We started that in California. In 1978, I passed a law as a California State Senator that gave a tax break for the solar industry. The first in the Nation. And it started the solar industry. It also started the wind turbine industry in California. Right now, we're spending about $5 billion a year of tax money on buses; we spend billions of dollars supporting the solar industry with tax credits, some of which we've talked about; and the wind industry. We need, in my view, a law that says if it's our tax money, then it will be made in America. It will be used to buy American-made buses, trains, light rail. It'll be used to pay for solar panels and tax credits on the homes of Americans; panels and equipment that are made in America. It is, after all, our tax money. And with the windmills or the wind turbines.

In my district, we have two of the biggest wind farm areas in the Nation. We've got the Montezuma Hills in Solano County, which I represent, and we have the Altamont Pass area in Alameda, and San Joaquin County. Many of the new turbines that are being put up are made overseas—and most of them are made in China. And I'm going, Wait a minute. We're giving them a tax credit, those companies that own these machines? We're giving them a tax credit to buy turbines that are made where? China? No way, no how. There ought to be a law. And I believe this Democratic Party and this floor is going to put such a law together.

□ 1740

I think we've got about 10 minutes left, and I just noticed a colleague from the great Midwest just arrived. Congresswoman KAPTUR, thank you so very much for joining us. I know you and I have had conversations about jobs, and I know that your part of the country used to be manufacturing center one. I guess the two of you can debate that. But let's talk about these kinds of things. How do we restore American manufacturing?

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, Congressman GARAMENDI, I just want to say I thank you so very much. You are from the State of California, a State that's about four times as large as ours, maybe five, with 53 million people. We have over 11 million people in Ohio, but we are a State that has had to grow our way forward, to build our way forward for so many generations. We really aren't federally dependent in the sense that we don't have gigantic bases. We do have Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in the city of Columbus, our capital. But the rest of Ohio has to either mine—and Congressman WILSON comes from a part of our State that actually supplies so much of the coal that is shipped to our region and others. We either have to grow in regions like mine—I represent a major agricultural region that abuts Lake Erie's southern shore—or we have to manufacture. We don't really have any choice. So we have to create wealth, basically.

And what's been happening over our country for many decades now is that we are amassing trillion-dollar trade deficits every year, which means all that spending benefits someplace else. Ten percent of the goods that are exported from China go to one company—Wal-Mart. They are a bazaar for Chinese goods.

We look at what you have pictures of up there, vehicles and wind turbines. I was just through a part of my district where wind turbines are going up now. We'd like to manufacture them as well as deploy them. And we are the solar capital of the Midwest—Toledo, Ohio, and northern Ohio. We are one of three centers on the continent, actually. People don't realize that we've built that off of our glass industry, and it is a new age for us. In fact, the largest solar field in Ohio was just dedicated in Upper Sandusky recently, and I have bases in my district—smaller bases, like the F–16 Fighter Wing and the 983rd Engineer Battalion and our Camp Perry—that have deployed solar fields.

So we are trying to move our region into the new energy era, but it's tough. It's really tough because we are on such an unlevel global playing field. Other countries aren't open to our products. And there is no question that unless we reduce that trade deficit and stop outsourcing our jobs to China, Mexico, every other place in the world,

we are not going to be able to create a strong middle class and maintain the middle class that we have today.

So I want to commend you for doing this Special Order tonight. We know that our future lies in wealth creation, and it has to come from places like Ohio that have to stand on their own two feet and pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much, Congresswoman KAPTUR, for joining us.

The heart and soul of America's manufacturing sector was the Midwest, and Ohio at one point was the strongest part of America's manufacturing economy. I know it can be restored. And right here in this area with the rolling stock of America's transportation system, with the new technologies, whether they're wind or turbine, if we use our tax money to support these industries rather than to support industries that are located in China or other countries, I think we can then provide the kind of strength that will return to America once again in the manufacturing sector.

We're nearly out of time, and this has been a great discussion. I just want to turn for a few moments to another colleague from California. We do think that we are the biggest part of the American economy. And a big part of it happens to be where Congresswoman WATSON lives, which is the entertainment industry.

Congresswoman WATSON, I think we're out of time.

THE GOVERNMENT, THE ECONOMY AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, it's a treat to be able to join you this evening to talk about the things that are of great significance to our country and to every individual citizen that lives in America. I thought that as we got into the subject of where things are with jobs and the economy tonight I might start by introducing it in a little different way than we do sometimes here on the floor, and what I'm going to be talking about tonight really is the fact that there is this fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. And most of the fighting and argument comes really in the answer to just one question. It's kind of a really simple thing. And the question is this: What should the Federal Government do? That's really what divides us. That's what makes all the people here in this Chamber disagree with each other, and sometimes even scream and yell, but at least respectfully disagree with each other, because we have a fundamentally different idea of what the Federal Government should do. That's a huge part of what we discuss. And, of course, the more that the Federal Government is going to do, it is going to cost more. And the more that it costs, the more regulations and all that you have, the more laws that are passed. And, inevitably, as the government does more, people have less freedom.

So there is some sort of a question, well, you know, what should the Federal Government do. So we're going to be talking in a way about that tonight because it is the question of politics, essentially. And of course the Democrat position is—it's almost like the law of gravity, that wherever there's a problem, the answer always is more taxes and more government. The government should fix that problem. That's what they think. And the Republicans always say, well, we want less taxes and less government, and they tend to go that way. So we're going to talk a little bit about that.

We're also going to talk about sort of a theoretical question that sometimes I used to ask interns. We had an intern program. These are students that are in college and are just about to graduate from college. And I would ask them this question, and that is, Is it possible for the government to steal? Can the government steal from people? And you'd see they'd get these quizzical or puzzled looks on their faces. Can the government steal? Well, what does that mean? And you'd see them thinking, Well, I guess it's impossible because the government can kind of do anything they want and, therefore, the government can't steal.

Of course if you come to the conclusion that the government can't steal, then that means that you believe the government owns everything. Do you really believe that? Many people are taught that in school. As they get older, as they work hard for a living, they start to take a different perspective. They worked hard for that dollar bill, and they're not so sure they want the government to confiscate it.

Anyway, we are going to be talking a little bit about the conditions in our economy and where we are. Why is it that we have a problem with jobs? Why is the economy flat on its back? Why do we have a sense that things are not well in America? And there are some answers to those questions. It's not complicated. We simply look to the people who have gone before us and see what those are.

I am joined here this evening by a new Member of Congress, a young man that shows tremendous promise and is joining us here on the floor tonight from Georgia. Georgia seems to be a good State for growing congressmen. And my good friend Congressman GRAVES is joining me on the floor here tonight from the State of Georgia. We are here early enough that it may be that even some of your constituents will have a chance to say, Hey, that's my guy. We sent him to Congress, and he's doing a great job.

Welcome, Congressman, and we are going to get into things here in just a minute. I thought I might start, though, by going back a little bit to how did this economic problem come to be.

□ 1750

And of course history just kind of continues to go along. But if I had to pick a point, this is kind of an interesting one. This is September 11, but it's not 2001, it's 2003, 2 years after the attack on New York City, September 11, 2003.

This is the New York Times, not exactly a conservative oracle, is reporting some news and this the news. It says that the Bush administration today recommended the most significant regulatory overhaul in the housing finance industry since the savings and loan crisis nearly a decade ago.

And it goes on to say that under the plan disclosed in the congressional hearing today a new agency would be created within the Treasury Department to assume supervision of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Why? Because they just lost about a billion dollars, and they weren't running their house very well.

Now, Freddie and Fannie are not government organizations. They're quasi-government. And when Freddie and Fannie started doing some wild and wooly things economically, the problem was that the assumption was the Federal Government would come and bail them out. And so Freddie and Fannie are getting out. This is 2003. Real estate market's booming.

President Bush says, watch out, Freddie and Fannie are getting in trouble. I need more authority as President to control Freddie and Fannie. Freddie and Fannie, paying many lobbyists up here on the Hill, dishing out hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars, thousand dollar bills, just passing them out all over here. So there's Freddie and Fannie. They're starting to get in trouble. President Bush says we've got to regulate them.

Now the Democrats, on the other hand, the guy who is now in charge of taking care of regulating Freddie and Fannie because he's in the majority now, this is Congressman FRANK, the Democrat, he says, these two entities, Freddie and Fannie, are not facing any kind of financial crisis.

Well, that's interesting. We, of course, 20/20 hindsight we say, well, obviously you were wrong. I'm sure he would admit he was wrong. They were facing a financial crisis. And as Freddie and Fannie start to crash and collapse, we start to see the recession that's upon us. And so that was a piece of it.

Now, Freddie and Fannie, their whole concept was that we're going to require banks to make loans to people who really can't afford to pay the loans. Now, how that's compassionate I'm not so sure because I wouldn't want to be in debt to some loan for my home that I couldn't afford to pay the mortgage payments on.

But many people were encouraged to take loans out on houses because they're going up in value so fast during those years. You just go ahead and take the loan, postpone paying any interest payments. Five years later turn the house over, you doubled your money. It sounded good for a while until the music stopped, and then you didn't have a chair to sit in. And so we have the beginning of this financial problem that was based on liberal social policy that said that banks have to loan money to people who can't afford to pay those mortgages, and we'll just sort of sweep it under the carpet.

Well, then as the economy crashes, what happens? Well, we go back to the same old mistake we've made in the past. Unfortunately, with the stimulus bill the Democrats didn't learn from their mistakes. I wish they would learn from other Democrats. They may not want to learn from Republicans, but at least learn from other Democrats.

This guy, Henry Morgenthau, is Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Treasury Secretary, and he's the one that started with the recession which turned into the Great Depression because they did the wrong things.

So he says now, after 8 years—their idea was that if you grab the loops of your boots and pull hard enough, you can fly around the room. The idea is if the government spends enough money, it will make the economy do really well. And so they tried it for 8 years. And this is his report to Congress.

He says, We have tried spending money. We're spending more than we've ever spent before, and it does not work. I wish they heard those words: ''it does not work.''

I say, after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.

You want to know why we've got unemployment? Because we haven't learned from going back even to FDR's Treasury. This was Keynesian economics. It says if the government hires a whole lot of people, spends a whole lot of money, it's going to make the economy okay. But the trouble is, it doesn't work.

I'd like to ask my good friend from Georgia now, Congressman GRAVES, if you would just join us. Let's talk a little bit about this whole situation because I don't want to be just critical of the Democrats. I will be critical of them, not because I don't like them, but because they're wrong. Their economics are wrong. They're doing the wrong thing. They're hurting the American public.

People are out of jobs, and what we need to do is say, that's not the right way to do it. But we have to have a good solution. We have to offer something constructive.

And let's talk about that. I yield.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It's great to join you tonight on this discussion. I think it's the number one discussion going on across America right now, and that's our economy, how's it going to get back on track.

And we've seen 15, 16 failed months of economic policy coming out of Washington, DC right here. And as I spent my time on the recess, and I had the opportunity 31 individual times to speak to various groups on those 12 days, I can tell you the economy is on the tops of the minds of the people.

Mr. AKIN. It sounds like the people from Georgia got their nickel's worth out of their Congressman. Thirty-one separate meetings?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Thirty-one separate addresses or speeches over 12 straight days.

Mr. AKIN. I wouldn't want to be your car.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. But I can tell you, it's the number one topic on the minds of north Georgians, is how to get this economy back on track.

But what astonished Georgians so much was that just 4 days before July 4, the day of independence, the day of celebrating independence from tyranny and bondage of years ago, 4 days before that, $167 billion of indebtedness was created on 1 day here because of the Federal Government. That's the numbers, 1, 6 and 7, with 9 zeroes behind it, a phenomenal amount, nearly $1,500 per person here in the United States just on 1 day.

Mr. AKIN. You're saying $167 billion of indebtedness just up to the time of just before the 4th of July?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. No, just on 1 day. That was June 30, June 30 of this year alone, which was more than the deficit of 2006 altogether.

And you look at the stated budget of the State of Georgia, the annual budget is about $17 billion today. So almost 10 times the budget of the State of Georgia for an entire year was borrowed in 1 day here for the Federal Government.

Mr. AKIN. Wow, that's a lot of borrowing.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. So Georgians want to know how are we going to get back on track. So I spent part of my time this week on what I was calling my Economic Advisory Tour. We decided we're going to tear down the walls that we see here in Washington where Washington is not listening to the constituents. Instead, we're going to open up communication. Instead of Washington pushing down ideas on job creation on the private sector, why don't we get the ideas from the business leaders themselves, the risk-takers, the entrepreneurs, the ones that have the vision and the dreams themselves.

And so we had a great tour this week. And we came up with a simple formula. We're not that far away. In fact, we have, what, in America, 17 million Americans without a job, 27 million businesses all throughout the Nation; and we know all those businesses want to expand, succeed, have a profit because we believe profit's a good word here in the Republican Caucus.

But you have 17 million unemployed. You have 27 million businesses, so the formula is simple. If just one business out of every three would hire one person in the next 12 months, unemployment would be cut in half. And you know what? I didn't say government.

Mr. AKIN. That's pretty straightforward. All you have to do is just create one job per every three businesses, and there's no more unemployment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. And we didn't say if government would hire one more American. We said the private sector. So the question comes down to this, and this is probably what would be a great discussion tonight is, Why? Why are businesses in north Georgia and all across this Nation saying, you know what? I'm not going to hire somebody right now, even though I want to. I want to expend my business. I want to see my profits grow, my sales increase. I want to invest in capital, but I'm not right now.

Mr. AKIN. Not going to do it. Hey, you know, I'd really like to pick up because, as you said, there are people sitting around having dinner in America. In fact, I'm a little hungry myself. I'm going to look forward to getting some chow. But they're sitting around there talking about the same things you and I are talking about here tonight.

And we've talked about one solution, which was the government takes $800 billion. That's what the Democrats did with their stimulus bill, and they said, if you don't pass this stimulus bill, do you know what's going to happen? We might get unemployment as high as 8 percent if you don't pass this stimulus bill. So the Republicans didn't vote for it, but they pushed it through anyway. Spent $800 billion.

And it really wasn't even good old FDR, you know, ''stimulus.'' It wasn't concrete to build hydro-plants or roads. It was basically taking money from one State, like in the State of, I don't know about Georgia, but Missouri, we're fairly conservative and we have a balanced budget, and we're not overspending. And yet you've got Illinois or California, they're overspending on the pensions of a lot of, like, teachers and things. So they take money away from our States, and I assume Georgia is probably a little bit more cautious fiscally. They take money away from our constituents and send them to the other States where the governments have been out of control spending.

Well, anyway, so they get this idea.

□ 1800

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Wealth redistribution.

Mr. AKIN. The old wealth redistribution. The old socialism deal. So anyway it is $800 billion. And here is what actually happened. This is putting people back to work the big government, Democrat way. Look what happens to the employment in the private sector. It's this white line. So 2007, 8, 9, 10, you see there is unemployment. And yet if

you take a look at the red line, that's the Federal Government. It's hiring all right. Instead of letting the businesses keep some of their money and hire people, instead they're hiring government workers. So that's how it works.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If I remember right, what, about 700,000 temporary workers for census data gathering, which already a third of them have been laid off.

Mr. AKIN. The trouble is really the government can't stimulate the economy. The whole assumption is silly, because all the government does is takes money and spend it. But if you hire a government employee, does that create a job? The answer is no, because for every one government employee you have two jobs you have lost from the private sector because you are sucking money out of the private sector. So when you have the government spending a lot, you take jobs away. That's what's going on. That's why the jobs are going.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If I could expand upon that, because you make an interesting point. Because what I have started to understand, just from talking to business owners, is that the labor pool is a zero sum game. You are either in the private sector or you are in the government sector, one or the other. And so as the government sector expands, you are actually drawing intellectual capital and wealth out of the private sector all together and expanding the governmental sector. So the inverse of that would be if we want to shift some intellectual capital and wealth back to the private sector, we must shrink the governmental sector.

Mr. AKIN. It's one of those things, it's sort of an inevitable law. And you can't just let the government continue to grow and grow and grow, because eventually it takes over everything like a cancer.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I guess to illustrate that point even more clearly, let's assume government is the solution here. And we hear a lot of people say government's the solution. So why don't we make every American a government employee? Why wouldn't we do that if everyone could have—

Mr. AKIN. Don't you go giving people ideas here in D.C. Somebody will try and do that you know.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. But they say that's the solution, to expand government. That's what creates jobs. So why don't we do that for everyone?

Mr. AKIN. Of course, obviously, that doesn't work, does it?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It doesn't work. Why? You are right. The answer then is the private sector.

Mr. AKIN. This is what was promised with the government bailout. You know, we are going to do the stimulus bill, $800 billion. And if you do the stimulus bill, these are the numbers the administration and the Democrats said—this is what's going to happen to unemployment; it's going to go down. And if you don't pass the bill, they said this is what's going to happen. But we did pass the bill, and that's what happened. Obviously, their economics don't work. They don't understand the facts.

So where have we gone? Here is the picture right here. This is the nasty little secret down here. You remember hearing that they used to say that George Bush spent too much money.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Right. Eight failed years, if I remember right.

Mr. AKIN. See, those are these blue years, was George Bush. And then right here was a Bush year, but this is when Speaker PELOSI was in charge of Congress. So this was in a way, if you give Bush credit for when PELOSI was in Congress, Congresswoman PELOSI, then this would be his worst year, which is about $460 billion worth of deficit. That's his worst year.

The next year, 2009, was when President Obama and the Democrats ran everything. Take a look at this jump. My goodness, it's a three times worse deficit than the Republicans had run under Bush, and Bush was spending too much money. And I agree we were spending too much money. And then the next year, 2010, it's even worse.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. So if you go back to your other graph that talked about employment and the growth of employment, or I guess in our case what we are talking about is the growth of unemployment today, you would see it probably correlates with that deficit spending.

Mr. AKIN. If you spend more money, look what happens. You start to lose jobs.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Yeah.

Mr. AKIN. Now, does that make sense? Is that logical? Now, you know, I was talking to a bunch of people, too, as I went around my district. And you know, people make economics way too complicated. I said, look, it's not that complicated. It's like a lemonade stand. Just picture you run a lemonade stand. It doesn't have to be complicated. And if you want a little business, if it's a lemonade stand or a machine shop or whatever it is, you want to make some jobs, you want to do some jobs, what you want is you have got to allow the guy that owns it to make enough profit from it so that he will add another wing on it, and he is going to sell tea mixed with lemonade, and then he is going to have peach lemonade, and different things and different products, different people. So as he expands his business he hires more people.

But in order to let him do that, first of all he's got to keep enough of his profit to be able to invest it back in his business. I mean it's isn't complicated. Don't make economics so hard. And so I am sure you are talking to your constituents. My constituents are nodding their head up and down, yeah, I understand that. Not that complicated.

So if you want to know what's going to kill jobs, the first thing is excessive taxation. It's just a killer to jobs. Where does the government get all its money? Taxation. Did you talk about that back in Georgia?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. We did. And I know we are moving to solutions here.

Mr. AKIN. Good.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It's easy to look back and sort of, I guess, bash the policies of the last several months, but what's important right now as a Nation is looking for leadership. I mean there has been a lack of leadership coming out of Washington for some time now. The Nation's looking for leadership. They're looking for a vision. They're looking for a plan. And what we have discovered is it's about certainty in the marketplace. When the marketplace has a little bit of certainty about what's going to happen in the future, that creates confidence. There is no confidence in the business marketplace.

So your first point up there is excessive taxation. The one thing that is certain right now is that because of inaction right here in Congress because of the Democrat leadership, taxes will go up this January of 2011. Capital gains will rise. Dividend tax will rise. Every income tax bracket will rise. The death tax will rise. The marriage penalty will rise. All of those will rise. So if we want to bring some confidence back to the marketplace, we would make those tax cuts permanent, wouldn't you think?

Mr. AKIN. You are absolutely right. I think you are hitting a couple of different points in this chart. The first one I am talking about is excessive taxation. But taxation also creates an economic uncertainty. And if you have got that lemonade stand and you don't know what's going on, you think maybe a tornado is coming, or maybe there is a tornado coming from Washington, or whatever it is, what you are going to do is you are going to hunker down. In Missouri, we use the word hunker down. I don't know if there is a verb to hunker or not.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You know, that's a favorite Georgia Bulldogs statement.

Mr. AKIN. Is it? Okay. Anyway, if you are talking about economic uncertainty, if you don't know what's going on as a businessman, what you are going to do is you are going to be very cautious, very conservative, and you are not going to hire a bunch of extra people.

But let's take a look at these job killers. Excessive taxation. Lets's take a look at what's coming down the pike. You have to be able to see. This is the largest tax increase in history unless Congress is going to act to deal with it. First of all, for married people the standard deduction decreases if you are married. And then parents, you have a child tax credit, it will be cut in half from a thousand to 500 per kid. If you die this year and you have an estate, you pay nothing. Next year if you die, 55 percent tax on it.

You are a small businessman. You have gotten to be 80 years old. You got your business all going, it's really doing good. It's actually a farm. It's 1,000 acres with some big pieces of equipment. It's worth $10 million, your farm is. And you up and die this year, and you pass that farm on to your son and he runs it, no problem. Next year same thing happens, you got the nice farm, got it all set up, you die, the government says, hey, taps your son on the shoulder, I need 55 percent. But he says wait a minute. If I take half the land of the farm then it doesn't make the thing work economically. I can't run the farm on half the land and half the equipment. If I have to sell 55 percent of it, you are going to put me out of business. They say you don't understand. You owe the IRS 55 percent of the cost of that farm. And so that small business closes down next year because of this policy.

Because what are we doing? Largest tax increase in history. Take a look at some of these tax increases. If you are paying 10 percent, you are going to be paying 15 percent next year. Those who are paying 25 percent of what they earn, they are going to be paying 28 percent. Those paying 28 are going to go to 31. Those paying 33 are going to go to 36. Thirty-five is going to go 39. Capital gains, dividends, death taxes. All of this stuff is going up.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Now, if I remember right, a couple years ago we heard a lot about hope, a lot about change. Taxes were not going to go up on the middle class if I remember right. But if I look at your charts, it's clear that the taxes are going to go up on not just the middle class, but every class. Everyone will pay taxes, regardless of where they are on the economic spectrum whatsoever. And as a result, businesses will not hire as many individuals because their taxes are going to go up. And if businesses aren't hiring individuals, unemployment continues to rise. Unemployment continues to rise, it impacts everyone throughout this Nation. Again we are back in this crazy cycle.

Mr. AKIN. Same cycle again. So basically what you are saying is, let's say that you don't make hardly any money at all. And so you are saying to yourself, hey, I am not making much money, so I am not paying any income taxes. So do I care? I like it if the taxes go up.

□ 1810

Oh, no, you don't, because what happens if you have excessive taxation? You get no jobs. You know, you can't just beat up on businesses, say all businesses are bad and then complain there aren't any jobs. So if we keep soaking the owners of businesses with excessive taxation, we're going to have a problem with jobs.

So what the solution to these problems is—we're making it sound complicated. It shouldn't be complicated. It's simply that you've got to back off on taxes and back off on government spending. It's as simple as that.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. So the solutions aren't reform and takeover of various industry in this Nation. In fact, it's just the opposite, because in the 15 counties that I spoke to this week, they said, Look, just get out of our way. Let us once again be creative, come up with the ideas to dream and to expand my business. But don't put that next regulation, don't force health care upon me. Don't increase taxes right now at all. Instead, let us, the business owners, the entrepreneurs, the risk-takers, the ones who are willing to risk it all and work the hardest here and put it all on the line, allow us to do that without government interference.

Mr. AKIN. This is kind of an amazing chart. These are all different countries all around the world down here, and there's a little green line there. And this is the corporate tax rates. And this little green line happens to be the United States. And the only one with higher taxes on corporations is Japan. And we wonder, gosh, we can't understand why we've lost jobs in this country. Well, we've got the second highest corporate tax rate going, not to mention the taxes on individuals, as you're saying.

So we're not doing the job. And part of the reason we're doing all of this taxation, of course, is because we're spending too much money.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It seems that there was a report put out by the Heritage Foundation that indicated that America is now classified for the first time as ''mostly free,'' I believe, given their ranking system. And that would be a great illustration. I don't think most Americans realize that America is second highest in the world when it comes to corporate tax rates, behind Japan, that all of these other nations that you have on this chart have lower tax rates than the United States of America. And we wonder why jobs go overseas to other countries.

Mr. AKIN. Right. And that's the thing. People get really upset. In fact, the Democrats that were talking before we came on tonight, they're very upset that all of these jobs went overseas. And I'm thinking to myself, Well, who's pushing all of the jobs overseas? You create an environment in America that is hostile to business and the jobs are going to go overseas. It is as inevitable as water running downhill.

And what do we do? We keep increasing taxes, increasing government spending, and the smart executives and corporations in America that have plants and facilities all over the world, they keep creating jobs. It's just the jobs aren't here. The jobs are going overseas because they've created such a hostile environment that the jobs aren't going to be here. And how do they make the environment hostile? Well, first of all, by too much in taxes, and the second thing, of course, is too much spending.

Here's a containment dome. We've had some trouble with oil leaking out of containment domes. And here's one. This is a containment dome. There's another containment dome, and it's not working either. It sure isn't working. Take a look at the rate of the spending that we've been doing. And the spending is always followed by, of course, a whole lot of taxation.

And so the first thing is, if you want to get this thing back on track, if you want to do the opposite of job killers, you want to create jobs, then what you need to do is you want to cut your taxation. This is one of those things I started out by saying I wish the Democrats would learn from the other Democrats, and one of them they could learn from was JFK. JFK had a bad economy and he did the right thing. He cut taxes. And when he cut taxes significantly, guess what happened? More jobs, stronger economy.

And the funny thing is—now this is sort of odd. If you cut taxes, the Federal Government will actually take in more money in revenue than if you didn't tax it. Have you thought about that? It's almost counterintuitive.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, it explains exactly what we need to do. You're right. It's counterintuitive, but it works. Just as if that were to work, then the opposite must be true if you increased taxes. That means your revenue decreases. There is a great illustration in the State of Georgia. They're trying to increase the tobacco tax in order to fill a budget hole. But prior to that, the administration here had raised tobacco taxes. And as a result of the raise of tobacco taxes from the Federal level, income of the State tobacco taxes had decreased by 20 percent.

Mr. AKIN. So let's do that again, because these numbers are interesting.

You're saying Georgia basically did a little experiment along these lines. It was a specific tax on one product—that is, tobacco—and they increased the tax on tobacco.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. They were proposing to increase the tax on tobacco. Then they looked, and they looked at what had happened just prior to that. And it was the year before, and it was the administration here that actually raised taxes on tobacco. And as a result of that, the revenue for the State of Georgia actually declined 20 percent. Without the State of Georgia raising taxes, the Federal Government raising taxes, but the State of Georgia's taxes that they would normally collect from tobacco actually declined by 20 percent. This shows that when you increase taxes, you actually—productivity or consumption, all of those things, decrease and therefore it's more damaging to the economy.

Mr. AKIN. I was trying to explain that to some—because I give some of these talks to my constituents, and one of the ways I try to explain it is let's say that you're king for a day and your job is to tax a loaf of bread and you want to get as much tax revenue as you can by taxing bread. And so you go

through this little exercise in your mind and say, I can tax the bread $10 a loaf or one penny a loaf. If I taxed at one penny a loaf, nobody would notice, and I would get a penny times all of those loaves of bread. But if I got $10 on a loaf, wow, I could make a lot of money, but then maybe nobody would buy any bread because it's too expensive. So common sense would say somewhere between a penny and $10 you're going to come to an optimum place where you can get the most tax on it and people will still keep buying bread. If you increase it, you actually lose revenue; If you decrease it—so there's an optimum spot.

And what's happening is the government is taxing people so much, by increasing the taxes, it basically stalls the economy and so their revenue drops.

Now, if I were a happy socialist, if I were really one of these guys that wants the government to do everything for everybody——

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Is there such thing as a happy socialist? I mean, help me with that.

Mr. AKIN. That's the trouble. There aren't very many of them that are happy because they're so worried about somebody else making money that they don't think—if I were a happy socialist, I would want a strong economy so I had more money to swap around to my buddies, you see. But instead what we're doing is we raise the taxes so much, it kills the economy and we don't have as much money to work on.

Now, the Federal Government doesn't notice it so much, but State governments that have balanced budgets—Missouri has a balanced budget amendment. We have to balance a budget. And if you're a legislator or Governor, particularly in a State that has a balanced budget—and most of them do—when you have a recession, it is a tough time to be the leader of your State because people hate you because you have to keep cutting things to keep the budget balanced. Of course, down here, we just let it go.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It's that print, spend, and borrow mentality down here.

What you were referring to a minute ago, there's a line of demarcation that I refer to as the tipping point that occurs. And whether it's an economy or anywhere else, there is a great book written on that very subject matter of how that occurs throughout time in various ways.

So what we need to do right now is look for solutions that tip the other way. I think we Republicans are certainly the ones for less taxes, less government, personal responsibility, and it's those positive solutions that I think Americans are looking for right now. They're looking for that glimmer of, I guess, sunshine out there that says we're going to get through this.

I'm telling you, we are going to get through this. We're going to get through this as Americans together working hard, once again, dreaming and not being dependent on the Federal Government to be the solution.

Mr. AKIN. You're absolutely right. I like the idea of being positive. And the solutions, one of them was JFK. He cut taxes, and the recession, after a period of about a year, turns right around and things go along well. Ronald Reagan did the same thing. Massive tax cut. As soon as he did that, the economy—takes a little while—the economy turns right around because there's money now being invested not in more big government but the businessman puts that money into different new ways of creating, buying another milling machine, another wing on the building, more money for research and development to come up with a better way to make a product. And all of those things together, when the money goes back to the small business man, they start to hire people.

I think—what is it?—companies with 500 or fewer employees employ 80 percent of Americans. So if those smaller businesses from 500 employees on down, if they got more money to spend on their own business, that's part of the solution. And everybody does better when that happens.

Of course, another thing that kills jobs is this insufficient liquidity. The businessman can't borrow money because it's all tied up in banks. Of course, we've got that problem going on now, too, and part of the reason is the government is gobbling up so much money with their incredible, incredible level of Federal spending which, once again, we point to this chart. This is what's happened under Obama the first 2 years of his Presidency. It's three times more deficit than Bush, in his worst year, had.

So this liquidity is a big deal to the businessman. And the banking rules right now make it hard for small business men to get liquidity. And as you mentioned, the economic uncertainty. Who is going to take a risk when you see the lineup of what's happened to us? First of all, you've got Wall Street bailout, and then you've got Cash for Clunkers, and you've got this stimulus bill where we waste $800 billion.

□ 1820

And then we passed cap-and-tax at three o'clock in the morning. It was supposed to be about how bad CO_2 is, and what's the solution to the bill to keep CO_2 down? You guessed it, a whole lot of taxes and a whole lot of red tape and government regulations

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Those taxes are only on Big Business, right, that wouldn't impact the consumer? That seems to be the argument that is put out there, but we all know that it's not Big Business that pays taxes. It's not the corporations that pay taxes. It's all passed down through the consumer through the cost of any goods and services as any other cost would be in a service or in a product.

But I've been here 30 days. Thirty days I've been sworn in here as a Member of Congress.

Mr. AKIN. We are glad to have you, too. We wish we had some more people who would vote along the lines of getting these jobs going and getting the economy going.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. It is an honor to represent Georgia's Ninth Congressional District. I tell you, in Georgia what an incredible State. I know your State is great as well. But we have 13 Fortune 500 companies, three Fortune 100, the world's busiest and largest airport, the fourth busiest port in the Nation, an incredible university system and so much when it comes to entrepreneurial sprit.

Mr. AKIN. But you haven't mentioned Georgia peaches yet. You've got some good peaches down there.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. But a great State, so much to work with there, but there's that uncertainty that lies out there.

So in my 30 days here, the House voted on TARP II—of course, I opposed that—the expansion of unemployment benefits to a far-reaching amount, and then the war supplemental budget which was 61 percent un-war related, and it goes one thing after another, whether it is financial reform or whether it is this reform or that reform, just in my 30 days. So there is a little bit of certainty out there in the business community.

The certainty is that something's going to come down from Washington that's going to put another burden on them, another tax on them and it is killing job creation today. It's time to change that certainty around and say you can be certain that coming out of Washington it's going to be less taxes, less government, personal responsibility, and liberty and just for all. Let's get back to free markets and capitalism.

Mr. AKIN. That's what it boils down, too, isn't it? Two different visions for America. One of them is there are all these people who are victims and the government has to take care of them and you don't have to be responsible and you are just going to be part of this permanent welfare idea. And I don't think Americans by and large really want that. I think Americans really like the idea more of having the courage to live some dream that God puts on their hearts.

You know, the way that this country was founded, they believed that every single person that God created in this world had some purpose, some job that God had in mind for them to do. So what they did was they came up with the idea that the only thing that you got in trouble for up in New England was if you didn't work. You see, over in Europe they had all these classes and they had certain people who didn't want any calluses on their hands because they didn't like the idea of working.

But the people that came to this country said, no, your job is to work hard because God made a job for everybody to do. In the process of doing

that, they created almost a classless society because how can you look down your nose at somebody else if God made one person to be an accountant, another person to be a blacksmith, another one to be a farmer? How could you look down your nose if somebody is doing what God called them to do?

But it was always the idea of hard work and being honest and so people could be free and chase the dreams that they had in their heart. But I don't think people are happy when the government is dishing them out, you know, always dependent on the government, you see, and I don't think that's what America is all about. I don't think Americans are happy with the system where they're just constantly going to be dependent on the government. I think people love freedom in this country.

As you talk to people around your district, I ask people if you had to summarize what is America all about—I love to ask that question. Let's say somebody from some foreign country came and they had a bunch of TV cameras and put it in your face, and you've lived in America. Can you tell me just in a sentence what is the basic secret of what makes America such a special place. And the word that I always hear is freedom, freedom. It is not like, no, that the government's going to take care of me. No, it's the idea of being a free person, and that's something that's so precious to us in this country.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You're right, and it's great, and that's what we've got to get back to is allowing the freedom to succeed and the freedom to fail, wouldn't you say? I mean, that is a freedom as well. Not government bailouts and government taking care of businesses that make poor decisions or take a risk that just doesn't work out, for whatever reason. But, you know, when we think about where we are going in the future—and I think we've got a great future—we just have to be positive. We have to come up with positive solutions and solutions that aren't the government being the solution but empowering the private sector.

We've come into a new era I believe, and I believe it's coming. I would like to say the sun is setting on an era, and that's the era of the champions of government, that the sun is setting on that and now a new dawn is arising and that is going to be the champions of the taxpayer.

So as we move forward through these next weeks and this great recess, I think America is waiting for this Congress to take a recess so that they will stop passing policies that are damaging to small businesses and elect a new governing majority here coming up soon and we have positive solutions that just reduce the business owners and, once again, empower them to be the job creators instead of empowering government to be that.

Mr. AKIN. You know, when people make a mistake—we were talking quite a bit about socialism, and liberals really just hate it when you mention that word ''socialism,'' but really an awful lot of Americans don't know socialism when they see it. And it is very dangerous, it's deadly, and it goes to the idea of what's the job of the government.

And if you go to our Founders, right off the bat the Pilgrims had socialism imposed on them by the loan sharks from England, and they pitched it out. They knew it wasn't any good. They knew that socialism was really a system of stealing where the government would take from one person and give to another person. If you go to the founding of our country, it was built on a bright vision. There was a fresh air; there was a vibrancy and enthusiasm because you could fail. There was an incentive to do well.

The understanding was that the job of the government was limited and limited in a particular way, and that was, the job of the government was justice. And Lady Justice was depicted—they chipped her out of marble, you know, and she's sitting there and she always had this blindfold over her eyes and she held up the scales, and the scales were what the law says and your own actions. But she always had that blindfold on. Well, what did the blindfold mean? Well it meant when you came before the government, before Lady Justice, she didn't peek whether you're black or white or male or female, rich or poor. She just said this is the way the law applies evenly to all people.

But socialism does something different. Lady Justice peeks and says this one's rich, this one's poor. I'm going to take from this one to give to this one and then we get sophisticated and we steal from everybody and pass it around to everybody else in the government. It gets more and more inefficient, but Lady Justice is peeking. That's socialism. It's wealth redistribution. It is institutionalized debt. It's morally wrong, and worst of all, it doesn't work.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Right. And I believe Bastiat over 150 years referred to that as ''legalized plunder'' in the book, ''The Law,'' where he knew that anyone that was taking without permission and giving to someone else was plunder. And in the case of taxation here in the United States and the raising of taxes that we're going to see in January 2011 just due to the inaction of the leadership here in Washington, that is an increased legalized plunder that is going to occur.

Mr. AKIN. Which really kind of wraps back around. I promised when we started we'd ask a couple of these really basic questions, that is, Can the government steal? A lot of kids say, well, the government can't possibly steal. The fact of the matter is the government can steal when the government does stuff that it's not its job to do. And one of the things it's not its job to do is to take something from one person and give it to someone else and that's, of course, what the President said that he wanted to do with the government. He announced that before he was elected that that was his plan, to take money from Joe the plumber and give it to someone else.

And, of course, he said he wouldn't tax anybody that made less than $250,000, and yet that silly cap-and-tax bill that we passed in this Chamber before you were here—you don't have the shame of having that having gone through here—but if you flipped a light switch, you start paying a tax. You know, it isn't a matter of 250,000 bucks, you flip a light switch you're going to be taxed.

And that socialized medicine bill, wow, is that ever a disaster. They've got taxes in there on wheelchairs. I thought I saw a taxing on everything that moves or doesn't move, but they've even got taxes on wheelchairs in that thing, and of course the problem is that's what kills jobs. It's messing the economy up, adding to the insufficient liquidity, the economic uncertainty and of course the red tape and government mandates.

You put this package together and you can go both ways. You can have a vibrant economy, people free and prosperous and out there chugging along, good economy, or you can just keep on dialing in more and more government interference, more tremendous levels of spending, and basically what you're doing is you're killing freedom.

□ 1830

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. When you think about it, imagine if you had the opportunity to implement the policies that you felt were best to get jobs moving forward here in this Nation. If it was me, I would say, let's empower the private sector. Let's allow them to be the job creators, not government. Let's reduce the tax burden. Let's start with the capital gains tax, the corporate tax rate, as well as many of the other tax rates involved in there. But then not only reduce taxes, cut spending. You have to cut spending in association with those tax cuts. In addition, we need to cut it beyond because of the spending level that we're currently on. But when you think about spending, everyone around here says, well, you can't cut spending. And you have to ask the question: Are we running at an efficient level here as government? We know the answer. The answer to that is no. In my opinion there are no sacred cows. It is time to cut government and cut it and cut deep when it comes to cutting government. Americans all across this Nation are cutting their budget, and there are a lot of important things in their budget. I believe it's time for the Federal Government to cut their budget tremendously, reduce taxes, reduce the regulation, and let the private sector once again flourish.

Mr. AKIN. I think you're absolutely right.

The idea, though, that we can bring the level of spending that we've got

going on under control by just trying to get efficiency, I think that's probably optimistic. I think what we have to do is decide that there are some things that Washington, D.C. should not be doing in the first place. We shouldn't cut it; we should just totally eliminate it. It should just stop. None. We need to take a good look at our Federal spending and say, What are the things the Federal Government has to do? We have to defend our Nation. We know that much. Because the States aren't going to do that. We have to make sure there's no pirates on the high seas. There used to be a law, it was one of the few Federal laws against piracy on the high seas. There was a Federal law when America started that was against counterfeiting, because that was not a State job; that had to be a Federal job.

There are very few jobs that originally started at the Federal level. And then everything else, we have to push them back to the States. I would be happy to say, look, if the people of California, or Massachusetts, or Tennessee want to have socialized medicine, let them try it and see how it works. They could learn from Massachusetts. It didn't work well. They could learn from Tennessee. They about shut down medicine in Tennessee. If States want to try these things, let the experiments begin at the State level. But at the Federal level, we have got to basically stop a lot of stuff. The first place I would start with would be just what Ronald Reagan said, shut down that Department of Education.

I had a group I was talking to down at a Honda dealership just a couple of days ago and I asked them, How much benefit do you think you've gotten from a whole bunch of Federal bureaucrats that work in the Department of Education? Has it helped your kid any at all? There were these blank looks. No, I don't think it's helped a whole lot.

So what happens if you sell the building and just shut down the Department of Education at the Federal level? Why can't that be done at the State or local level? I think we have to ask those tough questions. Maybe you could make a case, gosh, it would be nice if; but we can't afford it.

Here's a number: Debt and deficit as a percent of GDP. This is deficit. Here's the United States. We're right alongside of Greece and Spain and the United Kingdom. We're right in there with these European countries that are struggling, and we're not much better off than they are. We're way overspending.

Here is debt as a percent of GDP. You've got the United States. There are only two other countries that are worse than we are, that's Greece and Italy.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If you had to simplify that for the American viewers out there, and I see that says about 91 percent of our debt as a percentage of GDP. How would you simplify that in terms of the average household at home and they have income coming in, their pay as it relates to debt?

Mr. AKIN. Let's try and speculate a little bit. Let's say the income for the whole year, they make a hundred bucks. So what does this mean, 91 percent? If their income is a hundred dollars for the year, what does that mean? That means they've got an incredible level of debt. They're not going to get back out from under it hardly.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You're saying that 91 percent of that goes to debt; that income has to go to debt.

Mr. AKIN. That's the problem.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If the liability was called in at that point. It is a liability of 91 percent.

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

So the point is, what do we do here in America? We basically have to stop thinking that the Federal Government is God and that it's going to solve every problem. We've got the Federal Government now, they're into the automobile business, the insurance business, the student loan business, they're in the flood insurance business, they're in the food business, they're in the housing business.

It kind of reminds me, there was this country that I grew up paying close attention to in the U.S., and it had this philosophy that the government is going to give you food, and it's going to give you a place to live, some shelter, it's going to give you an education, the government's going to give you a job and it's going to give you health care. We looked at that country and thought, That's not going to work. And it didn't work. The whole country crashed economically. It was called the USSR.

Here we are today, and what does the Federal Government try to do? Give people housing and food and education and a job and health care. How are we different? What we have to understand is the Federal Government has to be reined in to do just what it's supposed to do, which is justice. That is, provide a set of laws where everybody is equal before the law and a national security that protects us from terrorists and other people that wish us ill. So that Federal Government is just going to have to go on a diet.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. That's right.

I've only been here 30 days and I can tell you, this government is way too big. It does not run efficiently. There are many tasks that it should not be involved in whatsoever. We've seen those pass this House just in my few short weeks of being here. As I think about where we're going and I think about the solutions that we're all seeking, the Economic Advisory Council that I've put together across the 15 counties of the Ninth Congressional District is going to be one of the most dynamic councils I believe we have ever seen, because these are the business leaders, those that are on the ground hiring and making decisions for their business, that are making tough decisions; what to cut out of their budgets, what hours are they going to operate, what supplies are they going to buy. And we're asking them that question, What is keeping you from hiring that next employee? Because it goes back to that, if one out of three businesses would just hire one person in the next 12 months, unemployment would be cut in half. That's how close we are.

So what is it that the government is doing to prevent you from hiring that next employee? I am excited that soon I will be bringing back what I believe are going to be some powerful recommendations to the House of Representatives right here and say, From the Ninth Congressional District, from the business leaders in north Georgia, here's what they say needs to be done in order to get this economy back on track.

Mr. AKIN. I think you and I have a pretty good idea what they're liable to say, because they have enough business sense to know what's happened historically. They know socialism doesn't work, and they know what you've got to do is as the jobs and wealth and freedom, those are things that come from free people. It isn't the government that makes jobs. It's the businesses. It's all of the innovative Americans that are out there, that are living that dream in their heart. From the beginning days of this country, there are these people, these crazy people that came to this land with some dream of something they wanted to do.

I remember there was one guy that had this idea, he wanted to build light bulbs. He built a hundred of them and none of them worked. His attitude was, now I know a hundred ways not to build a light bulb. These crazy people came with these dreams in their hearts, the dream became a vague possibility and eventually it became a reality, and America was built, one dream at a time. It got to be so common, we called it the American Dream.

I know, gentlemen, as you travel in Georgia and you talk to those people, that you really get to love them out there, and you hear the stories:

''Well, my wife and I were sleeping under a park bench, but we had this idea for a little business. That was 20 years ago. Well, now, my goodness, we've done pretty well. The kids are in good shape. We've got a nice house. I think I might be selling the business.''

We do this, this, or that. Who would have thought it? We've got one guy in Missouri. He started a little company called Innoventor. I love this story. Talk about somebody with some imagination. He had grown up on a hog farm. Some of us that are from suburbia, we're not too fond of the by-product of those hog farms. But he had a lot of that by-product kicking around trying to figure out what to do with it. And so this guy took all this pig manure and he put it into a tank and he ran the

temperature up and the pressure up in the tank according to some basic principles of the way that we work with petroleum products and figured out a way to turn all that pig manure into this thick oily sludge which they then use to make asphalt.

And so he's got a section of road in the State of Missouri that's paved with asphalt made from pig manure. Of course the first question is, does the road smell? He says, No, when you get it up to this temperature, all the ammonia and things that you associate with smell is gone. But here's a guy that took something that nobody wanted, people looked at it as a liability, and he's got an invention that's going to turn that pig manure into asphalt to pave our roads with.

That's the kind of thing that makes America. I thought that was a colorful example. I know you've got stories of your own from Georgia. My brother was a Ramblin' Wreck from Georgia Tech. I know they've trained some good engineers down there.

□ 1840

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. There are great talents and opportunities in Georgia. And as I know we are wrapping up our time probably here, and as I sort of close out, it goes back to that zero sum. It is a zero sum game when it comes to employment.

You are either expanding the private sector, or you are expanding the governmental sector. And I believe our objective, and I am glad that you are of like mind with me, that as we consider the deliberations over the next several weeks, that those who are watching tonight know that there are two men, plus more here, who really want to see the private sector expand, and expand through innovation and the excitement of the idea.

So I sort of liken it to the flame. There is that entrepreneurial flame out there. It has been dampened. It has been dampened quite a bit over the last 15–16 months with the policies coming out of Washington, and I believe it is our objective and I believe we can do this.

It is time to once again fan that flame and get that dampened spark flamed back up and get that entrepreneur fired back up about that American dream that you just spoke of.

I will close with this story, because my son who is 10 shared with me the greatest illustration last year. We were debating allowances. We were talking a dollar for this task and a dollar for that task. And he stopped me and he said, dad, if you give me a dollar to do something that I should already be doing, doesn't that just take away from what mom can buy groceries with? Wouldn't it be better if I made something and sold it and added to the family?

I mean, what a phenomenal example from a 10-year-old boy who understands productivity and wealth accumulation. That is something that excites me, that that young generation gets it.

Mr. AKIN. Well, you know, that is a heartwarming story, and it shows the basic nature of your 10-year-old son. He understands that somewhere along the line, that he was made to do something, and even that God maybe has a plan for him, and his thinking was, I want to help my dad.

You know, there is nothing I think as a Christian that inspires me more than a passage in the Bible that is in Ephesians. It says that we are God's workmanship created in Christ Jesus. That means that each one of us is a unique and special person.

But not only that. Here is what exciting. He says unto good work which God prepared for us to do, every single one of us has a purpose in this world, and the purpose is to do some good work, which our Father wants us to do. And it is a pretty exciting thing if you are not cynical to say, you mean I can actually do something that would please my Father in heaven?

You see, I think the freedom that we treasure in America was given to us so that we could do that mission that we were created to do. That is what freedom is all about. It is not to abuse, not to have the government take from one person and give to another person. It is about each one of us doing what we were called to do and living that American dream.

Then as the country builds and becomes strong and we have this attitude that everybody has a purpose, everybody, there is no one that isn't included in that, and that the freedom we enjoy is freedom so that we can do what we were created to do in the first place. When we have that kind of attitude, it gets contagious, and all over the world people are going to say, hey, look what is going on in America. Isn't that exciting? Those people really do believe in freedom. They understand the difference between socialism, which is big government doing something that is stealing, it is dishonest, and allowing people to follow their god-given direction.

That means as you said though that people will fail sometimes. We try, we fall down, we have to get up and try it again. If we didn't understand that, none of us would know how to walk. We fall down the first few times. And I found that out trying to ski as well. You know, there is a part of my anatomy that worked as a brake for quite a while. It got pretty sore.

But we keep getting back up again, and that is necessary in a free kind of society. But I think America loves that sunlight and bright light of freedom and that fresh air and the enthusiasm of the challenge, and the fact that every one of us has a purpose that we were put on this earth to do.

The Lord has given us the simple commandment, thou shalt not steal, and when somebody takes something from one person and gives it to you and you didn't earn it, you see, that is short-circuiting the way God made everything, and that is why it didn't work. It didn't work for the Soviet Union, it hasn't worked in these other countries.

Socialized medicine doesn't work. Yes, you get insurance, but you can't get any health care. That doesn't do you any good.

Well, I appreciate your joining me, and thank the good citizens from Georgia for sending up such a great Congressman, Congressman GRAVES. Is a pleasure joining you.

BRITISH PETROLEUM AND OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is always an honor and privilege to speak on the floor of the House of Representatives where so much history has been made. There are a number of things we need to cover.

I had some interesting things going on in the Natural Resources Committee today because we are taking up legislation as a result of the oil spill. Those pesky words keep resurfacing, ''never let a crisis go to waste,'' and it appears that is what is happening here.

We had 11 people lose their lives in the Deepwater Horizon explosion. Many thousands may lose their livelihood. We know that it is the worst environmental accident we have had in the United States.

It has been amazing that so little had been done to try to assist from the Federal Government. Eventually the Coast Guard came on board, but three days after this terrible accident, it is nations like the Netherlands that have extraordinary expertise in building barrier islands, in actually taking in water and separating out the oil, people that had all these wonderful inventions and ideas and things that would help capture the oil, should have all been utilized because so many of them have merit, and yet the Coast Guard kept turning them away. Kevin Costner had spent $10 million of his own money to see this thing developed that would separate oil and water and do so in large numbers, but didn't get a lot of attention.

So I know there were a lot of pressing things to do. There were golf courses to be played, there were things that had to be done, parties that had to be attended. All the while the oil kept coming up and the environment kept suffering, wildlife kept suffering.

And then when we eventually find out, well, actually there was a reason. British Petroleum thought they were bulletproof. They thought they could have more safety violations, hundreds of times more safety violations than other oil companies drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, and be immune from having the administration come down on it.

It is understandable now, once we got into it. They were supportive of the administration's crap-and-trade bill. In

fact, as the Deepwater Horizon rig was sinking, Senator KERRY down the hall was making negotiations making sure BP was still on board with the crap-and-trade bill. The White House counted them as being supportive of the bill. And they, of course, have so many lobbyists. Their best lobbyists are all from Democratic administrations. They felt like they were bulletproof.

So then it begins to explain why it took so long to finally get on to BP and fuss at them, because America had had enough. They had seen the kind of poor safety record BP had.

□ 1850

So BP got thrown under the bus, much to their apparent surprise, after all their support. They've given heavily to the President's campaign. So I'm sure they were surprised when they ultimately were thrown under the bus.

But as a result of that terrible tragedy there are some laws that are being voted out of committee. We had debate on them for several hours today. And that's as it should be. A bill shouldn't come to the floor that is so sweeping unless it goes through proper committee channels. Didn't go through subcommittee, but we had a long hearing on it today. And it will be voted on in the morning. All the votes were rolled so that they'll take place in the morning. It's just hard to believe that out of a crisis like the gulf oil spill, that people would take advantage of that and want to pork up the bill. Shocking. Shocking.

One of the things that economists have proposed across the country that would help get us on track is that—financially, that is, on track—is that is we have got to get out of the mentality of constantly buying more and more and more and more land. The Federal Government seems to want to take over the country, or at least those States that often vote heavily Republican. The colleagues across the aisle want to buy more and more of the land.

So I had a chart here of what the West looks like, the Western part of the United States, how much of it we have in red that is owned by the United States. That is, by the United States Government. So you get an idea. Here is the Western United States. The red parts are those that are owned by our Federal Government. And the Federal Government wants more. We have had information on the amount of money that our Federal Government has been spending in the past on buying land, and it's been rather shocking to see the numbers. Here we have the amount of money that was allocated in 2008 for the Federal Government to spend on buying more land in the United States for the Federal Government to take over. It's important to understand that when the Federal Government takes over land, it means the schools in that vicinity, the local governments in that vicinity get nothing. Because all of the land, when the Federal Government takes it, is removed from the tax rolls. It cannot be taxed. Schools, cities, counties, States cannot tax the Federal Government once it takes over the land.

So it makes sense that you want to be cautious in having the Federal Government take over more and more land in this country. In fact, that's what economists have said. You have got to get out of the mentality of continuing to buy land. Start selling some. Let's get on track to get rid of our deficit. Quit buying land. And it turns out that right now we're $3.7 billion behind in the projects that are needed to keep up the existing Federal land and Federal parks that we have right now. Our parks are going to squalor in many places. Places that people used to love to visit are just being let go because the money is not there to take care of it. Why? Because we keep spending money on buying more and more land and locking that land up so it cannot be used for any purpose.

That's one of the problems we've got down with the border between Arizona—a U.S. border—and Mexico. Thirty-two miles of that border are wilderness, national park, which means the Border Patrol are the only ones that can't take—or U.S. Federal agents are the only ones that can't take vehicles in there. It's against the law. They commit a crime if they do that. But it doesn't stop the drug smugglers, the illegal alien smugglers from taking vehicles across there. And so that's what happens. They can have mechanical instruments. But even if you need to bring a helicopter in to lift out somebody that's been shot, like a Border Patrol Agent, which has happened, the helicopter can't land. Illegal aliens, drug smugglers, they can drive right by them, but our Border Patrol cannot go in there because it's a national park wilderness area. That's why I've got a bill to try to do something about that, but apparently it's not going to see the light of day.

So here we have in 2008, the last year of the Bush Presidency. But since all appropriations originate in the House of Representatives, no matter what the President wants to do, it originates here, and if you check back in 2004, 2005, 2006, it was a fraction of a hundred million dollars. Well, in 2008 it was a little over a hundred million dollars. In 2009, it was still about $150 million or so, according to the chart. And then in 2010, this year, from last year's appropriation, it shot up to nearly $300 million. And for next year it's already—what is being laid out for next year's land acquisitions is nearly $400 million.

So here we are, in the worst budget crunch we have ever had, and what happens? For the first time since 1974, Congress is not going to have a budget. Apparently, it was considered too politically difficult for people to come in and vote for a budget that would expand costs as apparently the desire is to have done. So here you have a tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico, still ongoing. Hopefully, the cap is going to hold. But that remains to be seen. There's still so much damage.

And since we're dealing with a time when those in control do not want to let a good crisis go to waste without taking advantage of it, in the legislation that we debated today and that will apparently pass in the morning around 9:15, we're going to stick in $900 million for land acquisition. That's in the committee, July, 2010. That's what is apparently going to happen because the majority will have the votes. They're going to appropriate in an authorization bill $9 million to buy more land, as if our parks are not in enough trouble because all of this money keeps going for more and more land acquisition. We're going to not cut spending on land acquisition and just even have a moratorium just for a little while. Let this country catch its breath.

We're looking at a $1.5 trillion deficit for 1 year. My first year here, I kept hearing people across the aisle talking about how $100 billion, $200 billion was an outrage for a deficit in 1 year. And, you know what? They were right. There shouldn't have been $100 billion and $200 billion deficit for 1 year. And that's why people voted them into the majority in November 2006.

□ 1900

Yet here we go this year. The same people have no problem with a $1.5 trillion deficit in 1 year because of all the jobs that it apparently, they think, is creating. Well, it did. For June, 431,000 jobs were created. Unfortunately, 411,000 of them were temporary census jobs.

So here's our chart. This is what will pass tomorrow because me and my friends simply do not have enough votes to keep it from passing. They're going to pork up this bill to deal with the gulf oil crisis by sticking $900 million of pork in there to buy more land for the Federal Government to own, to put local governments, local schools, State governments in a difficult situation because they'll never be able to generate any tax dollars or revenue from that land once the Federal Government takes it over.

And so with that in mind, we look back at the chart again, the map, that shows the western part of the United States with that in red, representing areas that the Federal Government already owns. But apparently to those in charge right now, it's not enough. It's not enough to own nearly all of Nevada. It's not enough to own 70 percent of Utah. It's not enough to own most of Idaho, Arizona, Wyoming. So tomorrow, $900 million will be appropriated in this bill about the gulf oil crisis to buy more Federal land that will hurt more local governments and more local schools. It's just hard to fathom. It is hard to believe that this is going to happen tomorrow, but we simply do not have enough votes in our minority to keep that kind of pork from being added to a bill emanating from a crisis.

You know, we've already heard from people, families of victims who were

killed on Deepwater Horizon, out begging, Please do not have a moratorium, because they knew their friends would be out of work, other family members would be out of work. I don't have a problem if you want to shut down every one of BP's offshore rigs until we can be sure that they are safe. But when, as we heard in the hearing today, BP had had 800 safety violations to, in some cases, none for other oil companies in the same period, one for other oil companies in the same period, they had 800, so what did this administration do? They gave them an award for safety. That's right. They didn't fine them. They gave them an award for safety.

But when you understand they were embracing a tax, a gas tax, they were embracing so many of the bills this administration was pushing forward that most in the country didn't support, they didn't want to lose their good friend BP, and that's why it took them so long to throw them under the bus. Well, that's one area in which we're throwing away a lot of money. It's pretty amazing, pretty outrageous.

Another area is in our foreign assistance programs. Now, this is my third term here. In each of my three terms, I have filed a bill. This is no exception. It's H.R. 4636. I have now filed for a discharge petition. So hopefully we can get enough folks that will sign on to the discharge petition to force this bill to the floor for an up-or-down vote, because we haven't been able to get one. This is a very simple bill. In essence, it says—well, it's entitled the United Nations Voting Accountability Act. It is very simple. Any nation that votes against the United States' position more than half the time on contested votes in the United Nations will receive no Federal assistance from our government to theirs. Very simple. And as I have said before, you don't want to have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free. Why pay them to hate you when they'll do it for free?

So we pulled the report for this year—because each year a report comes out; it has to come out by March 31 of each year—of all of the votes, the contested votes from the year before so that we could get some idea of who is voting with us, how often, who we're paying to hate us.

For example, in 2008, there was $105 million given to Bangladesh. They voted against the U.S. position 82.4 percent of the time in 2008 and 80 percent of the time in 2009.

We gave millions to Belarus, a former state in the Soviet Union, and they voted against us in 2008 84.6 percent of the time, and this past year voted 75 percent of the time against the U.S. interests and position.

You've got Bolivia down in South America. We've given them over $100 million. That was in 2008. As I understand, it was a great deal more than that in 2009. They were our great ally and were only voting against us 85.2 percent of the time in 2008. And it got a little better in 2009. Only 70 percent of the time they voted against the country that provided them over $100 million in aid. We're paying them to hate us.

Brazil. Of course we've heard recently about the $2 billion that we're loaning to Brazil to develop their deepwater territories, their deepwater offshore drilling program. And lo and behold, it turns out apparently George Soros' biggest personal investment is in a company that does that drilling, so we provided $2 billion to help our dear friend George Soros make that much more money from his biggest investment, personally. And so Brazil, we loaned them millions—I'm sorry. We loaned them billions, give them millions, and they voted against us in 2008 70.7 percent of the time and against us last year in 2009 62.5 percent of the time.

You've got Cambodia, where lots of Americans lost their lives fighting for freedom for the people. We let them out from under all the murderous regimes that have followed. But with tens of millions of dollars, they voted against us 84 percent of the time in 2008 and 62.5 percent of the time in 2009. We are still just pouring money into them.

Now, I have been talking to them about this ever since I came on into Congress in 2005, and it makes me think that maybe we're doing some good, because of all the hundreds of millions we've given to Colombia, in 2008, they voted against the U.S. position 80 percent of the time. Last year, it was 40 percent of the time. So they would not be adversely affected by this bill because they have found their way clear to support us.

Most people think with the embargo sanctions against Cuba, that's taken care of. Not true. In 2008 alone, we gave $45 million in aid to Cuba when they voted against us in the U.N. 87.8 percent of the time. And in 2009, they got even higher, up to 90 percent of the time.

Now, the Republic of the Congo in 2008 got $103 million, $104 million, and for some reason, that same year they only voted against us 7 percent of the time. This year, I was under the impression they got even more money, but they voted against us 71 percent of the time. So from 7 percent to a 71.5 percent turnaround there.

□ 1910

You've got Dominican Republic. Give them tens of millions of dollars. They voted against us 80.5 percent of the time in '08, 60 percent of the time in '09.

Egypt gets a couple of billion dollars, in essence, but they voted against us in the U.N. against our position 93.3 percent of the time in '08, and in '09, 81.8 percent of the time.

Got Ethiopia. We gave $455 million in '08. They voted against us to show their gratitude 82.9 percent of the time in the U.N. in '08, and 83.3 percent in '09.

Again, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free.

India, $99 million that we gave away as Federal assistance to India in 2008. They voted against us 76.3 percent of the time. That number, I think, may have risen and now so has their opposition to anything we hold dear. They're now up to 88.9 percent of the time in 2009, voting against us.

India is benefiting from our high corporate taxes. They're benefiting from the threat of the crap-and-trade bill passing. They're benefiting from the health care bill that just got passed because employers, big manufacturers are saying, we've got to go where the country doesn't hate us being there so much. We're going to India, we're going to China, we're going to South America.

So a lot of these countries we're pouring money into that we don't have, that we're having to borrow from China, all the while they're opposing us every step of the way.

You've got Indonesia, 189, basically $190 million simply in foreign aid, not counting the other benefits we've given them. And yet they opposed us 84.9 percent of the time in the U.N. in '08, and 80 percent of the time in '09.

Pouring money into these countries that we don't have, that we're having to borrow, while people are out of work, hurting, searching for jobs, hoping for the economy to turn around, and something besides temporary census jobs to become available, and this is what they find out.

Jordan, in 2008 got $687 million, simply in aid, and they voted against us 91.7 percent of the time in '08 and 60 percent of the time in '09.

Now, Mexico, this shows $50 million in foreign aid in '08. But also, of course, we had, I believe, $500 million that we provided them to assist them in their defense effort. And as a result, we have the President of Mexico come in here and chastise us for having immigration laws that he says promote racism; laws like that passed in Arizona that simply are begging to have our laws enforced.

Well, Mexico voted against us 75.9 percent of the time in '08. But in '09 that dropped to 36.4 percent of the time, so apparently we're buying some love and affection there.

Nicaragua, they've got tens of millions of dollars each year, yet they voted against us in '08, 84.7 percent of the time, and against our positions 80 percent of the time in '09.

You've got Nigeria, $486 million they received in 2008, simply in foreign aid, not counting other types of aid; '08 they voted against us that same year 82.7 percent of the time in the U.N., and against our position 63.6 percent of the time in 2009.

Pakistan, that we keep hoping is going to make a turn for the better, well, in 2008, simply in foreign aid, we gave them $737 million. They voted against our position 81.1 percent of the time in '08; 87.5 percent of the time in '09.

Got the Philippines. They wanted to be completely shed of the United

States, didn't want anything to do with us. Well, almost nothing to do with us. They did want our hundred-plus million dollars that we will give them, as we did in 2008, while they voted against our position in the U.N. 81.2 percent of the time in '08; 62.5 percent of the time in '09.

Philippines have people there, many of whom are very dear to the United States. But as a separate independent nation, they're free to make their own decisions, love us or hate us. But we shouldn't have to pay people to hate us when they're willing to do it for free.

Russia, hard to believe, but we gave them $81 million in foreign aid in 2008, and they voted against us 82.9 percent of the time in '08. Did a little better, 66.7 percent of the time they were against our position in '09.

South Africa, $574 million in '08 we gave, only in foreign aid, not counting other types of aid. They voted against us, our positions, 84.5 percent of the time in 2008, and against our position 66.7 percent of the time in 2009.

Sudan, gave them $337 million in 2008, they voted against us to show their gratitude 91.9 percent of the time in 2008, and a clear 90 percent of the time in 2009.

You've got Uganda. We gave them $350 million, simply in foreign aid, not counting all the other types of assistance in 2008. They showed their gratitude by voting against our position 82.3 percent of the time in '08; 62.5 percent in '09.

Venezuela. I bet most people didn't know we were giving Venezuela foreign aid, but we did. This majority voted to give them around $10 million in 2008. Regardless who is in the White House, the Congress is the one that votes appropriations. Venezuela got basically $10 million, simply in foreign aid, and of course they showed their love and affection for the United States by voting against us in opposition, 86.1 percent of the time in '08 and 81.8 percent of the time in '09.

You've got Vietnam. Vietnam, we've gotten so friendly with, they got over $100 million of U.S. taxpayer money. Actually, I'm sure it's borrowed money from China that our grandchildren will pay the interest on, and pay the principal as well, unless they have to declare bankruptcy as a nation because of our gluttony. But Vietnam, we gave away over $100 million to them, and their gratitude was expressed by voting against the things we believe in 94.5 percent of the time in '08, and 75 percent of the time in '09.

□ 1920

Yemen. Yemen. Now, this was just giveaway money here. It's $16 million, $17 million just as foreign aid to Yemen in 2008. Showed their appreciation by voting against our position 92.8 percent of the time in 2008, 71.4 percent in 2009.

But Yemen, not only did they get millions and millions of dollars simply in foreign aid from the United States, New England gave them a real boon. New England, just found out in the last few weeks, this year New England gave them a contract to provide liquid natural gas for the next 20 years to Yemen.

Now, in order for Yemen to get that contract we had to snub our nose at countries who have been very supportive and have been friends, including some in the Caribbean. We snubbed our nose at our friends, and New England gives what will result in incredible amounts of money to Yemen for liquid natural gas.

At the same time, we were having hearings, been having hearings in the Natural Resources Committee to try to hamper hydraulic fracking. By the use of hydraulic fracking, we have been able to secure over 100 years' reserves of natural gas that we could be using, our own natural gas. DAN BOREN across the aisle has a wonderful bill that would encourage making cars that run on natural gas more widespread, more easy to get, and trying to move some of our country over to natural gas vehicles because we have so much of it. Of course if we eliminate hydraulic fracking, which by the way has never been shown to have polluted drinking water—we have had hearings on that—there is no need for the Federal Government to get in and try to oppose hydraulic fracking. Many States that have it regulate it themselves, and they have done a good job in controlling that, and will continue for the future.

As one of the Members of Congress from Louisiana said today, if you were to eliminate hydraulic fracking, you would do more damage to Louisiana and its economy and people's livelihoods than this environmental disaster will do. Yet Yemen got this massive contract to provide liquefied natural gas to New England.

That means big, huge ships carrying massive amounts of liquefied natural gas. In other words, a rather large bomb will be floating in routinely to Boston Harbor. And I found a quote from the Coast Guard where they indicate, gee, one of their biggest concerns, since Yemen has proved to be home of so many terrorists that want to destroy our way of life, one of their biggest jobs is going to try to make sure there is not one stowaway somewhere on that Yemen tanker that may set the thing off and wipe out much of Boston in the process. I wonder if the people of Boston knew that that was going on, that not only were we giving away so many millions to Yemen—of course, some may remember that just recently people were allowed to leave Guantanamo Bay, went to Yemen, and Yemen of course ended up seeing them take off and we don't know where they are anymore. Heck, they may be back here coming across our Mexican border, since we haven't secured that.

So, going back to my bill, 4636, I am going to keep bringing it up, and we will have a discharge petition and give people on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to sign that and bring that to the floor for a vote. That will end up cutting off foreign aid to countries that so strongly oppose the things that we hold dear, the things for which we have sacrificed, in John Adams' words, toil and blood and treasure to secure. And yet we just keep giving money to those who are opposing us in almost every turn.

They are sovereign nations. We shouldn't get into nation building. They are big folks. They can make their own decisions. But if they want to oppose us at every turn, they can't expect us to continue to pay them to oppose us at every turn. Are so it just is hard to believe that that's something we are still dealing with, but it is.

And I have to mention this. Regarding the gulf oil spill and this legislative markup, as it's called; it's of course voting a bill out of committee. It's the emergency response to the gulf oil bill that includes $900 million a year for the next 30, 40 years simply to buy more land. Think about the James Bond title ''The World Is Not Enough.'' Well, owning most of the West doesn't seem to be enough.

My friend ROB BISHOP from Utah indicated how about a friendly amendment to just say the Federal Government will only buy land in States in which the Federal Government does not already own up to 20 percent of the State? But my friends across the aisle from those States in the East that love continuing to purchase land in the West, forcing schools to lay off teachers, shut down schools, inability to provide tax revenue—they love that because they're not going to have land bought in their States. The friendly amendment that Mr. BISHOP offered, since the Federal Government already owns 70 percent of his State, was not accepted. So the intent appears clear: They want to keep buying more land in the West. They don't want it purchased up in the East for the most part.

So in addition to that, during the hearings regarding the gulf crisis, when I was questioning Director Birnbaum, brought out the facts that we learned that there was only one entity, one group within MMS, Minerals Management Service, that was allowed to unionize, and that was the offshore inspectors. The offshore inspectors, the people that stand between disaster and our beloved homeland. And they are unionized.

So I offered a simple amendment today, because those offshore inspectors that go out to make sure things are done properly to protect us from disaster on our homeland, they are like people in the Army. You know, I never went into warfare. I was commissioned based on an Army scholarship I had at Texas A&M. I had an Army scholarship there. I owed the Army 4 years, but I wasn't commissioned until a year after Vietnam. When I took the scholarship, I anticipated I would end up in Vietnam, but the war ended.

And we were taught, though, in training—and I had been a sentry before, put out on a perimeter to sit guard during the night. And I was out there to stand guard to make sure nothing happened to my friends who were getting some sleep at night. I was their protection. So I wasn't about to fall asleep when as dark as it was out on perimeter because I had to warn them if someone was coming in. And sure, you know, it was drills, it was practice if some want to call it that. But during drills you take it very seriously. But I came to appreciate the role of someone who is a forward observer, someone who is a sentry, someone who is out there on the perimeter sitting, standing guard to make sure that they are protected back in the main group.

Well, that's the way the role of an offshore inspector struck me. They are out there protecting us. Can you imagine someone on guard duty out protecting your perimeter calling in and saying, guess what, I am going on strike?

□ 1930

I don't like my contract. I'm going on strike. So you're no longer protected out here. Things could go completely awry. I'm not inspecting. I'm on strike. That should not be allowed to happen in the military. It shouldn't be allowed to happen on offshore rigs.

So I had a simple amendment that said offshore inspectors are not allowed to strike or threaten to strike from doing their jobs. Votes were rolled. So we will have a recorded vote on that in the morning and we'll find out how serious people on both sides of the aisle are about protecting our homeland, or are they going to have to kowtow and cater to unions as we've seen on so many votes. This, we're talking about our homeland. We're talking about prevention of environmental disaster.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that people will let their Members of Congress know that are on the Natural Resources Committee, Don't vote for the unions; vote for the homeland. Don't vote to allow our soldiers, our offshore inspectors out there on our shore, on our offshore rigs, to go on strike because, wow, what leverage.

It would be like an air traffic controller saying, All of those planes are in the air, and I don't care if they land or crash. We're walking away. They're on their own. You can't let them do that.

You have to provide for our country's security. You can't let people in the position with the leverage over lives and livelihoods to walk away on strike at the worst possible time. So we'll find out tomorrow who's voting for our Nation's homeland, our homeland, all we love and hold dear—the environment, the animals, the plants that can't do anything about the oil coming ashore. We'll see whether the vote will be for the unions so that offshore inspectors can continue to have the threat to strike if they so feel like it or not. That's tomorrow.

One other thing I want to get to, because I know our President said this year that we're not a Christian nation, and I want to debate that because I don't know if we are or not anymore. But I know how we got started, and it's easy to see in the writings, the things that were said, the proclamations. It's easy to see.

For example, George Washington, May 2, 1778, gave this order to his troops, May 2, 1778, to the troops at Valley Forge. Here it is, and I'm quoting from George Washington's order. ''The Commander-in-Chief directs that Divine service be performed every Sunday at 11 o'clock, in each Brigade which has a Chaplain. Those Brigades which have none will attend the places of worship nearest to them. It is expected that officers of all ranks will, by their attendance, set an example for their men. While we are zealously performing the duties of good citizens and soldiers, we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of Patriot, it should be our highest glory to laud the more distinguished Character of,'' and this is Washington's words, ''Christian.''

That was his order to the Continental Army, May 2, 1778. Again, I won't debate whether or not we're a Christian nation now. But it is important that people in this body know, and people across America know, that we, at one time were—the Judiciary Committee of the Senate made that proclamation at one time in one of their votes. They said point blank, We are a Christian nation. That was in the 1800s.

Abraham Lincoln, July 7, 1864, said this in his proclamation. Abraham Lincoln said, ''I do hereby further invite and request the heads of the Executive Departments of this Government, together with all legislatures, all judges and magistrates, and all other persons exercising authority in the land, whether civil, military, or naval, and all soldiers, seamen, and marines in the national service, and all of the other law-abiding people of the United States, to assemble in their preferred places of public worship on that day, and there and then to render to the Almighty and merciful Ruler of the Universe such homages and such confessions to offer to Him such supplications, as the Congress of the United States have in their aforesaid resolution so solemnly, so earnestly, and so reverently recommended.'' That was for the day July 7, 1864.

September 5 of 1864, Abraham Lincoln addressed a committee, and according to the historic document of Colored People from Baltimore—that's according to the historic document. Now, that would be African Americans, I'm sure, but back in 1864, apparently Lincoln didn't know better. So acknowledging a gift of a Bible from those wonderful people, he said, this is Lincoln's words, ''In regard to this Great Book, I have but to say, I believe the Bible is the best gift God has given to man. All the good Saviour,'' that's Lincoln's words, ''All the good Saviour gave to the world was communicated through this Book. But for this Book we could not know right from wrong. All things most desirable for man's welfare, here and hereafter, are to be found portrayed in it.'' In the Bible. How about that. Those are Lincoln's words.

You'll look at his second inaugural address. Interestingly enough, he said these words. These are carved in the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial. In the middle of his second inaugural address, he's talking about both the North and the South. He said, ''Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been fully answered. The Almighty has His own purposes.'' Then he quotes the Bible, ''Woe unto the world because of offenses.''

''Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bondsman 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'the judgements of the Lord, are true and righteous.' '' Those were Lincoln's words in the second inaugural address.

So I won't debate whether or not we're a Christian nation. But that's how we got our start. Despite the efforts of those even in the early 1800s up to the present day who disregard the facts, they disregard so many of our Founders' own words. Call Benjamin Franklin a deist, even though at 80 years of age at the Constitutional Convention he's the one that says, ''I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writing, that unless the Lord build the House, they labour in vain that build it.''

□ 1940

He went on to urge those other members at the Constitutional Convention—his words, not mine—he said, ''Firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the Builders of Babel.'' So much for him being a deist.

Regardless of where we are now, this Nation started as a Christian Nation. All of the indications from the official sources, from our Presidents, indicated as much. So, regardless of where we are now, that's where we started. We need to get history right if we're going to have a future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for July 13 and the balance of the week on account of the effect of Hurricane Alex on his district.

Mr. OLSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 13 and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRIGHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 21.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 21.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, July 19 and 20.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 15, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111–139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.J. Res. 83, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.J. RES. 83, A JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003, AS AMENDED

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	3014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	2	0	0	0	−153	153	0	−3	−7	0	−151	−8

Sources: Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8303. A letter from the Acting, Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Value-Added Producer Grant Program (RIN: 0570-AA79) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8304. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0737; FRL-8830-4] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8305. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2009. The report separately identifies the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 827 (110 Stat. 2611); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8306. A letter from the Secretary, Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting RAND Report, ''Retaining F-22A Tooling: Options and Costs''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8307. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1121] received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8308. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-000; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1090] received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8309. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Level Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8310. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8311. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico and Canada pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8312. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8313. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—-Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program--Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers (RERCs). Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Numbers: 84.133E-1 and 84.133E received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8314. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve covering calendar year 2008, in accordance with section 165 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-2009-0567; FRL-9162-7] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Final Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Carbon Monoxide and Volatile Organic Compounds [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-OH-0003; FRL-9159-3] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Arkansas: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-RCRA-2009-0708; FRL-9161-9] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment for PM10 for the Sandpoint PM10 Nonattainment Area, Idaho [Docket: EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0294; TRI-9165-2] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8319. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Massachusetts: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2010-0468; FRL-9165-8] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2008-0920; FRL-8824-6] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8321. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8322. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-066, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8323. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8324. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''Fiscal year 2009 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions'', pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8325. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, National Science Foundation, transmitting report on the Foundation's use of the category rating method of evaluating external applicants for Federal positions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3319; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8326. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8327. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8328. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8329. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2009 Accounting of Drug Control Funds''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8330. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 2009, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8331. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts — III''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8332. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Magnolia, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1179; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-35] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8333. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class C Airspace; Beale Air Force Base, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0367; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWA-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8334. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Panama City, Tyndall AFB, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0249; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-22] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8335. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Quitman, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0053; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-12] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8336. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hoquiam, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1063; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-22] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8337. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; West Yellowstone, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1101; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-24] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8338. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Grandfathered Health Plans under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [TD 9489] received June 18, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8339. A letter from the Deputy Associate Commissioner, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Social Security Administration Implementation of OMB Guidance for Drug-Free Workplace Requirements [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0054] (RIN: 0960-AH14) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8340. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's ''June 2010 Report to the Congress: Aligning Incentives in Medicare''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5381. A bill to require motor vehicle safety standards relating to vehicle electronics and to reauthorize and provide greater transparency, accountability, and safety authority to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; with an amendment (Rept. 111–536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1517. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5114) to extend the authorization for the national flood insurance program, to identify priorities essential to reform and ongoing stable functioning of the program, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–537). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado:

H.R. 5730. A bill to rescind earmarks for certain surface transportation projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 5731. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual reviews of mental health professionals treating veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KILROY (for herself, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5732. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit coverage of certain covered part D drugs for uses that are determined to be for medically accepted indications based upon clinical evidence in peer reviewed medical literature; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5733. A bill to permit health care providers to disclose certain protected health information to law enforcement officials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 5734. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to extend and improve the Dealer Floor Plan Pilot Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 5735. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a competitive leasing program for wind and solar energy development on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5736. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the owner or lawful possessor of a firearm to report its theft or loss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5737. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the age of eligibility of dependent children for receipt of transferred educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 5738. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to carry out a pilot program to reduce the amount of processed food served each day under the school breakfast program or school lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 5739. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the American Military Retirees Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 5740. A bill to provide for the mandatory recall of adulterated or misbranded drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H. Res. 1515. A resolution calling on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to uphold and respect basic human rights by releasing three women democracy activists, writer Tran Khai Thanh Thuy, attorney Le Thi Cong Nhan, and cyber-activist Pham Thanh Nghien; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. McKEON):

H. Res. 1516. A resolution recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the service members who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the service members who are currently serving in combat operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 1518. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the inaugural Nelson Mandela International Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 1519. A resolution congratulating the crew of the Ocean Watch for their remarkable voyage around North and South America and recognizing the importance of ocean and coastal conservation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

332. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 287 memorializing the Congress to designate the Honor and Remember Flag as a national emblem of service and sacrifice by the members of the Armed Forces who had given their lives in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

333. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 151 memorializing the Congress to reauthorize funding for the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

334. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 205 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for veterans who served on the waterways, territorial waterways and airspace of the Rebublic of Vietnam and in Thailand, Laos and Cambodia by passing the Agent Orange Equity Act of 2009; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 197: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 208: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 211: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 301: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 333: Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 336: Mr. COHEN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 365: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 536: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 564: Ms. McCOLLUM.
H.R. 571: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 614: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 672: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 678: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 881: Mr. HERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 988: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WU, and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1021: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1036: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1066: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1136: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1193: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 1236: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1240: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1294: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 1326: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 1371: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1410: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1458: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1569: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1792: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1864: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1923: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 2024: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2067: Mr. SALAZAR and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2103: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2156: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2328: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2378: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2406: Mr. MICA and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 2443: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 2598: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 2625: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2648: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2685: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 2828: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2839: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2853: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 3408: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3421: Mr. INSLEE and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3424: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3464: Mr. NUNES, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 3486: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 3578: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3680: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 3718: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 3720: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 3729: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3758: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3786: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3974: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4038: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4106: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4190: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4195: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4278: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 4311: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 4386: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4427: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 4525: Mr. BONNER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 4529: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4530: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4544: Mr. NADLER of New York and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 4557: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4594: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4599: Ms. BEAN and Mr. McGOVERN.
H.R. 4645: Mr. POLIS and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4690: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4695: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 4733: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. McGOVERN.
H.R. 4746: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. HELLER.
H.R. 4764: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4772: Mr. CHILDERS and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4788: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 4923: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4933: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4947: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4958: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4972: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4986: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4993: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. WU.
H.R. 5016: Mr. MICA and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 5028: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5029: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 5034: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 5040: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 5044: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 5058: Mr. McCAUL.
H.R. 5081: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 5143: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5162: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5226: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 5234: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5240: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 5243: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 5258: Mr. DJOU and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5266: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5300: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5309: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 5359: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5369: Mr. PETERS and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 5389: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5428: Mr. JONES and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 5434: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5440: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 5441: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5458: Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 5460: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 5471: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5476: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 5487: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5495: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 5504: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 5529: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 5538: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5540: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5541: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5542: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5555: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5565: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 5566: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 5585: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 5605: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5606: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5625: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 5644: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5652: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5662: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5663: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 5664: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 5679: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 5680: Mr. AKIN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CAO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NYE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 5685: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5689: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 5692: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5711: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SABLAN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. WU, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DJOU, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HARPER.

H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. CALVERT and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 173: Mrs. SCHMIDT and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 611: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 913: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 1052: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 1207: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Res. 1226: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 1285: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 1308: Mr. DJOU and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 1375: Mr. POLIS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 1390: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 1420: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Res. 1431: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 1433: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BACA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Res. 1442: Mr. COBLE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 1472: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 1476: Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BACA, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 1483: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 1494: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. KILROY.

H. Res. 1504: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 1513: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. BEAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HILL, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. LEVIN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5621: Mr. PAUL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

159. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 251 of 2010 requesting that the United States Senate pass S. 2747, the Land and Water Conservation Authorization and Funding Act of 2009; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

160. Also, a petition of Council, District of Columbia, relative to Council Resolution 18-485, the ''Sense of the Council in Support of Uniting American Families Act Resolution of 2010''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.