



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2010

No. 125

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: All powerful Lord, You fulfill Your promises day by day and lead Your people to greatness. You are the One who asks each of us to live a life worthy of our calling.

By embracing the responsibilities of our station in life, each of us is to perform our duties with humility, meekness, and patience. By bearing with one another with understanding, we are to make every effort to preserve the unity we have been given by Your Divine Providence and seek peace at every turn of events.

Your presence, Lord, has guided us from the beginning, is with us now, and will be fully revealed in the end.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. OLSON 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.

□ 1010

PASS THE SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, during my recent high-tech manufacturing tour, I saw firsthand the success of some of New Mexico's homegrown companies. While creating jobs, local small businesses like Senspex, Applied Technology Associates, and Aspen Avionics are also providing the innovation to meet our Nation's twenty-first century challenges.

Even through the recent economic downturn, this local high-tech sector has remained strong, and even grown by hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue. Yet many small businesses cannot access the credit that they need to expand and hire more workers. This is why the Congress must pass the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act. This legislation will boost small business lending through community banks and provide tax relief, and it will do it without adding a penny to the deficit.

I am doing all I can to support small businesses, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act.

TAX HIKES

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to struggle, the President's former budget director, Peter Orszag, stated that, and I quote, "Higher taxes now would crimp consumer spending, further depressing the already inadequate demand for what firms are capable of producing at full tilt." In non-Washington, D.C., language, that translates to the more

money the government takes from the American people, the less they have to spend and to help rebuild our economy. My Republican colleagues and I have been saying this for nearly 2 years.

Now, over 30 of my Democrat colleagues have joined us in supporting an extension of all the tax cuts across the board. They get it. It makes no sense, no sense to raise taxes, especially at this time when businesses and individuals are trying to invest what little they have to make a better future and get our economy going.

Mr. Speaker, end the uncertainty and let the American people keep their money. I urge House leadership to extend the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts.

THE BIG NEED OF SMALL BUSINESS

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is widely understood that one of the biggest problems facing our economy now is the fact that small businesses cannot get loans. And small business owners tell me every week from across my district they are not hiring because they cannot get loans and expand.

In fact, a recent report from the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, found that the number of small business loans peaked in the second quarter of 2008 at 27 million loans. But since then the number of loans have fallen by 18 percent.

The bill before the U.S. Senate today that passed the House will address that by expanding access to needed credit for small businesses, providing tax relief, and encouraging private investments. Our economic recovery depends on small businesses, and credit-worthy small businesses need loans. This bill is not a cure-all or a silver bullet, but it is without question an important step towards restoring and restarting the great American engine of growth.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6765

CONSTITUTION DAY

(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, tomorrow, September 17, is Constitution Day, a commemoration of the ratification of the U.S. Constitution on September 17, 1787. The role of the Federal Government, first debated by our Founding Fathers at the beginning of our new Nation, is still a topic of conversation over 200 years later.

Recently, we have seen an explosive expansion of the Federal Government, with a government takeover of health care, national interference in our schools, and government control of our auto industry. Power is being shifted from the people and the States to the Federal Government.

The Founders anticipated this dangerous growth of big government, so they drafted the 10th Amendment to the Constitution to ensure the Federal Government would only use powers granted specifically to them. As we take a moment today to remember the ratification, I hope we all remember that personal responsibility and less government intervention is a better way to promote liberty.

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

HONORING DR. MARIO OBLEDO

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

Ms. CHU. I rise today to honor a great voice for our Nation's disenfranchised, a man who passed away recently, Dr. Mario Obledo. Hailed as the Godfather of the Latino Movement, he dedicated his life to serving America's minority communities.

As president of the League of United Latin American Citizens and founder of the National Coalition of Hispanic Organizations, the Hispanic National Bar Association, and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Dr. Obledo fought tirelessly for civil rights and justice.

Governments both here and abroad honored his accomplishments. Dr. Obledo received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the country's highest civilian honor, and the OHTLI award, the highest tribute given by Mexico to foreigners. He was an inspiration to many.

I urge my House colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Mario Obledo and his exceptional impact upon our country. He will be missed.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution starts out, "We, the peo-

ple." It's written in really large print right at the beginning of the document. The Constitution is a rock. It's the foundation. It is not some abstract concept that changes depending on the social philosophy of the elites and tyrants of the Judiciary.

The Constitution says the things it says in plain, simple language. The Constitution is an agreement between the people and the government. It sets limits on what the government can do, not the other way around. The Constitution upholds the principle that people have God-given rights. Government has no rights. Government has power. And the more power it grabs the less rights we have.

Thomas Jefferson warned, "the natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." A government big and powerful enough to control our lives is big and powerful enough to take away everything we have. And that's un-American. After all, the Constitution says, "We, the people," not "We, the subjects."

And that's just the way it is.

HISTORY IS INSTRUCTIVE

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, history is instructive on almost every issue we face in this body. Today's issue is whether we should take action so that the wealthiest Americans don't have to pay an income tax rate of 39.6 percent.

So let's look back at when they were taxed at that rate during the Clinton administration. Well, what happened was exactly the opposite of what the Republican Party predicted would happen. In fact, people at that rate brought home more after-tax income than at any time in American history. Twenty-two million new jobs were created, and we had record budget surpluses. And in fact, at the end of this month we were projected to have paid off all of the debt, relieving our children and grandchildren of any of the debt that we would have otherwise burdened them with. Alan Greenspan was worried we didn't have enough debt floating out there.

But instead, when President Bush was elected, one of the very first things he did was to try to finance two wars with two deep tax cuts, none of it paid for and now we have \$12 trillion of debt. Let's look at history and learn for it.

□ 1020

HONORING MAJOR EDWARD J. HUDAK, JR., CORAL GABLES POLICE DEPARTMENT, AT THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize and honor Major Edward J. Hudak, Jr., of the Coral Gables Police Department, located in my congressional district.

Major Hudak graduates tomorrow from the FBI National Academy at Quantico. He was chosen by his chief to attend and by his class of 272 elite police executives to represent them after the 3-month training in terrorism protection and domestic crime investigation. Ed says it is quite an honor to be at the finest executive leadership course in the world.

There have only been 44,000 of these top graduates since July 29, 1935, when J. Edgar Hoover created the FBI Police Training Academy. So congratulations to Major Ed Hudak, to his wife, Alina Tejada Hudak, and their lovely daughters, Kristina, 13, and Jennifer, 12 years of age.

Congratulations to the entire family.

SEBELIUS BULLYING

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Health and Human Services Sebelius seemed shocked to find that placing new mandates on health insurers leads to increased costs.

After press reports last week indicated that insurers are raising premiums because of ObamaCare, the Secretary wrote a letter to the health insurance association which is nothing more than bullying. The Secretary called the measures onto the carpet, insisting that there would be "zero tolerance for misinformation and unjustified rate increases."

Why are these rate increases unjustified? Because government bureaucrats thought that all the new rules and mandates would only lead to increases of 1 or 2 percent. Now insurers functioning in the real world are increasing premiums by up to 9 percent.

Bullying and threats aren't going to make ObamaCare work. This unprecedented expansion of government power is only making health care more expensive.

The solution is to repeal this law and replace it with real market-based reforms that take power away from unelected government bureaucrats.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4785, RURAL ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1620 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1620

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. 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.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman 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 have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1620.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, (Mr. LANGEVIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1620 provides for consideration of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce. The rule makes in order as original text an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, and the rule also makes in order four amendments printed in part B of the Rules report and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that too many American families are unemployed. Too many American families are having trouble paying their energy bills. Too many of our manufacturing jobs have gone overseas to China and to other countries.

Now, the Democratic Congress has brought bill after bill after bill after bill to the floor to help American families weather these tough economic times and make long-term investments in a clean economy so that the United States maintains its status in the world as a leader in innovation.

And every time, and every time we bring a bill to the floor, my friends on the other side of the aisle have overwhelmingly voted “no.” They have become the party of no, no to everything. Unfortunately, based on some of the statements by some of my Rules Committee colleagues last night in the Rules Committee, I think that that will be their strategy today on this Rural Star bill.

This is a good, cost-effective bill. Rural Star will create high-skilled, high-wage manufacturing and construction jobs while delivering energy savings to millions of Americans by providing access to capital and energy-efficient technologies.

In fact, the National Association of Home Builders endorsed this bill, saying that H.R. 4785 will “save energy for American families, create jobs, and reap environmental rewards.”

Let’s not forget that this bill will put people to work, keep good-paying manufacturing jobs here in the United States, and lower the utility bills of families and farms across the country. The truth is more than 92 percent of energy efficiency products are manufactured here in America.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The truth is that more than 92 percent of energy efficiency products are manufactured right here in the United States of America.

We are talking about insulation, windows, doors and water heaters. That’s why this is so important. A family or a business will not only hire someone to install these energy efficiency products, but these products will be made

in our backyard right here in our own country. Make it in America. That’s what Democrats want. That’s what we stand for.

There shouldn’t be one Member of this body who opposes putting Americans to work in this fashion. And not only will H.R. 4785 result in more Americans jobs; it will lower families’ and farms’ utility bills. This is particularly important in rural areas where customers are facing increasing costs for electric power. Rural electric co-ops are facing a growing demand for electric power at a time when they are constrained from building new generation capacity.

The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, supports this bill because of the positive impacts on rural electric co-ops, and he said so during testimony last night in the Rules Committee. I want to thank Mr. INGLIS for his support and for putting American jobs over partisanship today.

□ 1030

To my colleagues who argue that this bill will cost too much, I want to remind them that the programs in this bill involve loans, not grants. These loans must be repaid. CBO has analyzed the legislation and concluded that it does not score. The legislation is fully compliant with statutory PAYGO and House PAYGO rules.

Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will take a close look at the important provisions in the Rural Star bill that will put Americans to work and help transition us to a stable clean energy economy of tomorrow.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put partisanship aside and support this rule and the underlying bill.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
HOME BUILDERS,

Washington, DC, September 13, 2010.

Hon. LOUISE SLAUGHTER,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LOUISE: On behalf of the 175,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), I am writing to express our support for H.R. 4785—the Rural Energy Savings Program Act of 2010. We applaud your efforts to create jobs and deliver meaningful energy savings for consumers in rural communities by providing access to capital and efficiency technologies.

Without meaningful incentives to improve the energy efficiency of the 130 million existing homes and dwelling units that comprise our nation’s housing stock, true energy savings will never materialize from the building sector. NAHB believes that H.R. 4785 helps address this problem in rural America by providing low interest loans to consumers to install energy efficient technologies that will save energy for American families, create jobs, and reap environmental rewards.

NAHB further supports the provisions in the legislation that will establish demonstration programs that help implement measurement and verification approaches to energy audits and investments in energy performance improvements with measurable results. NAHB believes that tracking energy savings improvements in older, less-efficient homes is important to demonstrate the voluntary efforts already underway to reduce GHG emissions from the overall building sector.

In addition to NAHB's consistent support for other energy efficiency incentives in both new and existing homes, NAHB supports H.R. 4785 as a way to further improve the nation's housing stock and provide avenues for consumers in rural communities to invest in efficiency. NAHB appreciates your thoughtful legislation.

Sincerely,

JOE STANTON,

Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding time. But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

Even though we have all had the opportunity to meet with our constituents in our districts over the past 6 weeks, it's clear that the ruling Democratic elite still do not seem to get it. My constituents in North Carolina want the Federal Government to stop spending, but this bill authorizes an additional \$5 billion for two new government-funded energy efficiency loan programs.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called stimulus in 2009 included over 8 billion in taxpayer dollars that were supposedly meant for energy efficiency in homes. At the time, the ruling Democrats boasted that it authorized \$4.7 billion for the Department of Energy to issue grants for a home weatherization program. However, though it was touted as another shovel-ready program, the Department of Energy has used less than 10 percent of those funds in the program's first year; just over 30,000 homes were weatherized instead of the hundreds of thousands promised.

If the Department of Energy can't implement the \$4.7 billion program in the stimulus, why should we authorize another \$5 billion loan program? We have not seen any evidence of these programs working or being implemented correctly.

Mr. Speaker, apparently the \$8 billion in stimulus spending was not enough. The Democrats are now asking that we borrow another \$5 billion from foreign countries and our grandchildren. The fact is we cannot afford, nor do we need, these new government programs, especially at a time when we have an unprecedented deficit and return on this spending is questionable at best.

Furthermore, this bill was not vetted by both the committees to which it was referred. And it's remarkable that our colleagues continue to bring ideas that have been rejected back to the floor. The Rules Committee Democrats have issued the self-executing rule to arbitrarily force inclusion of the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan program into the bill even though 346 Members, including 178 Democrats, already voted against it this past May. They are using blunt force to push their agenda through, ignoring the will of the American people by increasing the pro-

gram's authorization level from its original \$324 million to a whopping \$42.5 billion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed that after having 6 weeks at home to listen to their constituents—not just Democrat constituents, not just Republican constituents, not just Independent or unaffiliated, but folks from all areas of political persuasion. Their constituents don't want them to spend more of their hard-earned money on frivolous government programs. Instead, they want us to cut spending, lower their taxes, and enable businesses to prosper so they can get back to work.

The goals of these two government programs, new programs, could be achieved by existing programs such as the Rural Economic Development Loan and Grant program, which controlled approximately \$33.77 million for loans in fiscal 2010. Why two new programs are being created to do something an existing program can already achieve is beyond me.

Finally, I object to this rule because it is, once again, a structured rule. The ruling Democrat elites have chosen to block at least nine amendments from being offered on the floor today and instead have arbitrarily chosen to allow only four, which are the only amendments they will permit us to debate.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, after promising the most open and honest Congress in history, Speaker PELOSI has gone back on her word and against the will of the American people. When will our colleagues across the aisle learn that this House belongs to the people, not to them?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentlewoman from North Carolina has a problem with American jobs, but 92 percent of the products that have been used in this weatherization process were made here in the United States of America. We are helping keep jobs and we are helping to create jobs. I'm sorry that the Party of No has a problem with that. But the Democratic Party believes that we need to make it in America and that we need to invest in American jobs, and not only keep American jobs, but add American jobs.

The gentlelady says that somehow the weatherization program in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act didn't work. Well, I disagree with her very strongly. In some States like North Carolina, weatherization got off to a slow start, but in other States like Massachusetts we were able to start quickly. This was a function of the State having weatherization programs ready to handle these new funds right away or if they had to be ramped up.

Today, over 30,000 homes each month are being weatherized across the country thanks to the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. In 2009, 1,100 more houses were weatherized in Massachusetts than in North Carolina. But in

April, May, and June of this year, 1,000 more houses were weatherized in North Carolina than in Massachusetts. Today, nearly the same number of houses have been weatherized both in North Carolina and in Massachusetts. So to say that this program isn't working and that it's a failure is clearly and utterly a mischaracterization.

I hope that my colleagues will look at the facts and not demagogue this issue simply for political gain. Those projects on weatherization, I will say to my colleague from North Carolina, in her State are helping to keep people in their jobs and helping to create more jobs. Why is that such a big problem to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle? Why do they have a problem with making things here in the United States of America and protecting American jobs? That is one of the best reasons to support this bill. In addition to saving utility costs for families and small businesses, it is about creating jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts permitting me to speak on this important bill.

I could not agree with him more. I did spend a month working in Oregon to deal with people who are concerned about the economy. I had a meeting just last Friday with over 200 people, including executives, presidents of two of our local electric utilities. I have met with electrical contractors. I have met with utility contractors and with unemployed union workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you not only is the initiative under the Recovery Act putting people to work in North Carolina and in Massachusetts; it's putting people to work in Oregon. But what is important here is building on that model to be able to extend it to more home builders, more contractors and other utilities. There is a potential here to employ 168,000 people over the course of the next 2 years.

Now, I come from a region that has invested heavily in energy efficiency. We have been able to save hundreds of millions of dollars of investment because we are getting more out of the energy we have now. The good news is the products that are energy efficient are largely made in America. And they are very labor intensive. These are installing new windows, installing weatherization, installing more efficient appliances, heating and cooling. This is saving money for years to come for families while it's putting families to work now.

An important part of this legislation is that it will empower electric cooperatives which provide energy to many in my State and across the country to help customers reduce energy use and cost.

□ 1040

This bill was amended to include the Home Star Energy Efficiency program, so it helps people in the 88 percent of the country that are not served by electrical co-ops. All Americans should have access to these low-cost home improvement loans to save energy and save money.

And it has a terrific mechanism of working with the utilities, public and private utilities, and allowing people to pay it back on a monthly basis through their energy bills, which are going to be reduced. For many people, it is not going to actually cost them anything over the course of the next 5 years and it will save them money for years and years to come, every month with that utility bill, while it puts people to work here in America now.

It is why homebuilders, contractors, and energy companies all combined to support this legislation. I am baffled that my friends on the other side of the aisle didn't hear from people at home like I heard from who want this opportunity to work in America, to save energy, and to put people back to work.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

What this bill does once again is bringing up what is sort of a mini-stimulus bill. We were told when the stimulus bill was passed, unemployment wouldn't go above 8 percent. It would create jobs. It would be the great boon for the country. We now have 9.6 percent unemployment. I am a member of an electric co-op. I know very well how electric co-ops work. If the electric co-ops wanted to do this, if it was such a great deal, they would do it. We don't need the Federal Government doing this because everything that our friends have promised has failed, failed, failed. They want to continue their failed programs.

I don't have a problem with American jobs, but what this creates is not American jobs. They want to create more government jobs, which they have done, and we will talk about that in a little bit.

Now I would like to recognize my colleague from Florida, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), who is going to talk about this immensely successful project that Republicans have started here called YouCut.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, this Congress has spent the American people's taxpayer dollars at a record pace. My friends on the other side of the aisle have dug our country into a \$13 trillion hole. As the old saying goes, when you're in a hole, stop digging. It is time to cut out-of-control spending and get our fiscal house in order, even if that means saying "no" time and time again. This is going to require real leadership, and we are going to have to make some tough decisions.

All of these decisions won't be tough, though, and today we face a no-brainer. Should we require the IRS to collect unpaid taxes from Federal employees? Absolutely. Should they lose their jobs if they don't? Of course.

This cut will reduce the deficit by \$1 billion. And while all Americans should of course pay their taxes, Federal employees who receive their paychecks directly from the American people have a special obligation to pay what they owe. It is time to listen to the American people. Through the YouCut program, our constituents have cast 1.7 million votes urging us to cut wasteful spending. Republicans have brought forward proposals to cut more than \$120 billion in waste from the budget. Unfortunately, the majority party has blocked all, all, of these efforts. I hope that changes today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. For the record, I want to point out to my colleagues that the manager's amendment addresses the issue of Federal employees who are delinquent on their taxes, and I quote from the manager's amendment that a loan shall not be provided to a Federal employee under this act if any of the following apply to the employee: One, that the employee has a seriously delinquent tax debt.

So, yes, everybody should pay their taxes. We all should be concerned about the debt and the deficit, but I find it a little bit astonishing that the party that took a surplus that Bill Clinton gave them and turned it into a record deficit is talking about the importance of reducing our deficit. Dick Cheney, I remember the Vice President of the United States, made the statement that deficits don't matter. I strongly disagree with him, but that was said as the Bush-Cheney administration was racking up historic debt. He said it doesn't make any difference. He was wrong. They drove this country into a ditch, and now they are complaining about the size of the tow truck to get us back on the road.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are not going to be fooled. I also find it a little bit astonishing that again, while my friends are talking about the importance of focusing on the deficit, that they have embraced a tax plan that will double the projected deficit by adding \$4 trillion to the deficit over the next 10 years. What they are trying to do is make sure that millionaires and above get at least \$100,000 in tax breaks. That is where their priorities are.

The purpose of this bill is to not only help families lower their utility costs. The purpose of this bill is to create American jobs. And it is to buy products that are made in the United States of America. Not buy them from China, not buy them from India, not buy them from some other country, but made here in the United States.

I'm sorry that my colleague from North Carolina doesn't believe that the jobs that were created in her district as a result of the weatherization invest-

ments in the Reinvestment and Recovery Act somehow don't matter. They do. People are working and they are supporting their families. And we need to do more of that. We need to invest in the American people and the American economy.

I should also point out so there is no mistake: This is not additional spending. What this is is a loan program. This is not adding one cent to our deficit. This is a loan program where people will pay the loans back. CBO says it doesn't score. It is totally compliant with PAYGO. So this notion that somehow we are adding more spending to the deficit is just plain wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. My colleagues across the aisle always want to talk about this wonderful surplus that President Clinton had. They always neglect to mention that Congress holds the purse strings and it was Republicans who were in charge of the Congress the last 6 years of Mr. Clinton's administration. They were in terrible shape the first 2 years. Republicans took over and we, Republicans, brought the economy to a surplus.

They also like to point out how bad it was when President Bush left office. They always neglect to say you were in charge, Mr. Speaker, and your party, when Mr. Bush left office. You drove the American economy into the ditch, not the Republicans.

Every bill that comes up here is to create jobs, but the American people understand, again, everything you've done has failed, from the stimulus, February a year ago, to now. You want to continue to spend money to create jobs. But government only creates government jobs, not jobs in the private sector. So I can't let my colleague get by with that.

I would like to point out that the item that our colleague from Massachusetts pointed out is such a narrow piece. We want to really do something about Federal employees paying their taxes, not just those who might apply for a loan under this program.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have so many good Federal workers who wake up every morning and do good jobs. They go to work. They are working hard to make this country great, and we applaud them for that effort. Unfortunately, there is a small percentage of people who are not doing what they are supposed to be doing. It happens to be that nearly 100,000 Federal workers are not paying about a billion dollars a year in taxes.

The proposal that we will be able to vote on today will allow us to mandate and make sure that Federal workers who fall into this category of serious delinquent tax debt are fired if they don't pay their taxes.

□ 1050

The principle is simple: If you're on the Federal payroll, you should be paying your Federal taxes. Now, there is a provision in there that says if you're on a pathway to actually making whole and you're having your wages garnished and you're trying to get whole, then fine. We're obviously not going to fire you. Yet, according to the data from the IRS, the numbers are quite staggering—100,000 people. If you're taking those taxpayer dollars, you should be paying your taxes.

Interestingly enough, on January 20 of this year, President Obama gave a speech. He was talking about Federal contractors. I want you to listen to the words of the President, who I happen to agree with in this case; but I also want you to think, when they say "Federal contractor," they should also say "Federal worker."

In quoting President Obama: "It is simply wrong for companies to take taxpayer dollars and not be taxpayers themselves. We need to insist on the same sense of responsibility in Washington that so many of you strive to uphold in your own lives, in your own families, and in your own businesses."

He went on to say: "All across the country, there are people who meet their obligations each and every day. You do your jobs. You support your families. You pay the taxes you owe because it's a fundamental responsibility of citizenship; and yet, somehow, it has become standard practice in Washington to give contracts to companies that don't pay their taxes."

The President is right. Everywhere that it says "Federal contractors," it should also say "Federal employees." This is simple. This should be bipartisan. Everybody should unite behind this because, unfortunately, there are too many people who are on the payrolls who are taking taxpayer dollars but who are not paying their fair share. They have good-quality, high-paying jobs. Please support this measure as it comes up today, and let's do the right thing.

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

Just a couple of things. I will remind the gentlewoman from North Carolina that what dug us into this ditch were tax cuts for the rich that weren't paid for, two wars that weren't paid for and a Medicare prescription drug bill that was like five times the cost we were told it was, and it wasn't paid for. So let's get the record straight on that.

I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the Republican Party just takes my breath away when they get up here and talk about the responsibility that individuals have to pay their taxes. Where were they when we tried to crack down on companies that have opened up P.O. boxes in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands to avoid paying U.S. taxes, and yet they operate here in the United States and get U.S. Government money? Where were they? You know, the Republicans voted 170-1

to protect tax breaks for companies shipping American jobs overseas, and 95 percent of those Republicans have signed a pledge to protect these tax rates. That's where they are. They want to protect these big corporations that escape paying U.S. taxes, but they want to go after somebody who is working in NIH as a researcher, who is trying to find a cure for cancer. Let's focus on those people. That's what they say.

Look, the point of this legislation here is jobs. It's about saving families and farms and small businesses their utility costs, and it's about creating American jobs. It's about buying things here in the United States of America.

Why is that so objectionable to the Republicans? Why are they fighting this bill that will invest in our economy, that will invest in American jobs, that will help protect American jobs, and that will be great for American jobs? Why is this so controversial? You know, why do they insist that we need to have an economy in which we buy everything from China?

What Democrats are trying to do is to steer this economy toward making it here in America, toward making these products in America and investing in American jobs. That's what this is all about.

So rather than protecting tax breaks for corporations that escape paying U.S. taxes and that get incentives to move jobs overseas, how about standing up for the American worker? How about standing up for this concept of making it in America and for creating and expanding jobs here in the United States?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a couple of things to my colleague from Massachusetts.

What is sending jobs overseas are things like the government takeover of health care in this country, which is creating such uncertainty and which is driving up the cost of health care for everyone, as well as the rules and regulations established by the EPA and the programs that many of our colleagues across the aisle love so much. They constantly talk about tax cuts for the rich. Well, every American got a tax cut when the tax cuts went into effect. The tax rate for the lowest-income Americans went down from 15 percent to 10 percent. Now they are proposing to allow that to go back up on January 1 and to create the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

It sounds to me like my colleague across the aisle is defending Federal employees from not paying their taxes. I find that really difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, rhetorically it was asked, Where was I? Where was I?

Look, I'm just a freshman here. I didn't create this mess, but I am here

to help clean it up. I actually stand with some Democrats and the President in supporting the idea and the notion that, if you're a Federal contractor and if you don't pay your taxes, you should be dismissed as a contractor. In fact, you shouldn't get a contract. Let's have the guts to have that same standard for Federal employees. That's where the hypocrisy comes in. The President was very clear. I read his comments about taking care of Federal contractors. The same standard should apply to the Federal employees. To suggest that, well, we'll go ahead and grant them some special exemption, absolutely not. I think we need to hold them to a higher standard, do the same for contractors and do the same for the Federal employees. That's the right thing to do. Like I said, I didn't create this mess, but we are here to help clean it up.

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

I would say to the gentleman and to my friends on the other side of the aisle that they've all been long enough here to add to the mess, and cleaning up the mess means supporting bills like this that will create American jobs, that will protect American jobs. This is an important bill.

Again, for the life of me, I don't understand why there is controversy over a bill to invest in America, to invest in our workers, to help lower utility costs for small businesses, for individuals, for family farms. This is not adding to our deficit one penny. This is a loan program to help people weatherize, you know, their homes, and that's whether it's a mobile home, a farm or a small business. You know, over 90 percent of what is needed to do that is made in America.

Why is that a problem? Why do you have a problem with investing in programs that create American jobs? I mean, that's what this is about.

You know, again, the Republicans voted 170-1 to protect tax breaks for companies shipping American jobs overseas, and 95 percent of House Republicans have signed a pledge to protect these tax breaks. Enough of that. It is time to invest in American workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the reason Republicans vote against these programs is because we pay attention to what happens. Government programs don't work. It's real simple. Our colleagues across the aisle simply haven't learned that.

Again, we go back to the stimulus. We were promised unemployment would not go up past 8 percent. It is almost 10 percent. Our economy is in the ditch. We are in terrible, terrible shape in this country, all because of the spending by our colleagues across the aisle and because of the belief that the government is our savior. It is not our savior.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the motion on ordering the previous question.

I do so because, this summer, while Members were back home in their districts, they heard the growing frustration of the American people firsthand. Hardworking Americans can see that our Nation is at a crossroads. We have a \$13 trillion national debt. That works out to be \$42,000 for every man, woman and child in America.

Yet what is the Democratic majority doing today? They are bringing a bill to the floor to spend another \$5 billion that we don't have to continue their failed stimulus policies. All the while, the American people are saying that the rampant Federal spending in Washington has to stop. The people are speaking out through the YouCut program with over 1.7 million votes. The YouCut movement continues to encourage people of all stripes to go online and to take an active role in determining how their government spends taxpayer dollars.

□ 1100

YouCut voters have helped Republicans bring to the floor more than \$120 billion in spending cuts, only to be blocked every time by the Speaker and the Democratic majority. This week's winning proposal under the YouCut program is an idea put forward by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) to require the collection of unpaid taxes from Federal employees. While all Americans have an obligation to pay the taxes they owe, Federal employees can be seen as especially obliged to pay their share of the taxes because they draw their compensation from American taxpayers.

Addressing our staggering national debt is not a partisan calling, Mr. Speaker; it is a national imperative. And I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to bring this week's YouCut proposal to the House floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that what we are debating here is a bill that costs nothing, that adds nothing to our deficit, that will invest in American jobs, that will invest in American products, versus the Republican plan to add \$4 trillion to our deficit. That's what this is about here.

I hear frustration from people back home all the time. What they want is they want a manufacturing strategy. They want a strategy to help expand and create more American jobs, and they want us to close tax loopholes that encourage outsourcing U.S. jobs overseas. They want us to provide hometown tax credits to help small businesses hire new employees and sell their products and innovation overseas.

They want to boost incentives to create American clean energy jobs like making state-of-the-art wind turbines and solar panels, paid for by ending corporate welfare to Big Oil. They

want to strengthen rules that the U.S. and its contractors buy products made here in America, especially to build transportation and energy and communication infrastructure. They are tired of us shipping those jobs overseas and importing everything. They want to make it here in America.

They want us to force China and other countries to honor fair trade principles or lose American business. There ought to be a consequence if a country like China abrogates its obligations to a treaty or to a trade bill.

We need to give incentives to hire and retain America's returning veterans for new clean energy jobs, and we need to strengthen partnerships with businesses to retain America's workers for jobs in the future. That's what the American people want. The frustration is: Why are we importing everything from overseas? Why are you giving tax breaks to corporations that move their operations overseas or hire overseas when we have an unemployment problem here in the United States? What the American people are frustrated about is that we are losing American jobs that really, quite frankly, should be made here in America.

So I hear the frustration, but I would say the answer is not adding \$4 trillion to our deficit like they want to do. The answer is in supporting programs like this that don't add a cent to our deficit but will create American jobs.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now 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. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague from Worcester talk about the unemployment rate, talk about the economic challenges that we're facing, and I can tell you we all are well aware of it. Part of the area I represent in southern California has a 14 percent unemployment rate. Statewide in California, we have nearly a 12.5 percent unemployment rate. People are hurting.

Let's remember, we were promised, when the proposals came forward from this administration, that we would have an unemployment rate that would not exceed 8 percent, and now, as my friend from Grandfather Community said, we have an unemployment rate that is between 9.5 and 10 percent—very, very painful for people all across this country. And what it is that we've learned is that a \$1 trillion stimulus bill that had \$4.7 billion in it for weatherization, when only 10 percent of those funds have been expended, is obviously not the answer to the challenge of weatherization. And so we now have another bill that is a loan program, but it's \$4.25 billion and is designed, Mr. Speaker, to deal with a problem that, frankly, is not the top priority that we have out there.

My friend is absolutely right. We want to create jobs. But I think we have learned from the stimulus bill, Mr. Speaker, that the notion of spending billions and trillions of dollars is not what needs to be done to create jobs. We need to create good, private sector jobs.

And so what is it they've come forward with? They've come forward with another bill to deal with weatherization that they say will be a job creator. Well, the policies that we've seen over the past 20 months have killed jobs. The report that is coming out this morning is that the increase in the poverty rate has been nearly unprecedented. We have lots of very, very unfortunate economic indicators out there.

I am an optimist. I believe that our economy is going to recover. It is going to recover in spite of, not because of, the policies that we have put into place here in Washington, D.C., over the past few years. We will because we are Americans, because we are the United States of America. We will, as a Nation, recover, but, Mr. Speaker, what we should be doing is we should be breaking down barriers. We should be reducing the tax and regulatory burden on working Americans and job creators to ensure that we can, as early as possible, have that kind of success.

Now, this rule that we are considering right now is a further indication of the arrogance of the majority leadership. There was one Republican amendment that was germane that was submitted, and, Mr. Speaker, it was submitted by our Texas colleague, Mr. BARTON, who is the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. It was denied. Five amendments were made in order, all amendments offered by the majority.

Unfortunately, what we've seen is, time and time again, this institution, under the Democratic leadership that we have, is simply coming forward with proposals offered by Democrats, completely shutting out Republicans. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that in a partisan way. I'm saying it because the Republicans represent nearly half the American people, and the American people are the ones who are being shut out and, unfortunately, many Democratic Members are being shut out as well.

This has tragically been the single-most closed Congress in the history of our Republic. The 221-year history of our Republic has never seen a Congress as closed as this. Mr. Speaker, I know this comes as a surprise to many, but with the exception of the appropriations process in the first 2 years of Speaker PELOSI's leadership, we have seen a grand total of one bill considered under an open amendment process in the entire 3 years. In fact, we are poised right now to, for the first time in the history of our Republic, see an entire Congress without a single open rule. Why? Because we saw the appropriations process close down in this 111th Congress as well.

The American people want us to focus on job creation and economic growth, and they also want greater transparency, disclosure, and accountability, and, Mr. Speaker, they are not getting that from this Congress. They deserve better. And if we can deliver it, I am convinced we will be able to get our economy back on track.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule because we can do better. First vote “no” on the previous question so that we will be able to say to those Federal employees who are not paying their taxes that they shouldn’t be there. We are focusing specifically on ways to cut spending. We’ve got an opportunity to do that. Let’s vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker used the word “arrogance,” and I would just say that I think it is awfully arrogant for Members of this Congress, Members of this body to stand up and vote against bills that help small businesses, that help create American jobs, that provide loans and lending abilities to small businesses. I mean, small business is the engine of our economy, and the bill that we are talking about here today will help a lot of small businesses.

We had a small business bill on the floor that we passed—unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle voted against it, and I’m told that the Senate is going to be taking it up shortly—that will provide additional credit to small businesses, which is desperately needed.

□ 1110

I think many of my colleagues went home over the break and talked to a number of small businesses, and access to credit is a big issue. I think we’re going to probably get it. It took a long time and a lot of fighting to get it, but my Republican friends, the Party of No on the other side of the aisle, voted against it. So if you want to talk about arrogance, I think that’s arrogance.

This bill before us will not add a penny to our deficit, will provide loans that will help create energy-efficient products made here in the United States of America and will also help fund the installation of these products by American workers. This is about creating American jobs. We’re going to make it in America, and we’re going to create American jobs. That my friends on the other side of the aisle find that controversial or unacceptable is just astounding to me.

And when I hear that the money in the American Recovery and Reinvest-

ment Act didn’t create any jobs when it comes to the issue of weatherization and energy efficiency, again, I read the statistics. The statistics don’t lie. I mean, jobs were created. And many houses have been made more energy efficient, which means individuals and businesses don’t have to pay as much in utility bills. And that’s an important thing for a small business or a struggling family.

So this is about American jobs. It’s about investing in the American people. And I would just say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, rather than voting overwhelmingly, 170-1, to protect tax breaks for companies shipping American jobs overseas, you ought to focus on ways to help keep American jobs here in the United States of America. That’s what we’re trying to do with this bill.

I urge all my colleagues, don’t put politics above people. Don’t put politics above people. Do what’s right, and let’s help create more jobs here in the United States of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

With all due respect to my colleague across the aisle, we do not put politics above people. My colleagues and I were out in our districts all during the August recess, and we listened to our constituents. We know what our constituents want. They want a different direction for this country than our friends across the aisle have been taking us, along with this administration.

It wasn’t the Republicans that drove this country into the ditch. It was the Democrats through their spend, spend, spend program, debt, debt, debt program. The American people have awakened. They know what’s going on, and they don’t like it. We’re going to do everything we can to stop this irresponsible behavior on the part of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again expecting different results. Our colleagues have talked about every bill they’ve brought up here in the last 18 months as being a jobs bill. But what they’ve done is spend, spend, spend and claiming they’re creating jobs, but they have failed time after time. The results are clear.

The Democrat elites have run out of ideas about how to get the economy moving in the right direction. The American people can’t afford more of the ruling Democrats’ failed policies. They want new ideas for getting our economy back on track—not the same warmed-over stimulus and bailout policies that have failed to do anything but create new taxes, record deficits, and high unemployment.

Month after month Americans have been asking, “Where are the jobs?” The Democrats have been in total control of this country for almost 2 years, and what has President Obama offered? Nothing new but promising between now and November he will, quote, re-

mind the American people that policies he has put in place have, quote, moved us in the right direction.

Well, good luck, Mr. President, on selling the American people that you’ve taken us from 5 percent unemployment to 10 percent unemployment and you want to keep going in the same direction. Those who are unemployed aren’t going to agree, and those who worry about being unemployed aren’t going to agree with the President. The American people do not need more empty rhetoric and politically driven spin from the White House. They need real solutions.

The only jobs this administration has created have been Federal Government jobs, adding to the overwhelming layers of bureaucracy that already exist at the Federal level. From February of 2009 to June 2010, 405,000 Federal Government jobs have been created. Since the so-called “stimulus,” American taxpayers have spent \$44.9 billion on these new government worker salaries—and yet we continue to see record high unemployment in the private sector. All this administration and the liberal elite ruling Democrats want to do is grow government and grow bureaucracy, and this is evidenced by their backward policies.

As they try to sell their “Recovery Summer,” we know that more Americans are concerned about the state of the economic health. An August 24, 2010, Reuters’ IPSO poll showed that the economy is a core concern for Americans, with almost three-quarters—72 percent—of Americans very concerned about jobs. It showed 62 percent of Americans now think the country is on the wrong track.

It is clear that though President Obama believes he’s sailing the ship in the right direction, the American people overwhelmingly disagree. Even though the results are in and it’s clear the American people don’t want these policies, our friends across the aisle keep trying to shove expensive, wasteful pieces of legislation down the taxpayers’ throat. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better than this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment to which our colleagues spoke earlier 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.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so I can amend the rule to allow all Members of Congress the opportunity to vote on a cost-saving measure.

Recently, Republican Whip ERIC CANTOR launched YouCut, which gives people an opportunity to vote for Federal

spending they'd like to see Congress cut. Americans have cast their votes, and this week the American people want Congress to save nearly \$1 billion by requiring collection of unpaid taxes from Federal employees.

In 2008, the Internal Revenue Service reported that over 90,000 Federal employees were delinquent on their Federal income taxes, owing a total of \$1 billion in unpaid taxes. This includes 1,151 employees who owe \$7 million at the Department of Treasury which oversees the IRS.

H.R. 4735, of which I am a cosponsor, would prevent persons who have seriously delinquent tax debts from being eligible for Federal employment. By requiring at a minimum that the IRS work with Federal agencies to withhold a portion of each employee's paycheck who is determined to have a "seriously delinquent tax debt," we can ensure that Federal employees are paying their fair share of taxes. Failure to pay required taxes should result in disciplinary actions designed to ensure that the taxpayers are made whole. In addition to collecting back taxes already due, this reform will ensure future unpaid taxes are also collected.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 8½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, once again I urge my colleagues not to put politics over people. These are serious, difficult economic times. We need to make policy here that invests in our people, that invests in American jobs, that helps create a climate where more American jobs can be created.

My colleague from North Carolina talks about how the Republicans somehow are not responsible for this massive, colossal deficit that we have, but I just want to remind people about the facts. The facts are that when Bill Clinton provided George Bush with this record-breaking surplus, it was a Republican Congress and a Republican President that instituted tax cuts—mostly for the wealthy—that weren't paid for; tax cuts that benefited the wealthiest of the wealthy that were not paid for.

□ 1120

It was a prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for and was much more expensive than they advertised. It was two wars that they decided not to pay for. American soldiers and their families sacrificed, but the rest of us are asked to not do anything to help sacrifice or pay for the war.

That all happened when you had a Republican Congress—they were in control of everything—and a Republican President. I mean those are the facts. I am sorry that it bothers my friends, but it's the truth.

And now they are coming up with a proposal that will add \$4 trillion to our deficit. It doesn't seem to bother any of them. Well, it bothers me and it bothers the people that I represent. I think it bothers most people in this country. One of the things that I think is clear is that the American people don't want to go back to the same old policies that created this mess.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush holds the worst jobs record of any administration in 75 years, including 4.6 million American manufacturing jobs lost. House Republican leaders have said, and I quote, "We need to go back to the exact same agenda." That's what they want to do. They want to go back to the same policies that created this mess.

I am going to repeat what I said before about the fact that Republicans voted 170 to 1 to protect tax breaks for companies shipping American jobs overseas. One hundred seventy to one to protect tax breaks that are shipping our jobs overseas. Ninety-five percent of House Republicans have signed a pledge to protect these tax breaks. I mean what are they thinking? One hundred percent of House Republicans voted against creating and saving 3.6 million American jobs, including advanced vehicle and clean energy manufacturing jobs. We cannot go back. We cannot go back.

You know, when we make it in America more middle class families will make it too. It's that simple. And what the underlying bill does is provide loans. It doesn't add a single cent to our deficit. It provides loans to families and to businesses and to farms to be able to do weatherization and energy efficiency. And over 90 percent of the products that are needed to do energy efficiency improvements are made in America. Not made in China; made in America. This is a good thing.

The more people take loans and the more people want to weatherize their homes and their businesses, they will save money on utility costs, and more and more American workers will get a job. Why is that so hard for my friends on the other side of the aisle to get? I mean they fight tooth and nail to protect tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. That is their big issue. I assume that helps them politically in terms of the money given to the Republican National Committee. But it doesn't do a damn thing for American workers.

We need to start insisting that American workers come first. And that is what this bill is about. It is investing in our workforce. It is about making it here in the United States, creating jobs in the United States.

So Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote to support this bill. I would urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1620 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. 4735) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment. 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. 4735.

(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. 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 ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1620, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on the Senate amendments to H.R. 3562.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—226

Adler (NJ)	Boccieri	Chu
Altmire	Boren	Clarke
Andrews	Boswell	Clay
Arcuri	Boucher	Cleaver
Baca	Boyd	Clyburn
Baird	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Connolly (VA)
Barrow	Butterfield	Conyers
Bean	Capps	Cooper
Becerra	Capuano	Costa
Berkley	Cardoza	Costello
Berman	Carnahan	Courtney
Berry	Carney	Critz
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Chandler	Cummings

Dahlkemper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kilroy	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kind	Reyes
Davis (TN)	Kissell	Richardson
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
DeGette	Kosmas	Ross
Delahunt	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Salazar
Doggett	Levin	Sánchez, Linda T.
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Driehaus	Loeb	Schakowsky
Edwards (MD)	Loeb	Schauer
Edwards (TX)	Loftgren, Zoe	Schiff
Ellison	Lowe	Schrader
Engel	Lujan	Scott (GA)
Etheridge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Farr	Maffei	Serrano
Fattah	Maloney	Sestak
Filner	Markey (CO)	Sherman
Foster	Markey (MA)	Shuler
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Sires
Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Garamendi	McCollum	Slaughter
Gonzalez	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Grayson	McGovern	Snyder
Green, Al	McMahon	Speier
Green, Gene	Meeke (NY)	Spratt
Grijalva	Melancon	Stark
Gutierrez	Michaud	Stupak
Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)	Sutton
Halvorson	Miller, George	Tanner
Hare	Moore (KS)	Teague
Harman	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Titus
Herseth Sandlin	Murphy (NY)	Tonko
Higgins	Murphy, Patrick	Towns
Himes	Nadler (NY)	Tsongas
Hinche	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Hirono	Oberstar	Wald
Holden	Obey	Wasserman
Holt	Oliver	Schultz
Honda	Ortiz	Waters
Hoyer	Owens	Watson
Inlee	Pallone	Watt
Israel	Pascrell	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Weiner
Jackson Lee	Payne	Welch
(TX)	Perlmutter	Wilson (OH)
Johnson (GA)	Perriello	Woolsey
Johnson, E. B.	Peters	Wu
Kagen	Peterson	Yarmuth
Kanjorski	Pingree (ME)	
Kaptur	Polis (CO)	
Kennedy	Pomeroy	
Kildee	Price (NC)	
	Quigley	

NAYS—186

Aderholt	Castle	Guthrie
Akin	Chaffetz	Hall (TX)
Alexander	Childers	Harper
Austria	Coble	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Heller
Bachus	Cole	Hensarling
Barrett (SC)	Conaway	Herge
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Hill
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Hoekstra
Biggert	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Bilbray	Dent	Issa
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Blackburn	Djou	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Dreier	Jones
Bono Mack	Duncan	Jordan (OH)
Boozman	Ehlers	King (IA)
Boustany	Emerson	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kingston
Bright	Fleming	Kirk
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Kline (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Kratovil
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Burgess	Gallegly	Latham
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	LaTourette
Buyer	Gerlach	Latta
Calvert	Giffords	Lee (NY)
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis (CA)
Campbell	Gohmert	Linder
Cantor	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Cao	Granger	Lucas
Capito	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Carter	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Cassidy	Griffith	

Lungren, Daniel	Olson	Shadegg
E.	Paul	Shimkus
Mack	Paulsen	Shuster
Manzullo	Pence	Simpson
Marshall	Petri	Smith (NE)
Matheson	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Smith (TX)
McCaul	Poe (TX)	Space
McClintock	Posey	Stearns
McCotter	Price (GA)	Sullivan
McHenry	Radanovich	Taylor
McIntyre	Rehberg	Terry
McKeon	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
McNerney	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Upton
Miller (MI)	Rooney	Walden
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
Minnick	Roskam	Westmoreland
Mitchell	Royce	Whitfield
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Tim	Scalise	Wittman
Myrick	Schmidt	Wolf
Neugebauer	Schock	Young (AK)
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	
Nye	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Fallin	Putnam
Blunt	Gordon (TN)	Rush
Bonner	Hodes	Schwartz
Braley (IA)	Inglis	Shea-Porter
Davis (AL)	Marchant	Tierney
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Young (FL)
Eshoo	Mollohan	

□ 1152

Messrs. CASSIDY and BACHUS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 526 on H. Res. 1620, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. 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—aye 225, noes 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—225

Altmire	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Carnahan	Davis (TN)
Arcuri	Carney	DeFazio
Baca	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Baird	Castor (FL)	Delahunt
Baldwin	Chandler	DeLauro
Barrow	Chu	Deutch
Bean	Clarke	Dicks
Becerra	Clay	Dingell
Berkley	Cleaver	Djou
Berman	Clyburn	Doggett
Berry	Cohen	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Connolly (VA)	Driehaus
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Edwards (MD)
Blumenauer	Cooper	Edwards (TX)
Bocchieri	Costa	Ehlers
Boswell	Costello	Ellison
Boucher	Courtney	Engel
Boyd	Critz	Etheridge
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Farr
Brown, Corrine	Cuellar	Fattah
Butterfield	Cummings	Filner
Capps	Dahlkemper	Poster
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Frank (MA)

Fudge Lofgren, Zoe
 Garamendi Lowey
 Gonzalez Lujan
 Gordon (TN) Lynch
 Grayson Maffei
 Green, Al Maloney
 Green, Gene Markey (CO)
 Grijalva Markey (MA)
 Gutierrez Matsui
 Hall (NY) McCarthy (NY)
 Halvorson McCollum
 Hare McDermott
 Harman McGovern
 Hastings (FL) McIntyre
 Heinrich McMahon
 Herseth Sandlin McNeerney
 Higgins Meeks (NY)
 Himes Michaud
 Hinchey Miller (NC)
 Hinojosa Miller, George
 Hirono Moore (KS)
 Holden Moore (WI)
 Holt Moran (VA)
 Honda Murphy (CT)
 Hoyer Murphy (NY)
 Inslee Murphy, Patrick
 Israel Nadler (NY)
 Jackson (IL) Napolitano
 Jackson Lee Neal (MA)
 (TX) Nye
 Johnson (GA) Oberstar
 Johnson, E. B. Obey
 Kagen Oliver
 Kanjorski Ortiz
 Kaptur Owens
 Kennedy Pallone
 Kildee Pascrell
 Kilpatrick (MI) Pastor (AZ)
 Kilroy Payne
 Kind Perlmutter
 Kissell Perriello
 Klein (FL) Peters
 Kosmas Peterson
 Kucinich Pingree (ME)
 Langevin Polis (CO)
 Larsen (WA) Pomeroy
 Larson (CT) Price (NC)
 Lee (CA) Quigley
 Levin Rahall
 Lewis (GA) Rangel
 Lipinski Reyes
 Loeb sack Richardson

Rodriguez Nunes
 Rothman (NJ) Olson
 Roybal-Allard Paul
 Ruppertsberger Paulsen
 Ryan (OH) Pence
 Salazar Petri
 Sánchez, Linda Pitts
 T. Platts
 Sanchez, Loretta Poe (TX)
 Sarbanes Posey
 Schakowsky Price (GA)
 Schauer Radanovich
 Schiff Rehberg
 Schrader Reichert
 Scott (GA) Roe (TN)
 Scott (VA) Rogers (AL)
 Serrano Rogers (KY)
 Sestak Rogers (MI)
 Sherman Rohrabacher
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Buyer Grijalva
 Calvert Guthrie
 Campbell Gutierrez
 Cantor Hall (NY)
 Cao Hall (TX)
 Capito Halvorson
 Capps Hare
 Capuano Harman
 Cardoza Harper
 Carnahan Hastings (FL)
 Carney Hastings (WA)
 Carson (IN) Heinrich
 Carter Heller
 Cassidy Hensarling
 Castle Herger
 Castor (FL) Herseth Sandlin
 Chaffetz Chaffetz
 Chandler Hill
 Childers Himes
 Chu Hinchey
 Clarke Hinojosa
 Clay Hirono
 Cleaver Hoekstra
 Clyburn Holden
 Coble Holt
 Coffman (CO) Honda
 Cohen Hoyer
 Cole Hunter
 Conaway Inglis
 Connolly (VA) Inslee
 Conyers Israel
 Cooper Issa
 Costa Jackson (IL)
 Costello Jackson Lee
 Courtney (TX)
 Crenshaw Jenkins
 Critz Johnson (GA)
 Crowley Johnson (IL)
 Cuellar Johnson, E. B.
 Culberson Johnson, Sam
 Cummings Jones
 Dahlkemper Jordan (OH)
 Davis (CA) Kagen
 Davis (IL) Kanjorski
 Davis (KY) Kaptur
 Davis (TN) Kennedy
 DeFazio Kildee
 DeGette Kilpatrick (MI)
 Delahunt Kilroy
 DeLauro Kind
 Dent King (IA)
 Deutch King (NY)
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kingston
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kirk
 Dicks Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Dingell Kissell
 Djou Klein (FL)
 Doggett Kline (MN)
 Donnelly (IN) Kosmas
 Doyle Kratovil
 Dreier Kucinich
 Driehaus Lamborn
 Duncan Lance
 Edwards (MD) Langevin
 Edwards (TX) Larsen (WA)
 Ehlers Larson (CT)
 Ellison Latham
 Emerson LaTourette
 Engel Latta
 Etheridge Lee (CA)
 Farr Lee (NY)
 Fattah Levin
 Filner Lewis (CA)
 Flake Lewis (GA)
 Forbes Linder
 Fortenberry Lipinski
 Foster LoBiondo
 Foyx Loeb sack
 Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe
 Franks (AZ) Lowey
 Frelinghuysen Lucas
 Fudge Luetkemeyer
 Gallegly Lujan
 Garamendi Lummis
 Garrett (NJ) Lungren, Daniel
 Gerlach E.
 Giffords Lynch
 Gingrey (GA) Mack
 Gohmert Maffei
 Gonzalez Maloney
 Goodlatte Manzullo
 Gordon (TN) Markey (CO)
 Granger Markey (MA)
 Graves (GA) Marshall
 Graves (MO) Matheson
 Grayson Matsui
 Green, Al McCarthy (CA)
 Green, Gene McCarthy (NY)
 Griffith McCaul

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman Hodes
 Blunt Marchant
 Murphy (IA) Meeck (FL)
 Davis (AL) Mollohan
 Ellsworth Putnam
 Eshoo Rush
 Fallin Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1201

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.

JAMES CHANEY, ANDREW GOODMAN, MICHAEL SCHWERNER, AND ROY K. MOORE FEDERAL BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3562) to designate the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the “James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner Federal Building,” 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 Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—409

NOES—188
 Aderholt Conaway
 Adler (NJ) Crenshaw
 Akin Culberson
 Alexander Davis (KY)
 Austria Dent
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart, L.
 Bachus Diaz-Balart, M.
 Barrett (SC) Donnelly (IN)
 Bartlett Dreier
 Barton (TX) Duncan
 Biggert Emerson
 Bilbray Flake
 Bilirakis Fleming
 Bishop (UT) Forbes
 Blackburn Fortenberry
 Boehner Foxx
 Bonner Franks (AZ)
 Bono Mack Frelinghuysen
 Boozman Gallegly
 Boren Garrett (NJ)
 Boustany Gerlach
 Brady (TX) Giffords
 Bright Gingrey (GA)
 Broun (GA) Gohmert
 Brown (SC) Goodlatte
 Brown-Waite, Granger
 Ginny Graves (GA)
 Buchanan Graves (MO)
 Burgess Griffith
 Burton (IN) Guthrie
 Buyer Hall (TX)
 Calvert Harper
 Camp Hastings (WA)
 Campbell Heller
 Cantor Hensarling
 Cao Herger
 Capito Hill
 Carter Hoekstra
 Cassidy Hunter
 Castle Inglis
 Chaffetz Issa
 Childers Jenkins
 Coble Johnson (IL)
 Coffman (CO) Johnson, Sam
 Cole 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
 Marshall
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Melancon
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Neugebauer

Shea-Porter
 Sutton
 Tierney
 Visclosky
 Young (FL)
 Shearman & Sterling
 Young (FL)
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 Kagen
 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
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 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
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 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
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock

Schrader	Spratt	Velázquez
Scott (GA)	Stark	Walden
Scott (VA)	Stearns	Walz
Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Wamp
Serrano	Sullivan	Wasserman
Sessions	Sutton	Schultz
Sestak	Tanner	Waters
Shadegg	Taylor	Watson
Sherman	Teague	Waxman
Shimkus	Terry	Weiner
Shuler	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland
Simpson	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Sires	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Skelton	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Slaughter	Tiberi	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Titus	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Woolsey
Smith (TX)	Towns	Wu
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Snyder	Turner	Young (AK)
Space	Upton	
Speier	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman	Fallin	Rush
Bishop (GA)	Fleming	Schwartz
Blunt	Hodes	Shea-Porter
Bralley (IA)	Marchant	Tierney
Camp	McClintock	Visclosky
Davis (AL)	Meek (FL)	Watt
Ellsworth	Mollohan	Young (FL)
Eshoo	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1212

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, September 16, 2010, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 527 and 528.

Had I been present for rollcall 527, on agreeing to H. Res. 1620, providing for the consideration of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 528, on a motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate Amendments to H.R. 3562, a measure to designate the Federal building under construction at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the Chaney, Goodman, Schwerner Federal Building, I would have voted "aye."

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas a reconvening of Congress between the regularly scheduled Federal election in November and the start of the next session of Congress is known as a lame-duck session of Congress;

Whereas Democrats have recently insinuated that significant legislative matters

would deliberately not be addressed during the 111th Congress until after the midterm 2010 elections;

Whereas this Congress began its mortgage of the Nation's future with a "stimulus" package costing \$1.1 trillion that failed to lower unemployment, spur economic growth, or actually address the needs of struggling American businesses and families;

Whereas this Congress continued its free-wheeling spending with an increase of \$72.4 billion in nonemergency discretionary spending in fiscal year 2009 to reach a total spending level of \$1.01 trillion for the first time in United States history;

Whereas this Congress approved a budget resolution in 2009 that proposed the 6 largest nominal deficits in American history and included tax increases of \$423 billion during a period of sustained high unemployment;

Whereas the House of Representatives disregarded the interests and opinions of everyday Americans by passing a national energy tax bill that would increase costs on nearly every aspect of American lives by up to \$3,000 per person per year, eliminate millions of jobs, reduce workers' income, and devastate economic growth;

Whereas this Congress disregarded the interests and opinions of everyday Americans by passing a massive government takeover of health care that will force millions of Americans from their health insurance plans, increase premiums and costs for individuals and employers, raise taxes by \$569.2 billion, and fund abortions—all at a cost of \$2.64 trillion over the first 10 years of full implementation;

Whereas this Congress nationalized the student loan industry with a potential cost of 30,000 private sector jobs and \$50.1 billion over 10 years;

Whereas the House of Representatives passed the DISCLOSE Act, which would violate the First Amendment and hinder the free speech of citizens associations and corporations while leaving all unions exempt from many of the new requirements, in order to try to influence the outcome of the midterm 2010 elections;

Whereas in spite of the House Budget Committee Chairman's 2006 statement that "if you can't budget, you can't govern", the Democrat leadership has failed to introduce a budget resolution in 2010 as mandated by law, but instead self-executed a "deeming resolution" that increases nonemergency discretionary spending in fiscal year 2011 by \$30 billion to \$1.121 trillion, setting another new record for the highest level in United States history;

Whereas this Congress has failed Main Street through passage of a financial system takeover that fails to end the moral hazard of too-big-to-fail, does not address Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and creates numerous new boards, councils, and positions with unconstitutionally broad authorities that will interfere with the creation of wealth and jobs;

Whereas this Congress has wasted taxpayer funds on an unnecessary and unconstitutional auto industry bailout, a "cash for clunkers" program, a home remediation program ("cash for caulkers"), and countless other special interest projects while allowing the public debt to reach its highest level in United States history;

Whereas the New York Times reported on June 19, 2010, that "[f]or all the focus on the historic federal rescue of the banking industry, it is the government's decision to seize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in September 2008 that is likely to cost taxpayers the most money. . . . Republicans want to sever ties with Fannie and Freddie once the crisis abates. The Obama administration and Congressional Democrats have insisted on post-

poning the argument until after the midterm elections";

Whereas the Washington Times reported on June 22, 2010, that House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer stated, "a budget, which sets out binding one-year targets and a multiyear plan, is useless this year because Congress has shunted key questions about deficits to the independent debt commission created by President Obama, which is due to report back at the end of this year";

Whereas the Hill reported on June 24, 2010, that Senator Tom Harkin, a Democrat from Iowa, suggested that "Democrats might attempt to move 'card-check' legislation this year, perhaps during a lame-duck session. . . . 'A lot of things can happen in a lame-duck session, too,' he said";

Whereas the New York Times published an article on June 28, 2010, titled "Lame-Duck Session Emerges as Possibility for Climate Bill Conference" that declares, "many expect the final energy or climate bill to be worked out during the lame-duck session between the November election and the start of the new Congress in January";

Whereas the Hill reported on July 1, 2010, that "Democratic leaders are likely to punt the task of renewing Bush-era tax cuts until after the election. Voters in November's midterms will thus be left without a clear idea of their future tax rates when they go to the polls";

Whereas the Wall Street Journal reported on July 13, 2010, that "there have been signs in recent weeks that party leaders are planning an ambitious, lame-duck session to muscle through bills in December they don't want to defend before November. Retiring or defeated members of Congress would then be able to vote for sweeping legislation without any fear of voter retaliation";

Whereas the Hill reported on July 27, 2010, that Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said, at the recent Netroots Nation conference of liberal bloggers, in reference to Democrats' unfinished priorities, "We're going to have to have a lame duck session, so we're not giving up";

Whereas the Hill reported in the same piece on July 27, 2010, that the lame-duck session will include priorities such as "comprehensive immigration reform, climate change legislation and a whole host of other issues";

Whereas during NBC's Meet the Press on August 8, 2010, White House advisor Carol Browner stated that Congress would "potentially" deal with a national energy tax bill in a lame-duck session;

Whereas the Hill reported on August 20, 2010, that Rep. Mike Quigley (D-IL) said, "I'm more hopeful about the lame duck session. I have faith that we're going to repeal Don't Ask Don't Tell";

Whereas the members of the House Republican Conference, as an alternative to passing a massive omnibus spending bill for next year during a lame-duck session, have called on members of both parties, as a starting point, to work together this month to enact legislation that cuts nonsecurity discretionary spending to 2008 levels (the last year before the wave of bailouts, stimulus spending sprees, and takeovers that have dismayed the American people) for the next year and provides much-needed certainty to American small businesses by freezing tax rates at their current levels for the next 2 years;

Whereas recent public polling shows that the American people clearly oppose the idea of dealing with major new legislation in a lame-duck session;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence notes that governments "[derive] their just powers from the consent of the governed";

Whereas the American people have expressed their loss of confidence through self-organized and self-funded taxpayer marches on Washington, at countless "tea party" events, at townhalls and speeches, and with numerous letters, emails, and phone calls to their elected representatives;

Whereas the Democrat majority has all but announced plans to use any lame-duck Congress to advance currently unattainable, partisan policies that are widely unpopular with the American people or that further increase the national debt against the will of most Americans;

Whereas reconvening the House of Representatives in a lame-duck session to address major new legislation subverts the will of the American people, lessens accountability, and does lasting damage to the dignity and integrity of this body's proceedings; and

Whereas under the leadership of Speaker Pelosi and the Democrat majority, and largely due to the current trends of expanding governmental power and limiting individual liberty, the American people have lost confidence in their elected officials, and that faith must be restored: Now, therefore, be it—

Resolved, That the House of Representatives pledges not to assemble on or between November 2, 2010, and January 3, 2011, except in the case of an unforeseen, sudden emergency requiring immediate action from Congress, and that the consideration of any of the following matters does not constitute an unforeseen, sudden emergency:

- (1) Card check, including H.R. 1409 (111th).
- (2) A national energy tax, including H.R. 2454 (111th).
- (3) Any legislation that would provide more authority to Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac.
- (4) Any legislation pertaining to the Immigration and Nationality Act.
- (5) Any legislation making regular appropriations for fiscal year 2011 that would be an increase over previous funding levels.
- (6) Any legislation increasing any tax on any American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Georgia will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 4785.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1620 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4785.

□ 1223

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use, with Mr. SALAZAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today, H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act, will greatly benefit our rural residents. The agriculture provisions in this bill build on existing U.S. Department of Agriculture programs and will reduce energy consumption and, as a result, reduce energy costs in rural America.

Rural electric cooperatives estimate that the Rural Energy Savings Program Act has the potential to create between 20,000 and 40,000 jobs per year and will make loans available to between 1.1 and 1.6 million rural households, depending on the average consumer size. It is clear that this is a win-win proposition for our rural constituents and our rural economy.

This Act furthers the Agriculture Committee's commitment to expand renewable and alternative sources of power and discover new technologies to improve the efficiency and sustainability of existing power generation across rural America.

H.R. 4785 authorizes USDA's rural utility service to make interest-free loans to eligible entities. These enti-

ties will use these funds to make low-interest loans to rural consumers allowing them to implement energy-efficient measures on their property. Using the existing Rural Utilities Service structure, with the rural electric cooperatives as the delivery system, rural consumers can more quickly obtain the benefits of energy-efficient investments and ultimately decrease their energy bills.

Rural customers are facing increasing energy costs and rural electric cooperatives, which serve 42 million member owners across the country, are facing growing demand for electric power, yet are constrained from building new generation capacity.

The upfront costs to make energy-efficient upgrades are often beyond the reach of most consumers. This is true even if the costs can be recovered over time or a tax credit or a rebate would reduce the initial price. Additionally, consumers often lack the necessary knowledge about what technologies would be the most effective.

H.R. 4785 is an opportunity to meet these challenges and enact policy that we know will reduce energy costs and consumption and improve the quality of life in our rural communities.

I would like to thank Congressman CLYBURN and Congressman PERRIELLO for their hard work and dedication to improving energy efficiency and their support for the agriculture provisions within this Act.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the agriculture provisions contained in this Act and encourage its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I must rise today in opposition to H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act. As a result of the Democratic leadership's failed policies, we are now considering a bill that creates two new government funded programs to address high energy bills and energy demand. We are considering creating a program that duplicates thousands of other efficiency measures that Congress has passed and funded in the billions of dollars over the last several years.

H.R. 4785, as reported by the Agriculture Committee, would require the government, through USDA, to front nearly a billion dollars to rural electric cooperatives so that they can, in return, make what might potentially be risky loans to their customers for energy-efficiency projects in their homes. The investments made in this program would only benefit an estimated 1.5 million of the 43 million customers served by rural electric cooperatives. Energy efficiency is an important step in an overall energy plan. But creating a new government funded program is not the solution.

This issue can be addressed in the farm bill by making adjustments to current programs. The 2008 farm bill included a provision that would have allowed rural electric cooperatives to

expand clean energy production and provide affordable electricity for more of its customers.

□ 1230

However, the provision was stripped by the current Democratic leadership. As a result, rural electric cooperatives cannot access RUS lending for new base load generation. In other words, base load generation from sources such as nuclear, natural gas, and clean coal technologies are difficult, if not impossible, to finance through the program now.

Even more alarming is that this is not the bill that was reported by the Committee on Agriculture. Instead, the Democratic leadership created a bill that is five times larger and includes a program that was already stripped, already stripped, the Home Star program, on the House floor by bipartisan support. It will give the Department of Energy another program and billions more in taxpayer dollars to administer.

Why would Congress add to a failed stimulus policy? The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act alone created the \$5.25 billion Weatherization Assistance Program for home energy efficiency updates, which has been, some say, a colossal failure from an implementation perspective, and very well may have wasted huge amounts of taxpayers' dollars at the hands of the Department of Energy.

The Democratic leadership is pushing energy policy that will create increased and burdensome energy costs for Americans. As a result, we are creating new government programs that increase spending to address the consequences of those policies. I urge my colleagues oppose the bill.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 4785, a bill authored by the distinguished majority whip, Mr. JAMES CLYBURN of South Carolina. The Rural Energy Savings Program Act will not only quickly create construction and manufacturing jobs, but it will also help Americans make their homes more energy efficient.

The Agriculture Committee reported this bill favorably in July. I want to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CLYBURN for subsequently working with my committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, to actually improve the legislation. The bill includes the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program that was reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee on April 15, 2010, as part of H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act of 2010.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5019 was approved by the committee with a bipartisan vote of 30–17. It was supported by a broad array of stakeholders, including energy efficiency advocates, manufacturers, business and industry trade

associations, and small businesses. Under this bill, homeowners anywhere in the country will be able to work with their rural cooperative, utility, or other governor-designated lender to borrow money for proven energy efficiency investments in their homes. They would repay the loans over time, generally from a portion of the money they save on their energy bill, and at an interest rate of not more than 3 percent. The lenders would repay their States, and the States would repay the Federal Government after not more than 20 years.

The Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program is a natural companion to the Rural Energy Savings Program Act. As you may know, the Rural Energy Savings Act authorizes zero-interest loans to rural electric cooperatives for purposes of offering consumer loans for energy efficiency home retrofits. The Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program will authorize zero-interest loans to those portions of the country not served—I repeat that—not served by rural electric cooperatives.

I originally cosponsored this bill because it provided enormous assistance to consumers served by rural electric cooperatives across the country. My district in North Carolina is served by 10 rural electric co-ops in addition to the 20 municipal power utilities and two investor-owned utilities.

Across the country, cooperatives only serve about 12 percent of the Nation's population. So the provisions included in the substitute amendment will ensure that a homeowner will have the same access to a low interest energy efficiency loan whether or not they are served by a co-op, an investor-owned utility, or a municipality.

Under the Home Star loan program, States could borrow Federal funds to allow entities like electric utilities or other entities provide loans to consumers for residential energy efficiency measures. The Department of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, would identify the eligible energy efficiency measures.

The programs in this bill, Mr. Chairman, vary significantly from the Weatherization Assistance Program. Weatherization is a grant program used by low-income households to reduce their energy bills by making their homes more energy efficient. The programs in this bill are loans, and thus do not increase the deficit. They are available to anyone, regardless of income.

Some of my Republican colleagues have questioned this bill's necessity due to the significant investment made in the Weatherization program in the Recovery Act. Well, while I concede that Weatherization got off to a slow start, today over 30,000 homes each month are being weatherized across the country. In September, the Department of Energy announced that it had weatherized over 200,000 homes across the country. In June, 960 homes were weatherized in my State of North Caro-

lina. Each of the low-income families living in those 960 homes will save an average of \$437 annually on their energy bill. But that's not why we are here today. We are here to offer all Americans a chance to lower their utility bills and put their neighbors back to work.

The recession has had a significant impact on the home construction and services industry, which has experienced unemployment rates of 27 percent. Additionally, manufacturing plants that produce construction-related products have operated at 50 percent of capacity. Home energy retrofit work can provide, and it will provide, significant employment opportunities for construction workers while boosting domestic manufacturing. More than 92 percent of the energy-efficient products and materials for which the Home Star program will stimulate sales are manufactured here in the United States of America.

Home energy efficiency retrofits can also cut the Nation's energy use, saving consumers money and cutting pollution. American homes account for about 33 percent of the Nation's total electricity demand, and approximately 22 percent of all energy use in the United States. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, presents an opportunity for all of us to work together to save energy and create jobs. I urge all of our colleagues to seize this opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished majority whip.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend, Chairman HOLDEN, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act. Mr. Chairman, the Rural Energy Savings Program, or Rural Star, as it is popularly called, is an important piece of the Make It in America agenda. It is a program that will create jobs and help save families money on their energy bills.

Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once called our 50 States "laboratories of democracy." And that is certainly the case with this homegrown, American-owned idea. The rural electric co-ops in South Carolina brought this idea to my attention late last year. And I worked with them and my colleague Congressman JOHN SPRATT to craft legislation that takes the South Carolina model nationwide. I am very proud that South Carolina is providing significant leadership for our economic recovery with this innovative approach to job creation and energy savings.

The concept is very simple: low-cost home improvement loans for energy-efficient upgrades, sealing, insulation,

HVAC systems, heat pumps, and other structural improvements. Those low-cost loans are paid back on customers' electricity bills, with the energy savings covering the cost of the loan.

□ 1240

When the term of the loan expires, most people will be saving hundreds of dollars annually on their monthly utility bills.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation is first and foremost a jobs bill, and it is based on commonsense ideas that can be done in a fiscally responsible manner that will protect taxpayers and the Treasury. Let me emphasize that this is a voluntary loan program, not a grant or rebate; and the loans are paid back to the Federal Treasury.

We call this the Rural Energy Savings Program because it will save consumers energy and money. More importantly, it will put people back to work, particularly in the building and construction trades and manufacturing industries, sectors that have been hard hit by the economic downturn.

While providing energy upgrades and significant employment opportunities for building and construction workers, this legislation will boost domestic manufacturing. Retailers of energy-efficient building materials and appliances will also benefit from increased sales. Virtually all of the energy-efficient products and materials used for energy efficiency improvements are made in America.

Rural Star has the support of a broad coalition of stakeholders, including the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Home Builders, the Retail Industry Leaders Association and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Rural Star will create high-skill, high-wage manufacturing and construction jobs and deliver meaningful energy savings for consumers that will put money directly into their wallets.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. Let's create jobs that are made in America so that our fellow citizens can "Make It in America."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, this bill will authorize the Rural Utilities Service to make loans to rural electric co-ops so that the co-ops, in turn, can make loans to families and small businesses for energy conservation and efficiency measures that meet Federal standards.

This process will begin with an energy audit aimed at identifying energy-saving measures. Based on this audit, the co-ops will propose improvements

like insulation or high-efficiency heat pumps. Consumers will pay the co-ops for the installation through a charge on their utility bills spread over a period of 5 to 10 years. The energy savings will cover much, if not all, of the loan repayment. And after the loan is repaid, the participating consumer will continue to save, as will the economy, because of the more efficient use of energy.

There are more than 200,000 rural electric cooperative customers in my district, many of them near or below the poverty level. Many of these hard-working people would gladly invest in their homes to make them more efficient, but they cannot borrow or afford the funds necessary to install a new heat pump or place insulation in their walls and ceilings.

This is where the ingenuity of the co-ops comes in. Through a program that could be implemented nationwide, they would provide a simple but effective solution to help their customers at relatively low cost. At the same time they would create new jobs by making low-cost loans available to install high-impact energy efficiency improvements. The loans will be repaid over time on the consumer's utility bill, and ideally there will be a net reduction of utility payments even when accounting for the loan repayments. This is a win-win solution to a major problem.

I urge support for this bill. It is well crafted and it will not have an impact on the bottom line of the budget because we are talking about loans made by the Federal Government to the electric co-ops, which will be, I am sure, duly repaid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you for yielding.

This is a great day, and this is a great program. This is the kind of commonsense approach people are looking for right now to help cut costs for families that are struggling and help put construction crews back to work that are desperately under demand in this economy.

Here we have a chance to help support American construction, using American-manufactured products to reduce the electric bills of rural America, including seniors on fixed incomes, including middle class families and working class families. It is the kind of common sense that has always made this country stronger and more vibrant. Here we are at a time when construction is down that we can be stepping up to renovate the building stock that we have, and we know in our rural communities our building stock is less efficient than in much of the rest of America.

So here we have a chance to make our rural communities more competitive and more livable, the utilities as

partners, because the only limiting factor here is up-front capital. We know that the market can drive the rest.

So helping the utilities to provide that up-front investment, to unleash construction crews going to work to renovate homes, using American manufactured products like insulation, double-paned glass, window film—including the best window film in the world that we can make in southern Virginia in my district—that reduces electric bills.

If you are a senior on a fixed income and you have seen your electric rates go up and up, there is nothing you can take out of that budget. You don't have some party budget that you are going to give up. It's a fixed income. If we can help reduce that electric bill, that's more money for food and for transportation and for other needs that our seniors and our working families face. We can unleash what we do best, making things, building things, growing things in America and saving money for the average American who is so stretched right now.

We should not delay. We should pass this today on a bipartisan basis. We should make sure the Senate follows suit because this is the kind of common sense that can support those construction jobs we need, those manufacturing jobs we need, and that economic relief that our working and middle class families desperately need.

I urge all of my colleagues to be part of this commonsense solution and get us building and making things in America again today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest confidence, faith and belief in the integrity and the intention of my colleagues as they work on this bill; but, Mr. Chairman, this is adding 5 billion more dollars on top of hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars that we have spent over the course of the last year and a half-plus that we don't have.

I would simply urge my colleagues, turn this bill back, let's not add \$5 billion more on to what we have already spent. Let's fulfill our constitutional responsibilities and pass our 12 appropriation bills in regular session. Let's fulfill our responsibility to our constituents and the economy they have to work in by addressing the tax issues from 2001 and 2003, and let's just go home.

There is a political storm brewing out there. This is going to be a different body in January. Let's do what we are obligated to do under the Constitution and for our constituents and go home.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, we know that rural cooperatives will need

to double generating capacity. Several reports, including one done by USDA, state it will take a 10-year capital requirement of \$65.5 billion, \$49.9 billion which would be for new generation, and this does not even take into consideration the \$10 billion needed for transmission and the \$3 billion to retrofit. So that would be a tremendous expense to consumers across rural America. Energy efficiency investment is the way we need to proceed, so I encourage adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today. I am going to ask my colleagues to vote "no."

We had a similar bill on the floor back in May; and in that bill we offered a motion to recommit, which passed, which struck the Home Star loan program.

□ 1250

This bill, the bill that we struck the loan program from back in May, was a \$324 million authorization. This bill has come back to us at a \$5 billion authorization. That is a little bit of a puzzlement. If it didn't make sense in May to start a new program for \$300 million, it doesn't make sense in September to start the same program except for \$5 billion. So, if for no other reason, we should vote against this bill.

The second point I want to make is that the programs in the bill are worthwhile. I know that seems to be a little bit inconsistent with what I just said, but it is not that these are bad programs. The question is can we afford them when we have a deficit that is going to be between \$1.2 trillion and \$1.4 trillion this year?

In another energy efficiency bill that has become law last year, we authorized, and I think we appropriated, \$4.7 billion for the Department of Energy to do the same sort of programs that this bill would authorize. Today, the Department of Energy has spent about 10 percent of that, a little less than \$500 million. So they have over \$4 billion that has been appropriated that hasn't been spent. Now, I'm not casting stones on the Department of Energy. It probably makes sense to take your time setting up the program and making sure you get the processes and the requirements to participate in the right form. But if we have an existing program that has been appropriated and has over \$4 billion surplus in it, I don't see the need for another program.

One may say, well, this is for rural America or for specific homeowners. But, to my knowledge, and I have got the Agriculture Committee here, there would be no exclusions because of the location under the program that the Department of Energy is currently implementing.

I would point out that 2 years ago the Federal debt was a little under \$6 trillion. We have added almost \$3 trillion to it in the last 2 years. I can't see that there is much net improvement that has happened to our economy with the expenditure of that much money, the addition of that much money to the debt.

It is not a case, Mr. Chairman, of coming to the floor and saying, This is a good program, support it. With these kinds of deficits, I think we need to think as a body, Is this a program that is absolutely essential and is it worth adding more to the public debt to pass this program? And with all due respect, while this is a good program, it is not a program that I think we should add to our children's and our grandchildren's debt. So I would urge a "no" vote at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the bill before us and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

There is a growing tide of voices in this country calling for less government, less spending, and less debt. These concerns stretch across party and region. Our national debt presents a crisis we have mistakenly ignored for far too long. But after nearly two trillion dollars have been spent on a failed economic stimulus package and programs to prop-up our financial system, we need to examine every dollar authorized with the utmost scrutiny.

If we apply just the slightest amount of examination to this bill, it becomes difficult to defend the premise on which the Rural Energy Savings Program Act rests. Take the so-called stimulus bill for instance. In early 2009, Congress authorized the Department of Energy to spend an additional \$4.7 billion on its home weatherization program. Improved home energy efficiency is a great way to ensure savings for the homeowner and helps lessen our overall consumption of electricity. Programs that speed efficiency measures along should be a no-brainer. But twelve months after \$4.7 billion was handed to the Department of Energy for these purposes, we found out we had little to show for it. In that time, DOE had spent only 10 percent of its new funds to upgrade around 30,000 homes around the country. This was supposed to be another "shovel-ready" stimulus project that would create thousands of jobs and improve energy efficiency in hundreds of thousands of homes. In that pursuit, the program was a complete failure.

The bill before us today basically seeks the same goals using the same byzantine structures and bureaucracies that failed us before. If we can't trust DOE to handle increased funding for an already-existing program, how can we trust DOE and the Department of Agriculture to handle billions of dollars for an entirely new program? The simple answer is we can't.

On top of the issue of government shortcomings is the question of cost. H.R. 4785 authorizes \$5 billion in taxpayer money without any means of finding a way of paying for it. Again, we're ignoring the Majority's own pay-as-you-go rules. These rules, as the voters were led to believe, were created to help stop the bleeding of funds into the pool of national debt. But over the past few years, we all realize it is a grand illusion. Our country is at its greatest level of debt since the end of World

War II—62 percent of GDP. We cannot keep adding a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there thinking the cost of these programs have no effect. Somewhere we must put a stop to the bleeding. And if we look at government's past performance in improving home energy efficiency and weigh the costs with the benefits, we cannot logically justify tallying \$5 billion in additional red ink.

I can only conclude from the reading of this bill that my opposition was not necessary from the outset. Had this bill properly made its way through the Energy and Commerce and Agriculture Committees, we would have had a better chance at learning more of the program's advantages and disadvantages and, through committee markup, had the opportunity to make improvements that would have eliminated the debt problem and further developed the accountability measures that are absent from this legislation. As we've seen so many times in this Congress and the one before, regular order has been ignored and incomplete legislation results.

Mr. Chair, it does not always have to be this way. I support making homes more energy efficient and government efforts that properly pursue that goal. H.R. 4785 will not accomplish that task and simply creates more problems than it solves.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, thank the gentleman from Texas because he did help make this bill and the Home Star bill a better bill.

There is a question here about why we provide this money in a time of a deficit, and there is an answer to that. America faces, right now, two great challenges. One is high unemployment—we have got to put people back to work—and the other is an energy policy that is not as clean as it needs to be. It is not as sustainable as it must be, and it is not as affordable as it is essential that it be.

This legislation addresses both of those challenges by investing in energy efficiency, and this is with people making their own decisions about how best to do that in their own rural homes. We invest in our economy. Over 90 percent of the materials are manufactured in the United States of America. By slowing our wasteful use of energy, we can save homeowners hundreds of millions of dollars. That is money in their pocket that they can spend on other things good for the economy. And by, of course, reducing the amount of costly oil we import from hostile nations, we can create clean energy jobs here at home.

So this is a practical approach to address persistent high unemployment, tight family budgets, and climate change. This is a win-win-win for families, for our economy, and for our energy future.

I applaud Mr. CLYBURN and the other sponsors, Mr. SPRATT, and I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I'll make it short and sweet. This is the same bill that was rejected under suspension back in May, with the exception that the authorization on the Home Star program has been increased by 13-fold. I suggested a "no" vote then. I continue to suggest a "no" vote and would ask for a "no" vote at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his comments.

We continue to say that this legislation is a good bill and it is certainly deficit neutral. It has been judged that way by the Congressional Budget Office. It is a loan program. It is not a grant program. It will not add to the deficit. It will not add to the debt in any respect.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to distinguish this program from the Department of Energy program that is a weatherization program. The weatherization programs, as we all know as Members, are intended to help low-income families, and it is a grant program. This is a loan program whereby Federal dollars are given to an investor-owned utility or to a municipality or to a rural cooperative, and the money is used then, in turn, to make low-interest loans to families who qualify. It is not income based. There are qualifications for the loans, but the family income is not a qualification to qualify for the loan.

We must enable the American people to weatherize their homes. Forty percent, in some instances, of their utility bill can be attributed to the loss of heat and air within the homes. And so this program is intended to help install replacement windows and insulation and other things that will make homes more energy efficient.

It will pay for itself. It's a good bill. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act.

I am a cosponsor of this bill, which has been modified to include provisions of H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act, of which I am also a cosponsor.

The Rural Energy Savings Program Act creates two energy efficiency loan programs. The Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program, administered by the Energy Department, will provide interest-free loans to states or territories, which will then re-loan the money to consumers for energy efficiency home renovations. The Rural Star Energy Program, run by the Agriculture Department, will make loans to rural electric co-ops, enabling these organizations to provide loans to qualified consumers to make their homes and businesses become more energy efficient.

Constituents in my district have some of the highest energy costs in the country, especially residents of Hawaii's rural communities. The Rural Star Energy Program would give Kauai Island Utility Cooperative, a rural electric co-op

in my district, the opportunity to help families, farms, and businesses on Kauai save money on their energy bills while reducing energy waste and carbon pollution.

In addition, the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program and the Rural Star Energy Program will help create jobs by increasing demand for energy efficiency products (many of which are made in the United States) and energy equipment retrofits.

I strongly support H.R. 4785 and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program (RESPA).

As a part-time farmer and a representative of a rural district, I know how crippling the cost of energy can be to farms, families and our rural citizens. As our nation moves towards finding cleaner and more efficient ways of generating energy, many people in small communities are finding that the costs of energy efficiency improvements are simply too high. The farmers I talk to know that the savings from these improvements are real, but the upfront costs are too often out of reach. That is what is so important about this bill: through the use of interest-free loans distributed by the Department of Agriculture, it will allow farmers and rural citizens to implement critical energy-efficient technology that will bring their energy costs down.

This bill authorizes USDA's Rural Utilities Service to make interest-free loans to individual or state-based groups of co-ops. These loans will then be used by the co-op to fund energy-efficient improvements for farms or residences. These projects are projected to have a 10 year or less payback period, meaning the customer will realize savings in a relatively quick time frame. The loan will be repaid on the customer's utility bill over a 10 year window.

While this is a great bill for rural America, it is also an important bill for the rest of the country. The energy upgrades mean jobs in America for Americans, in construction, installation, and manufacturing. These are good jobs that cannot be outsourced, the kind of jobs we need to put North Carolinians back to work. At the same time, Americans know that many providers of our imported energy sources like oil are unstable and a potential threat to our national security. This bill moves us forward with a policy that reduces our dependence on these risky sources of energy.

As a Representative who is committed to budget discipline, I am pleased that this bill advances these priorities at absolutely no cost to taxpayers. The co-ops will assume all risks for consumer repayments of their efficiency investments. This means that the Federal Government bears no risk in these transactions and must be repaid by the co-op. This bill moves us a step closer to energy independence without increasing our Federal deficit, and I applaud the bill's sponsor for that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this bill. It is good for our farmers, our rural citizens and for our country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act, which also authorizes the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program. Residential housing accounts for one-third of the Nation's total electricity demand and about 22 percent of all energy use in the United States. Moreover, it is estimated that existing tech-

nologies and practices could reduce energy use—and therefore home energy costs for American families—by up to 40 percent per home. This legislation will allow electric utilities and co-ops to make low-interest loans of a few thousand dollars to consumers who wish to make energy efficient upgrades to their homes. The loans can then be repaid on the consumers' electric bill, with most of the loan costs covered by their savings in electricity.

The Rural Energy Savings and Home Star Energy Efficiency programs will help homeowners with the upfront costs of installing energy efficiency retrofits while boosting markets for U.S. manufacturers of energy efficiency products and creating new jobs for our construction workers and contractors. It is estimated that the two programs will create nearly 200,000 jobs in the construction, manufacturing, and retail sectors that have been devastated by the recent recession. At the same time, these programs will help curb our Nation's carbon emissions and reduce our unsustainable dependence on fossil fuels. This legislation is good for our economy, good for American worker and consumers, good for the environment, and good for our Nation's energy security.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Rural Energy Savings Program Act and the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program contained in today's substitute amendment. Together, these complementary initiatives will create good paying American jobs, save consumers money and enhance our nation's energy security.

The Rural Star program will enable rural electric cooperatives to borrow money from the USDA Rural Utilities Service to fund voluntary and cost-effective energy efficiency upgrades for the citizens they serve. The resulting low-interest loans would bear an interest rate of no greater than three percent and would be repaid on the participating consumers' utility bill over a ten year period of time.

The Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program is designed for those citizens not served by rural electric cooperatives. Under this companion measure, which tracks the National Home Energy Savings Revolving Fund legislation I introduced earlier this Congress, states would be able to borrow federal funds they could then make available to electric utilities and other entities capable of administering a loan program for cost-effective residential energy efficiency retrofits. As an added "Made in America" benefit, it is estimated that 92 percent of the products and materials that would be used in the Home Star program are manufactured in the United States.

Mr. Chair, this is common-sense, forward-looking legislation that will meaningfully advance America's clean energy future. I urge "yes" vote.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chair, the House considers today H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program. I am a cosponsor of the original, bipartisan legislation that would address a critical need in rural America—energy efficiency improvements that will reduce our energy consumption and lower consumers' utility bills.

This original bill creates new loans under the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service. The voluntary loans to electric cooperatives will facilitate their providing low-interest loans to consumers, to be repaid

through utility bills. Loans will allow cooperative customers to make only energy efficiency improvements that are proven to be worth the investment. After the small loans for improvements are repaid, consumers will have a lasting reduction in their bills as their energy consumption declines. The federal government will be repaid, wisely leveraging these taxpayer dollars for long-term benefits. This program is a win-win-win for consumers, the cooperatives that serve them, and taxpayers, and I strongly support this model.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today also includes the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act—a measure the House considered in May of this year and that I opposed. This bill—also known as “Cash for Caulkers”—would authorize more than \$6 billion in new federal spending for rebates to home improvements. I heard from constituents before last spring’s vote that this bill will simply not work for Greater Arizona. The rebates require homeowners to have means to make the improvements in the first place, and in this economic downturn that is simply not an option for many families.

In addition, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act could cost the taxpayers more than \$6 billion over the life of the program. I just spent six weeks back in Greater Arizona meeting with small businesses, working families, and local leaders. The concern I heard expressed most frequently was concern that our deficit is growing too quickly and that our national debt is mortgaging our children’s future. We must stop spending and start to address our long-term fiscal imbalance, and moving forward with this bill is not going to get the job done.

I support our rural electric cooperatives, but I cannot support a bill that will add so significantly to our deficit or that will not help families struggling in these tough times.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise reluctantly to oppose H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act.

I am listed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4785, however, the legislation I added my name to in March is vastly different than the legislation we consider today. The Rural Energy Savings Program Act that I cosponsored, authorized a relatively modest \$750 million over ten-year loan program to assist 1.6 million homeowners in rural America to install energy efficiency measures in their homes. By providing these loans, we would be able to reduce consumer’s energy cost and increase the demand for energy efficient products, thus creating jobs for countless Americans.

Mr. Chair, during these tough economic times, we are all looking for ways to stretch our dollars. One way many consumers seek to reduce their monthly expenditures is by reducing their power bill. However, the average cost of an energy efficient upgrade is \$1,500. Quite simply, in rural America, where income is 14 percent below the national average, many homeowners do not have the up-front funding necessary to install these upgrades, even though the energy savings provided by these upgrades pay for themselves over a relatively short period of time.

Additionally, I supported the original version of H.R. 4785 because it accomplished the laudable, above-described goal, without creating another inefficient government bureaucracy. Instead, the program would have used our nation’s existing and well-functioning rural electric co-ops to distribute these loans to consumers.

I have a long history of supporting the rural electric co-ops, not just in this body, or during my time in the South Carolina State House, but also by paying my monthly power bill to my own rural electric co-op in Berkeley County, South Carolina.

As such it pains me to oppose this legislation. However, the original, modest goal of H.R. 4785 has been lost amid the inclusion of the \$4.25 billion Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program. This portion of the bill would provide funding to states and other unspecified entities to create lending programs for homeowners to make home energy improvements.

Mr. Chair, I support energy efficiency for urban consumers, just as I do for rural consumers. However, unlike the privately owned rural electric co-ops, who have provided many years of faithful service, the Department of Energy has not proven they are capable of effectively managing such a large program.

The so-called “Stimulus” legislation provided \$4.7 billion to the Department of Energy in order to weatherize the homes of low-income individuals. However, the Department’s own Inspector General has found that one year after the Stimulus was passed into law only \$368 million or 7.83 percent had been used and only 30,297 units had been weatherized.

Considering this abject failure, I simply cannot vote to provide another \$4.25 billion of our taxpayer’s dollars to the Department of Energy. I am not alone in my opposition to the Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program. In fact, the House voted earlier this year to remove this objectionable program from H.R. 5019 the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act by a broad bipartisan vote of 346 to 68. It is very objectionable this program has been brought back for a vote as a portion of H.R. 4785. As such, I am forced to rise in opposition to H.R. 4785 although I remain supportive of the original purpose of the legislation and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in order to lower the electricity costs of all Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise today to comment on H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program. As marked up by the House Committee on Agriculture, this legislation would truly help rural America. Unfortunately, the bill considered on the House floor today, is an expensive, and unfortunate alternative that could result in \$4.25 billion in extra spending that has nothing to do with rural America.

The Rural Energy Savings Program would allow electric cooperatives to borrow money for the purposes of funding local energy efficiency programs. Eligible co-ops would provide money for energy efficiency upgrades to farms and rural consumers in the form of low-interest loans. In many cases, the costs to consumers would be covered by the resulting savings in their respective energy bills.

I support H.R. 4785, as originally passed by the House Agriculture Committee. This voluntary program would help electric cooperatives provide potential energy solutions to their members. I voted against the rule for H.R. 4785, which had it failed would have paved the way for members to vote on a clean bill. However, the bill before us today adds a \$4.25 billion authorization for a “Home Star” energy program that the House has already defeated once and therefore I voted no on the overall package.

I strongly support section two of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program, and urge the House and Senate to work together to craft a bill that mirrors the work completed in the House Agriculture Committee. This Rural Energy Savings program is a sensible approach that could improve energy efficiency in rural America.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, although I support incentives to promote energy efficiency as well as the work of contractors across the country who make our homes and businesses more energy efficient, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act.

During the 6 week August recess, I heard over and over from my constituents in Northwest Georgia that the Federal Government needs to get its fiscal house in order. That is hard to accomplish when—for the first time in the modern era—Congress failed to even adopt a budget blueprint for the fiscal year. Why is it that hardworking families have to make difficult decisions on their personal budgets while Washington can’t? The American people deserve better.

Mr. Chair, unfortunately, the Democratic Majority just doesn’t get it. I find it hard to believe that the message they are receiving from their constituents is much different than what I am hearing. Yet, they don’t seem to be listening.

At a time where we have amassed a \$1.3 trillion deficit for Fiscal Year 2010 alone and we are faced with over \$13 trillion in debt, we need to demonstrate fiscal restraint. Instead, H.R. 4785 seeks to spend an additional \$5 billion when the American people are begging us to reduce spending.

Mr. Chair, I believe that we must take the needed steps to get federal spending under control. The Democratic Majority has clearly demonstrated that it is out of touch with the American people by passing the \$862 billion “Stimulus” and the \$1 trillion ObamaCare bill. H.R. 4785 embodies that same attitude that we must spend our way back to prosperity, when we have seen it fail time after time.

Therefore, despite my support for energy efficiency programs and the people who would benefit from this legislation, I urge all of my colleagues to listen to the American people and curb federal spending.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-594. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4785

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

SECTION 1. HOME STAR ENERGY EFFICIENCY LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—*In this section:*

(1) **ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.**—The term “eligible participant” means a homeowner who receives financial assistance from a qualified financing entity to carry out qualifying energy savings measures pursuant to this section, and who is not also a qualified consumer under section 2.

(2) **QUALIFIED FINANCING ENTITY.**—The term “qualified financing entity” means a State, political subdivision of a State, tribal government, electric utility, natural gas utility, nonprofit or community-based organization, energy service company, retailer, or any other entity that—

(A) meets the eligibility requirements of this section; and

(B) is designated by the Governor of a State in accordance with subsection (f)(1),

except that an entity that is an eligible entity under section 2 shall not be a qualified financing entity.

(3) **QUALIFIED LOAN PROGRAM MECHANISM.**—The term “qualified loan program mechanism” means a mechanism for the establishment and operation of a loan program that is—

(A) administered by a qualified financing entity; and

(B) funded in significant part—

(i) by funds provided by or overseen by a State; or

(ii) through the energy loan program of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(4) **QUALIFYING ENERGY SAVINGS MEASURE.**—The term “qualifying energy savings measure” means a measure listed under subsection (c)(1) or (2) or stipulated in a whole-house analysis under subsection (c)(3).

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Energy shall establish a Home Star Energy Efficiency Loan Program under which the Secretary of Energy shall offer loans at zero percent interest to States to support financial assistance provided by qualified financing entities for the installation of qualifying energy savings measures.

(c) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES AND STANDARDS.**—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall publish—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a master list of residential energy efficiency measures determined to be cost-effective, readily available from commercial sources, to be permanently installed in a residence, and capable of supporting measurement and verification of the energy savings that results from their adoption;

(2) additions to such a list, approved by the Secretary of Energy, of other residential energy efficiency measures that are—

(A) recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture;

(B) calculated to achieve sufficient energy savings that they will achieve a simple payback within 10 years or less; and

(C) permanently installed in a residence;

(3) specifications for whole-house energy performance analyses simulating energy use before and after a retrofit utilizing measures from the master list published pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) and such other permanent structural measures as can be demonstrated, when installed and operated as intended, to improve residential energy efficiency in a manner that can be determined with confidence to be cost-effective and to recover their own cost in energy cost savings within the term of a proposed loan; and

(4) a protocol for measurement and verification of the energy savings that have resulted from any and all energy efficiency measures taken with respect to a residence and financed in whole or in part pursuant to this title.

(d) **ELIGIBILITY OF QUALIFIED FINANCING ENTITIES.**—To be eligible to participate in the Home Star Loan Program, a qualified financing entity shall—

(1) offer a financing product under which eligible participants may pay over time for the cost to the eligible participant (after all applicable

Federal, State, local, and other rebates or incentives are applied) of installations described in subsection (b);

(2) require all financed installations to be performed by contractors in a manner that meets building code requirements and other appropriate minimum standards;

(3) establish standard underwriting criteria to determine the eligibility of Home Star Loan Program applicants, which criteria shall be consistent with—

(A) with respect to unsecured consumer loan programs, standard underwriting criteria used under the energy loan program of the Federal National Mortgage Association; or

(B) with respect to secured loans or other forms of financial assistance, commercially recognized best practices applicable to the form of financial assistance being provided (as determined by the designated entity administering the Home Star Loan Program in the State); and

(4) undertake particular efforts to make such loans available in public use microdata areas that have a poverty rate of 12 percent or more in a proportion of total loans made at least equal to the proportion the number of residents in such areas bears to the total population of the area served by that qualified financing entity.

(e) **ALLOCATION.**—In allocating 75 percent of the loan funds made available to States for each fiscal year under this section, the Secretary of Energy shall use the formula used to allocate funds to States to carry out State energy conservation plans established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.), with appropriate modifications to reflect the funds to be provided in States for loans under section 2. In allocating the remaining 25 percent of the loan funds made available to States for each fiscal year under this section, the Secretary of Energy may vary the result of the formula to recognize and reward those States that make the best progress in providing loans to low-income areas pursuant to subsection (d)(4).

(f) **QUALIFIED FINANCING ENTITIES.**—Before making funds available to a State under this section, the Secretary of Energy shall require the Governor of the State to provide to the Secretary of Energy a letter of agreement that the State—

(1) will use the funds provided pursuant to this section solely as provided in this section;

(2) has 1 or more qualified financing entities that meet the requirements of this section;

(3) has established, or has required its designated qualified financing entities to establish, a qualified loan program mechanism that—

(A) will use a quality assurance program or another appropriate methodology to ensure energy savings;

(B) incorporates an effective repayment mechanism, which may include—

(i) on-utility-bill repayment;

(ii) tax assessment or other form of property assessment financing;

(iii) municipal service charges;

(iv) energy or energy efficiency services contracts;

(v) energy efficiency power purchase agreements;

(vi) unsecured loans applying the underwriting requirements of the energy loan program of the Federal National Mortgage Association; or

(vii) alternative contractual repayment mechanisms that have been demonstrated to have appropriate risk mitigation features;

(4) will provide, in a timely manner, all information regarding the administration of the Home Star Loan Program as the Secretary of Energy may require to permit the Secretary of Energy to meet program evaluation requirements; and

(5) will commit to the full repayment of the loaned funds to the Secretary of Energy by a date not later than 20 years from the date of the loan closing.

(g) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds made available to States for carrying out the Home Star Loan Program may be used to support financing mechanisms offered by qualified financing entities to eligible participants, including—

(1) interest rate reductions to interest rates as low as zero percent;

(2) loan loss reserves or other forms of credit enhancement;

(3) revolving loan funds from which qualified financing entities may offer direct loans; or

(4) other debt instruments necessary—

(A) to use available funds to obtain appropriate leverage through private investment; and

(B) to support widespread deployment of energy efficiency programs.

(h) **USE OF REPAID FUNDS.**—In the case of a revolving loan fund described in subsection (g)(3), a qualified financing entity may use funds repaid by eligible participants under the Home Star Loan Program to provide financial assistance for additional eligible participants for installations described in subsection (b) in a manner that is consistent with this section.

(i) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—A State may permit a qualified financing entity to charge interest of 3 percent to cover the costs of loan administration and personnel and program management, or for establishing a loan loss reserve.

(j) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary of Energy shall report to the Congress on the implementation of this title, including the energy savings and cost savings estimated to be achieved, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and again by not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section.

(k) **ASSESSMENT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.**—The Comptroller General shall, by not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, prepare and submit to the Congress an analysis and report determining—

(1) the actual taxpayer funds made available for the program created in this section;

(2) the actual amounts of such funds made available to eligible participants or qualified consumers in the program created in this section;

(3) the extent of measured and verified residential energy savings achieved and expected to be achieved on an ongoing basis as a function of this program;

(4) the extent to which funds were made available to support commercial or industrial energy efficiency measures under this program;

(5) the extent to which funds made available were expended for training, administration, program support by contractors, or trade association activities under this program; and

(6) the consistency and rigor of the standards for energy efficiency and for measurement and verification adopted and implemented by this program.

(l) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of this section \$850,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 2. RURAL ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) any public or cooperative electric utility that is eligible to borrow from the Rural Utilities Service electrification program authorized under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) that serves a rural area;

(B) any current borrower of the Rural Utilities Service electrification program authorized under that Act; or

(C) any entity primarily owned or controlled by an entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term “energy efficiency measure”, with respect to property served by an eligible entity, means a

fixed structural improvement and investment in a cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technology to reduce residential energy use that is either—

(A) included in the master list published under section 1(c)(1) and (2); or

(B) stipulated in a whole-house simulation conducted pursuant to section 1(c)(3).

(3) FARM EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term “farm efficiency measure” means an energy saving application that is a fixed improvement installed in or attached to a building or structure on a farm at a total loan value for that farm of \$50,000 or less, that is not otherwise an energy efficiency measure, and that would achieve energy savings sufficient to repay the cost of the measure in 10 years or fewer.

(4) QUALIFIED CONSUMER.—The term “qualified consumer” means a consumer served by an eligible entity that has the ability to repay a loan made under subsection (d), as determined by an eligible entity, and who has not accepted any loan as an eligible participant pursuant to section 1.

(5) QUALIFIED ENTITY.—The term “qualified entity” means any organization that the Secretary of Agriculture determines has significant experience in providing eligible entities with—

(A) advice on energy, environmental, energy efficiency, and information research and technology;

(B) training, education, and consulting;

(C) guidance in energy and operational issues and rural community and economic development; and

(D) other relevant assistance, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) RURAL AREA.—The term “rural area” means any area other than—

(A) a city or town that has a population of greater than 50,000 inhabitants; and

(B) any urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to a city or town described in subparagraph (A).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Rural Utility Service, shall establish the Rural Star Energy Savings Program for the purpose of making loans to eligible entities that agree to accept the loan funds authorized pursuant to this section to make loans to qualified consumers for the purpose of implementing residential energy efficiency measures or farm efficiency measures approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) LOANS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

(1) LOANS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall make loans to an eligible entity that agrees that the loan funds will be used to make loans to qualified consumers as described in subsection (d) for the purpose of implementing one or more energy efficiency measures, or a farm efficiency measure in response to an application by an eligible entity.

(2) LIST, PLAN, AND MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition to receiving a loan under paragraph (1), an eligible entity shall—

(i) establish a list of energy efficiency measures or farm efficiency measures expected to decrease energy use or costs of a qualified consumer from the master list published under section 1(c)(1) and (2);

(ii) establish a procedure to identify to the Secretary of Agriculture any specific farm efficiency measures for which the eligible entity seeks authority to make a loan;

(iii) prepare an implementation plan for use of the loan funds to ensure that a loan to a qualified consumer is for energy efficiency investments that will achieve savings sufficient to service the loan during the term of the loan; and

(iv) provide for appropriate measurement and verification as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture to ensure the actual use and effectiveness of the energy efficiency loans made by the eligible entity.

(B) REVISION OF LIST OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—An eligible entity may update the list required under subparagraph (A)(i) to account for efficiency technologies added to the master list published under section 1(c)(1) pursuant to section 1(c)(2), or farm efficiency measures approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(C) EXISTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS.—An eligible entity that, on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, has already established an energy efficiency program for qualified consumers may submit an existing list of energy efficiency measures or farm efficiency measures, implementation plans, or measurement and verification systems to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (A) to the Secretary of Agriculture and may use such list until and unless such list is inconsistent with the measures published pursuant to section 1(c)(1) and (2).

(3) LOAN TERMS FOR LOANS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

(A) NO INTEREST.—A loan made to an eligible entity under paragraph (1) shall bear no interest.

(B) REPAYMENT.—With respect to a loan under paragraph (1)—

(i) the term shall not exceed 20 years from the date the loan is closed; and

(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (D), the repayment of each advance shall be amortized for a period not to exceed 10 years.

(C) AMOUNT OF ADVANCES.—Any advance of loan funds to an eligible entity in any single year shall not exceed 30 percent of the approved loan amount.

(D) SPECIAL ADVANCE FOR START-UP ACTIVITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist an eligible entity in defraying initial start-up costs, the Secretary of Agriculture shall allow an eligible entity to request a special advance.

(ii) AMOUNT OF SPECIAL ADVANCE.—No eligible entity may receive a special advance under this subparagraph for an amount that is greater than 4 percent of the loan amount received by the eligible entity under paragraph (1).

(iii) REPAYMENT.—The repayment of the special advance shall be required within 10 years after the special advance is made and, at the election of the eligible entity, may be deferred to the end of the 10-year period.

(E) LIMITATION ON ADVANCES.—All advances shall be made under a loan described in paragraph (1) within the first 10 years of the term of the loan.

(d) LOANS TO QUALIFIED CONSUMERS.—

(1) TERMS OF LOANS.—Loans made by an eligible entity to qualified consumers using loan funds provided by the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (c)—

(A) may bear interest, not to exceed three percent, to be used by the eligible entity for purposes such as establishing a loan loss reserve and to offset personnel and program costs of the eligible entity to provide the loans;

(B) shall finance only energy efficiency measures or farm efficiency measures for the purpose of decreasing energy usage or costs of a qualified consumer by an amount such that a loan term of not more than 10 years will achieve a simple payback of the amount invested;

(C) shall not be used to fund purchases of, or modifications to, personal property unless the personal property—

(i) is or becomes attached to real property as a fixture; or

(ii) is a manufactured home;

(D) shall be repaid through charges added to the electric bill for the property for, or at which energy efficiency measures are or will be implemented, except that this requirement shall not be construed to prohibit—

(i) the voluntary prepayment of a loan by the owner of the property; or

(ii) the use of any additional repayment mechanisms that are—

(1) demonstrated to have appropriate risk mitigation features, as determined by the eligible entity; or

(II) required if the qualified consumer is no longer a customer of the eligible entity; and

(E) shall require an energy audit to determine the impact of proposed energy efficiency measures on the energy costs and consumption of the qualified consumer.

(2) CONTRACTORS.—In addition to any other qualified general contractor, eligible entities may serve as general contractors.

(3) USE OF OTHER ENERGY EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES.—Energy efficiency incentives made available under any other Act, including rebates, grants, or any other payments, may be used to reduce the amount of a loan made under this subsection to qualified consumers in order to meet the requirement of paragraph (1)(B).

(e) MEASUREMENT, VERIFICATION, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Agriculture—

(A) shall establish an implementation and measurement and verification advisory committee consisting of representatives of eligible entities and qualified entities;

(B) may enter into cooperative agreements with qualified entities to provide technical assistance and training to the employees of eligible entities to carry out this section; and

(C) shall establish a process to compile and maintain a directory of energy efficiency auditors that are used by eligible entities to carry out this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) The Secretary of Agriculture shall not utilize the authority provided under this subsection or subsection (j) to—

(i) develop, adopt, or implement a public labeling system that rates and compares the energy performance among qualified consumers; or

(ii) require the public disclosure of an energy performance evaluation or rating developed for any qualified consumer.

(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude—

(i) the computation, collection, or use, by the Secretary of Agriculture, eligible entity, or qualified entity for the purposes of aggregating information on the rating and comparison of the energy performance among qualified consumers with and without energy efficiency features or on energy performance evaluation or rating;

(ii) the use and publication of aggregate data (without identifying individual qualified consumers) based on information referred to in clause (i) to determine or demonstrate the performance of this program; or

(iii) the provision of information referred to in clause (i) with respect to a qualified consumer:

(I) to the State, eligible consumer, eligible entity, or qualified entity, as necessary to enable carrying out this title; or

(II) for purposes of prosecuting fraud and abuse.

(f) FAST START DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall, not later than 90 days after the enactment of this section, enter into agreements with eligible entities (or groups of eligible entities) that have established an energy efficiency program described in subsection (c)(2)(C) to establish an energy efficiency loan demonstration projects consistent with the purposes of this section that—

(1) implement approaches to energy audits and investments in energy efficiency measures or farm efficiency measures that yield measurable and predictable savings;

(2) use measurement and verification processes to determine the effectiveness of energy efficiency loans made by eligible entities;

(3) include training for employees of eligible entities, including any contractors of such entities, to implement or oversee the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2);

(4) provide for the participation of a majority of eligible entities in a State;

(5) reduce the need for generating capacity;

(6) provide efficiency loans to—

(A) not fewer than 20,000 consumers, in the case of a single eligible entity; or

(B) not fewer than 80,000 consumers, in the case of a group of eligible entities; and

(7) serve areas where 15 percent or more of consumers reside—

(A) in manufactured homes; or

(B) in housing units that are more than 50 years old.

(g) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The authority provided in this section is in addition to any authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to offer loans under any other law.

(h) **EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the loans and other expenditures required to be made under this section are authorized to be made during each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(i) **REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this section.

(2) **PROCEDURE.**—The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this section shall be made without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”); and

(B) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking.

(3) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use the authority provided under section 808 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) **INTERIM REGULATIONS.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), to the extent regulations are necessary to carry out any provision of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement such regulations through the promulgation of an interim rule.

(j) **AUDIT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct an audit of the program authorized by this section to ensure that the funds provided to eligible entities under this section are used in accordance with the purpose of this section.

(k) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall report to the Congress on the implementation of this Act, including the energy savings and costs savings estimated to be achieved, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and again not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(l) **ASSESSMENT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.**—The Comptroller General shall, by not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, prepare and submit to the Congress an analysis and report determining—

(1) the actual taxpayer funds made available for the program created in this section;

(2) the actual amounts of such funds made available to eligible entities for qualified consumers in the program created in this section;

(3) the extent of measured and verified energy savings achieved and expected to be achieved on an ongoing basis as a function of the program created in this section;

(4) the extent to which funds made available were expended for training, administration, and program support by eligible entities and qualified entities under the program created in this section; and

(5) the consistency and rigor of the standards for energy efficiency and for measurement and verification adopted and implemented by program created in this section.

(m) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of this section \$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014, which shall remain available until expended.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a sub-

stitute is in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLDEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 111-594.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 1, after line 17, insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) is not an entity that has an ongoing capital repayment obligation to the Department of the Treasury pursuant to the Troubled Asset Relief Program (Public Law 110-343, 122 Stat. 3765); and

Page 2, line 1, redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C).

Page 6, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(2) will use the funds provided under this section to supplement and not supplant any prior or planned Federal and State funding provided to carry out energy efficiency programs, on the condition that, to the extent the Secretary finds that a State has supplanted other such programs with funding under this section, the Secretary may withhold an equivalent amount of funding from allocations for the State under this section;

Page 10, strike lines 5 through 7.

Page 10, line 8, strike “(5)” and insert “(4)”.

Page 10, line 12, strike “(6)” and insert “(5)”.

Page 10, line 17, after “this section” insert “, provided that enactment of this Act would not increase direct spending.”.

Page 18, strike lines 3 through 8 and insert the following:

(C) shall not be used to fund—

(i) the purchase of a manufactured home; or

(ii) the purchase of any other personal property unless the personal property is or becomes attached to real property as a fixture;

(D) shall not be used to fund modifications to personal property unless the personal property—

(i) is or becomes attached to real property as a fixture; or

(ii) is a manufactured home;

Page 18, line 9, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 18, line 24, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

Page 20, line 8, strike “(j)” and insert “(i)”.

Page 25, line 19, after “this section” insert “, provided that enactment of this Act would not increase direct spending.”.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION.

Neither the Secretary of Energy nor the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide any funds authorized by this Act to any contractor that employs an employee to work in a consumer’s home if that employee has been convicted of, or plead guilty to, a crime of

child molestation, rape, or any other form of sexual assault.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) A loan shall not be provided to a Federal employee under this Act if any of the following apply to the employee:

(1) The employee has a seriously delinquent tax debt (as determined under subsection (b)).

(2) 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)).

(3) 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.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)(1), 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—

(1) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code; or

(2) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code is requested, pending, or completed and no payment is required.

SEC. 5. WRONGFUL USE OR DIVERSION OF PROGRAM FUNDS.

The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such steps as are necessary and appropriate, including requirements for the immediate repayment of Federal assistance, to ensure that none of the funds authorized in this Act are used—

(1) in violation of law;

(2) in a manner that creates a significant threat to human health or safety;

(3) in a manner that undercuts the integrity and accountability of the program under this Act; or

(4) for purposes other than those serving the objectives of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1620, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1300

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, the manager’s amendment contains the following provisions: It prohibits entities with ongoing TARP obligations from participating in the program. It mandates that funds provided by the legislation must be used to supplement and not to supplant other energy efficiency funding. It says that no report has to be filed by the comptroller general regarding the extent to which funds provided by the legislation are used to support commercial or industrial energy measures. It prohibits any additions to direct spending with respect to the legislation. It forbids funds from being used to purchase personal property, including manufactured homes; but allows funds to be used for modifications to manufactured homes.

The manager’s amendment prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from promulgating regulations regarding a

home labeling program. It also prohibits the wrongful use or diversion of program funds, as well as prohibits providing funds to any contractor who employs any person who has been convicted of, or pled guilty to, any form of sexual assault. Finally, it prohibits Federal employees from receiving loan funds if they have seriously delinquent tax debt, have received a payment in violation of LIHEAA, or have been officially disciplined for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography on a Federal Government computer or while performing official Federal Government duties.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. While I claim the time in opposition, I would state for the RECORD that I support my good friend from Pennsylvania's amendment. I support his efforts to import more integrity into this. What I am afraid of is a duplicative program. More importantly, I support his attempt to make sure that that the program does not affect direct spending. As my good friend has mentioned, his amendment prohibits any direct or mandatory spending. What it does not do, however, is prevent appropriators from adding to our national debt by spending discretionary dollars on the program.

While I support my friend's efforts to be truly fiscally responsible, this act should sunset if it is not deficit neutral. Again, I support Mr. HOLDEN's amendment and urge others to do the same. I would prefer language that more directly prevents direct spending, but this is what we have.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I too rise in support of the Holden amendment. It is not as good as our motion to recommit from back in May, it is not as good as the Barton amendment that was offered to the Rules Committee, but it is strangely similar. So if flattery is the most sincere form of compliment, then I am complimented that you have taken a page out of our playbook. It is going to make our coming motion to recommit much more difficult to develop, but I can assure you that agile minds are working as we speak on that motion to recommit. But for purposes of this debate, both Mr. LUCAS and myself do support your amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlemen from North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas for their support of the manager's amendment, and encourage its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 111-594.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

(n) The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide assistance and technical advice to the qualified entities providing loans under this bill in conducting outreach for the purposes of increasing participation of economically distressed rural communities with unemployment rates above the national average, or rural areas that lack basic living necessities, such as water and sewer systems, electricity, and safe, sanitary housing, in the program established under this section.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1620, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment to the Rural Energy Savings Program. This amendment will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance and advice to the entities providing loans under this act to increase participation in the areas of high unemployment. This important amendment will go a long way towards making sure those areas that have been hit the hardest are about to take advantage of this legislation.

As you know, unemployment is still a real problem for many Americans throughout the country. In my congressional district, as an example, I have two counties that are significantly above the national average for unemployment, which is about 9.4. Hidalgo County is suffering at 11.1 percent, and Starr County is at 17.3 percent.

This amendment will make sure that these communities are not left out of this good piece of legislation. Under my amendment, USDA will provide its expertise to the entities providing loans for the purposes of outreach. This amendment will increase economic activity in the areas that need it the most while providing valuable energy cost savings.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOLDEN, and the other folks who have been working very hard, and also the

ranking members. I thank you, and stand in strong support of this piece of legislation along with my amendment. I ask Members to vote "yes" on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I claim the time in opposition, Mr. Chairman, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

This amendment would simply direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance and technical advice to electric cooperatives who have been approved as qualified entities in an effort to improve the outreach to the rural communities it serves with unemployment rates above the national average, as the author noted. As I understand the amendment, it does not require special treatment; rather it focuses on promotion of the program to those communities that are hit hard by the failing economy.

I think the gentleman's intentions are laudable, and given the legislative framework that the majority leadership has us working in, I do not oppose this amendment. I do, however, think there are better ways to bring cheap and efficient energy to these communities.

The prohibition on lending in the last farm bill to increase base load generation from clean coal, natural gas, and nuclear technologies is the biggest hidden tax on rural Americans that I can possibly think of, administered by the present majority leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank the ranking member for his support and again thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLYBURN, and all of the folks who have worked so hard. I ask Members to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 111-594.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. ____ . PRIORITY FOR ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

In providing loans to eligible participants under section 1 or qualified consumers under section 2, the lender shall give priority to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty and to veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1620, the gentlewoman from New

York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I want to thank Chairmen PETERSON and WAXMAN and Ranking Members LUCAS and BARTON for bringing forward this important legislation. I also thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, TIM HOLDEN.

Mr. Chairman, energy costs in this country continue to rise. For many families these costs are becoming an unbearable burden. I support this bill and believe that it will be a great help to many American families. H.R. 4785 creates the tools necessary to give homeowners control over their energy costs. The loans provided for in this bill will allow homeowners to invest in energy efficiency measures that will provide long-term savings to many, many families. It will help bring down energy costs for homeowners, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and help us transition towards a clean-energy economy.

Although all Americans are facing the reality of rising energy costs, for our active duty troops and our veterans, the challenges of skyrocketing energy costs can be even more problematic. The members of our active duty military must often balance their household and service requirements. Does this still get your point across? I believe it does.

Our veterans, both our new veterans just starting out and our older veterans living on a fixed income, also have unique challenges when it comes to their energy costs.

□ 1310

I believe it is important that we give priority in this bill to those men and women who have sacrificed and who continue to sacrifice for our country. This is what my amendment does. Let us make sure that, with all the challenges in life, our active duty members and veterans are able to worry a little less about their electricity bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes. Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In agriculture, we've learned the hard way, Mr. Chairman, that carve-outs and programs generally reduce the effectiveness of the programs. It's a simple economic principle. By focusing on the beneficiary instead of the results, the marginal utility is lowered.

Now, having said that, I can think of no more deserving group than the brave men and women of our Armed Services to be prioritized in any Federal program. Yes, I support and encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 111-594.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. What is the protocol when the author of an amendment is not on the floor and the amendment is called?

The CHAIR. The Chair is trying to ascertain whether the proponent will offer the amendment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Is there a prescribed waiting period? Are we in a holding pattern around an airport or, within a minute, no-show, no-go?

The CHAIR. The Chair will respect Members' opportunities to offer amendments, and the Chair will wait momentarily until finding out whether the amendment will be offered.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to continue with the bill. If the author is not here, he has lost his opportunity to offer it. So I would ask unanimous consent to move forward in consideration of pending business of the House and to skip over the amendment.

The CHAIR. This is the last amendment.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I stand to offer this amendment as a designee.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, requesting the right to object, I seek recognition to object if it is under the rules. We don't know. I have great faith in Mr. BUTTERFIELD, but I am not sure he has been authorized by Mr. INSLEE. If Mr. INSLEE is not here, I would object, with all due respect to Mr. BUTTERFIELD's substituting for him, without knowing whether Mr. INSLEE wants him to.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the gentleman from Washington is en route to the floor. I simply stood to offer the amendment to make it in order. The gentleman who offered the amendment should be here momentarily.

The CHAIR. The Chair then will wait until the gentleman arrives.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Will the Chair give that consideration to Members of the minority if we happen to be tardy and dawdling? We certainly are cognizant of the graciousness, but the House of Representatives is a busy place, and I always thought if you weren't here, you lost your spot in the lineup.

The CHAIR. Under House Resolution 1620, unanimous consent is not required for a designee to offer an amendment.

The Chair is prepared to recognize the gentleman from North Carolina. The Chair has actually been very nonbiased to both sides, and intends to be fair to both sides.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am not disparaging of the Chair's nonbiasness. I hope we will have that similar consideration.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized to offer the amendment.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed as the designee.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 12, insert the following: In determining which residential energy efficiency measures to include in the list published under paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall consider advanced performance initiatives, such as the Passive House Standard as certified by the Passive House Institute US.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1620, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me apologize to the Chair, to the ranking member and to my colleagues for all of the confusion, but we are ready to proceed on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed this amendment. It appears to be in keeping with the spirit of the underlying legislation. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would ask the author's designee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, if he would engage in a colloquy on this amendment.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. To the extent that I can, Mr. BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Would you define what a "passive house" is?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I do not have that material in front of me, Mr. BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Okay. So we're getting a pig-in-the-poke here; is that right?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. You certainly appreciate the disadvantage at which I find myself.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I am not totally opposed to this amendment. I don't know too much more about it than Mr. BUTTERFIELD, but I do know that this "passive house" concept, while it saves energy once it is in place, is more expensive to construct. It is my understanding that the concept that the amendment supports is substantially more expensive than

standard construction. That may be appropriate when people have high incomes and when the cost of construction is really of little interest; but for most of my constituents, Mr. Chairman, the initial cost is of significance.

Again, I don't think there is a tremendous downside to this amendment, but I think it should be pointed out that if the Department of Energy, which it is not under the amendment required to mandate this, did direct that it had to meet this test, you would raise construction costs substantially, and I think that is something that should be of concern.

I am going to oppose the amendment but not vigorously. I do think that the author of the amendment usually should be on the floor when the amendment is offered, and I would hope that we would take notice that the author was not. We should give kudos to Mr. BUTTERFIELD for substituting in his place.

I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment printed in part B of House Report 111-594 on which further proceedings were postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLDEN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 402, noes 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

AYES—402

Aderholt	Baldwin	Bishop (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (NY)
Akin	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Alexander	Bartlett	Blackburn
Altmire	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Andrews	Bean	Bocchieri
Arcuri	Becerra	Bonner
Austria	Berkley	Bono Mack
Baca	Berman	Boozman
Bachmann	Berry	Bordallo
Bachus	Biggert	Boren
Baird	Bilirakis	Boswell

Boucher	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Boustany	Gohmert	Markey (CO)
Boyd	Gonzalez	Markey (MA)
Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	Marshall
Brady (TX)	Gordon (TN)	Matheson
Braley (IA)	Granger	Matsui
Bright	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (SC)	Grayson	McCaul
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McClintock
Brown-Waite,	Green, Gene	McCollum
Ginny	Griffith	McCotter
Buchanan	Grijalva	McDermott
Burgess	Guthrie	McGovern
Burton (IN)	Gutierrez	McHenry
Butterfield	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Calvert	Halvorson	McMahon
Camp	Hare	McMorris
Campbell	Harper	Rodgers
Cantor	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Cao	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Capito	Heinrich	Melancon
Capps	Hensarling	Mica
Capuano	Herger	Michaud
Cardoza	Hersteth Sandlin	Miller (FL)
Carnahan	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Carney	Hill	Miller (NC)
Carson (IN)	Himes	Miller, Gary
Carter	Hinchey	Miller, George
Cassidy	Hinojosa	Minnick
Castle	Hirono	Mitchell
Chaffetz	Hoekstra	Moore (KS)
Chandler	Holden	Moran (KS)
Childers	Holt	Moran (VA)
Chu	Honda	Murphy (CT)
Clarke	Hoyer	Murphy (NY)
Clay	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick
Cleaver	Inglis	Murphy, Tim
Clyburn	Inslee	Myrick
Coble	Israel	Nadler (NY)
Coffman (CO)	Issa	Napolitano
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Cole	Jackson Lee	Neugebauer
Conaway	(TX)	Nunes
Connolly (VA)	Jenkins	Nye
Conyers	Johnson (IL)	Oliver
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Costello	Jones	Pallone
Courtney	Jordan (OH)	Pascarella
Crenshaw	Kagen	Pastor (AZ)
Critz	Kanjorski	Paul
Crowley	Kaptur	Paulsen
Cuellar	Kildee	Payne
Culberson	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence
Cummings	Kilroy	Perlmutter
Dahlkemper	Kind	Perriello
Davis (AL)	King (IA)	Peters
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Peterson
Davis (IL)	Kingston	Petri
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Pierluisi
Davis (TN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kissell	Pitts
DeGette	Klein (FL)	Platts
DeLauro	Kline (MN)	Poe (TX)
Dent	Kosmas	Polis (CO)
Deutch	Kratovil	Pomeroy
Dicks	Kucinich	Posey
Dingell	Lamborn	Price (GA)
Djou	Lance	Price (NC)
Doggett	Langevin	Quigley
Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Dreier	Latham	Rehberg
Driehaus	LaTourette	Reichert
Duncan	Latta	Reyes
Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)	Rodriguez
Edwards (TX)	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)
Ehlers	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Faleomavaega	Linder	Rooney
Farr	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Fattah	LoBiondo	Roskam
Filner	Loebsack	Ross
Flake	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)
Forbes	Lowe	Roybal-Allard
Fortenberry	Lucas	Royce
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Ruppersberger
Fox	Lujan	Rush
Frank (MA)	Lummis	Ryan (OH)
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Frelinghuysen	E.	Sablan
Fudge	Lynch	Salazar
Galleghy	Mack	Sánchez, Linda
Garamendi	Maffei	T.
Gerlach	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Giffords	Manzullo	Sarbanes

Scalise	Smith (TX)	Upton
Schakowsky	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen
Schauer	Snyder	Velázquez
Schiff	Space	Vislousky
Schmidt	Speier	Walden
Schock	Spratt	Walz
Schrader	Stark	Wamp
Schwartz	Stearns	Wasserman
Scott (GA)	Stupak	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Sullivan	Waters
Sensenbrenner	Sutton	Watson
Serrano	Taylor	Watt
Sessions	Teague	Waxman
Sestak	Terry	Weiner
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland
Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Shuler	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Shuster	Tiaht	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Tiberi	Wittman
Sires	Titus	Wolf
Skelton	Tonko	Woolsey
Slaughter	Towns	Wu
Smith (NE)	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Eshoo	Norton
Bilbray	Fallin	Oberstar
Blunt	Fleming	Obey
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	Olson
Castor (FL)	Harman	Putnam
Christensen	Heller	Radanovich
Delahunt	Hodes	Richardson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Ellsworth	Mollohan	Tierney
Engel	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)

□ 1349

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, today I was unavoidably delayed and unable to return to the floor in time for rollcall vote 529.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 529, I would have voted "aye" (the Manager's Amendment to H.R. 4785).

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. SALAZAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1620, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHADEGG. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shadegg moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4785 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 5, insert "with a gross annual household income of less than \$250,000" after "homeowner".

Page 1, line 9, insert "A homeowner may not qualify as an eligible participant if the homeowner has been more than 6 months delinquent in child support payments." after "under section 2."

Page 1, lines 13 and 14, strike "or community-based".

Page 3, line 10, insert "primary" after "installed in a".

Page 3, line 12, insert ", but which shall not include the installation or replacement of pool heaters or the installation of Energy Star televisions" after "their adoption".

Page 3, line 21, insert "primary" after "installed in a".

Page 5, line 16, insert ", consistent with paragraph (3)," after "particular efforts".

Page 8, line 22, through page 9, line 3, strike subsection (h) (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly).

Page 9, line 14, insert "The Secretary of Energy shall also include a detailed accounting of any waste, fraud, or abuse occurring in the administration of this Act in such reports." after "of this section."

Page 10, line 11, strike "and".

Page 10, line 15, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 10, after line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) the extent to which any waste, fraud, or abuse occurred under this program.

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION.

(a) Funds authorized by this Act shall only be made available for the purpose of carrying out qualifying energy savings measures on a primary residence.

(b) Neither the Secretary of Energy nor the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide any funds authorized by this Act to any contractor that has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to any fraudulent offense.

SEC. 4. SUNSET.

The provisions of this Act shall be suspended and shall not apply if this Act will have a negative net effect on the national budget deficit of the United States.

Mr. SHADEGG (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 Arizona?

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. CLYBURN (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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation creates a \$5 billion government loan program to assist people in purchasing energy efficiency devices. Anytime we spend that amount of money, we ought to be very careful about the spending of that money, especially since we face a \$1.3 trillion deficit. Earlier this year, the GAO conducted an investigation which found rampant fraud and abuse in the highly touted Energy Star Program.

Sadly, many companies have become very creative in ripping off the Department of Energy and the Energy Star Program. The motion to recommit makes a number of sensible changes and restrictions to protect the taxpayers in the implementation of this legislation.

First, it urges that the GAO and the Secretary of Energy report any waste, fraud or abuse found in the program. This is simply good governance.

Second, this program, which provides government subsidized loans, makes sure that these home improvement loans are eligible only to people who deserve the largesse, the assistance, of the government. First, it says, for example, loans can be only used for primary residences. Energy Star loans subsidized by the government under this legislation could not be used for vacation homes or beach houses. The taxpayer should not be providing energy-efficient appliances at luxury homes.

Second, the motion to recommit strikes community-based organizations from potential lenders. This goes back to the problem of ACORN and the strong belief that they should not be in the position of using or having access to these funds.

Third, the MTR ensures that these retrofit loans are only available to households where the gross income is less than \$250,000. It should go without saying that if the other side is proposing to increase taxes on earners in this category, we should not be opening up subsidized government loans to people who make money at that level.

Third, the motion to recommit provides that homeowners who are delinquent in their child support payments, so-called deadbeat dads, are not eligible for these subsidized loans. It's pretty simple and straightforward that when the government decides to help people in these circumstances purchase energy-efficient equipment that they can't otherwise afford, that we should not be doing that either for deadbeat dads or for the wealthiest of Americans.

It also provides that loans and loan subsidies under this legislation cannot be used for such luxuries such as swimming pool heaters or to purchase LCD TVs or fancy TVs. While these technologies may save energy, the dollars in this loan program, \$5 billion, which I would argue we don't have right now, should not be used to fund luxury items.

People should not be using a subsidy from the government or a subsidized loan to buy a flat-screen TV or swimming pool heater.

Last, the MTR provides to fill in the standards in the legislation, ensuring that sketchy contractors cannot implement this program. For example, the construction cannot be done by contractors convicted of fraud.

Finally, and most importantly, the legislation provides that the programs must be deficit neutral. If either program, if either program is found to have a negative effect on the national debt, then that program is suspended.

My colleagues on the other side will find this one of the things that they call a gutting amendment, but it really isn't. It is simply put in place to say that if you don't want to pay for the bill, which we would have argued for it and which we offered amendments in Rules for, then we should not allow it to increase the Nation's deficit.

As I mentioned, we face a \$1.3 trillion deficit. This simply says that before we provide subsidized government loans to people to buy energy-efficient equipment, that should not be done in a deficit situation where we are expanding the deficit and passing the cost of the program on to our children and our grandchildren.

These are simple, straightforward, good-government provisions. They make the legislation better. They enable it to do what the authors of the legislation intended it to do without adding to the financial burden on the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition but do not oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 1400

Mr. CLYBURN. I wish to thank my colleague and occasional sparring partner for making what I consider to be reasonable improvements to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the bipartisan, in fact, unanimous vote in favor of this legislation, I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, 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 motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 4785, 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. BUTTERFIELD:

Page 1, line 5, insert "with a gross annual household income of less than \$250,000" after "homeowner".

Page 1, line 9, insert "A homeowner may not qualify as an eligible participant if the homeowner has been more than 6 months delinquent in child support payments." after "under section 2."

Page 1, lines 13 and 14, strike "or community-based".

Page 3, line 10, insert "primary" after "installed in a".

Page 3, line 12, insert ", but which shall not include the installation or replacement of pool heaters or the installation of Energy Star televisions" after "their adoption".

Page 3, line 21, insert "primary" after "installed in a".

Page 5, line 16, insert ", consistent with paragraph (3)," after "particular efforts".

Page 8, line 22, through page 9, line 3, strike subsection (h) (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly).

Page 9, line 14, insert "The Secretary of Energy shall also include a detailed accounting of any waste, fraud, or abuse occurring in the administration of this Act in such reports." after "of this section."

Page 10, line 11, strike "and".

Page 10, line 15, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 10, after line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) the extent to which any waste, fraud, or abuse occurred under this program.

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION.

(a) Funds authorized by this Act shall only be made available for the purpose of carrying out qualifying energy savings measures on a primary residence.

(b) Neither the Secretary of Energy nor the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide any funds authorized by this Act to any contractor that has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to any fraudulent offense.

SEC. 4. SUNSET.

The provisions of this Act shall be suspended and shall not apply if this Act will have a negative net effect on the national budget deficit of the United States.

Mr. CLYBURN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend on House Resolution 1613.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 172, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—240

Altmire	Foster	Melancon
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Michaud
Arcuri	Fudge	Miller (NC)
Baca	Garamendi	Miller, George
Baird	Giffords	Minnick
Barrett (SC)	Gonzalez	Mitchell
Barrow	Gordon (TN)	Moore (KS)
Bean	Grayson	Moore (WI)
Becerra	Green, Al	Moran (VA)
Berkley	Green, Gene	Murphy (CT)
Berman	Grijalva	Murphy (NY)
Berry	Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick
Bishop (GA)	Hall (NY)	Nadler (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Halvorson	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Hare	Neal (MA)
Bocchieri	Harman	Nye
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Boswell	Heinrich	Olver
Boucher	Hereth Sandlin	Ortiz
Boyd	Higgins	Owens
Brady (PA)	Hill	Pallone
Braley (IA)	Himes	Pascarell
Bright	Hinchee	Pastor (AZ)
Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	Payne
Butterfield	Hirono	Pelmutter
Capps	Holden	Perriello
Capuano	Holt	Peters
Cardoza	Honda	Peterson
Carnahan	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Inglis	Polis (CO)
Carson (IN)	Inslie	Pomeroy
Castle	Israel	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Chandler	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Childers	(TX)	Rangel
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Clay	Kagen	Rodriguez
Cleaver	Kanjorski	Ross
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Cohen	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Connolly (VA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rush
Conyers	Kilroy	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kind	Salazar
Costa	Kissell	Sánchez, Linda
Costello	Klein (FL)	T.
Courtney	Kosmas	Sanchez, Loretta
Critz	Kratovil	Sarbanes
Crowley	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Langevin	Schiff
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Dahlkemper	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Davis (AL)	Lee (CA)	Scott (GA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis (TN)	Lipinski	Sestak
DeFazio	Loebsack	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuler
DeLauro	Lowe	Sires
Deutch	Luján	Slaughter
Dicks	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Maffei	Snyder
Djou	Maloney	Space
Doggett	Markey (CO)	Speier
Donnelly (IN)	Markey (MA)	Spratt
Doyle	Matheson	Stark
Driehaus	Matsui	Stupak
Edwards (MD)	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Edwards (TX)	McCollum	Taylor
Ehlers	McDermott	Teague
Engel	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McMahon	Titus
Fattah	McNerney	Tonko
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Towns

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield

NOES—172

Aderholt	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim
Adler (NJ)	Gohmert	Myrick
Akin	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Alexander	Granger	Nunes
Austria	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Paul
Bachus	Griffith	Paulsen
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pence
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)	Petri
Biggert	Harper	Pitts
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Bilirakis	Heller	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Posey
Blackburn	Herger	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Bonner	Hunter	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Issa	Reichert
Boozman	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Jordan (OH)	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	King (IA)	Rooney
Ginny	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Kirk	Roskam
Burgess	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Lamborn	Scalise
Calvert	Lance	Schauer
Camp	Latham	Schmidt
Campbell	LaTourette	Schock
Cantor	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cao	Lee (NY)	Sessions
Capito	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Carter	Linder	Shimkus
Cassidy	LoBiondo	Shuster
Chaffetz	Lucas	Simpson
Coble	Luetkemeyer	Skelton
Coffman (CO)	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Cole	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	E.	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Mack	Stearns
Culberson	Manzullo	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Marchant	Terry
Dent	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCaul	Tiahrt
Dreier	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Upton
Flake	McKeon	Walden
Forbes	McMorris	Wamp
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fox	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Galleghy	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	
Gerlach		

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Fallin	Putnam
Baldwin	Fleming	Ruppersberger
Blunt	Hodes	Shea-Porter
Delahunt	Kennedy	Tanner
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Ellsworth	Mollohan	Young (FL)
Eshoo	Obey	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1420

Messrs. PAUL and MCCAUL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ANDREWS, JOHNSON of Georgia, and LANGEVIN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that agree that the funds will

be used to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce energy use, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I regret that I missed a vote on final passage of H.R. 4785, the Rural Energy Savings Program Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” in support of the bill.

Stated against:

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 30, I inadvertently voted “aye” but I meant to vote “no.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO PAKISTANI PEOPLE AFTER FLOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1613) expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating floods that began on July 22, 2010, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 2, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—396

Aderholt Barrett (SC) Bishop (NY)
 Adler (NJ) Barrow Bishop (UT)
 Akin Bartlett Blackburn
 Alexander Barton (TX) Blumenauer
 Altmire Bean Bocchieri
 Andrews Becerra Boehner
 Arcuri Berkeley Bonner
 Austria Berman Bono Mack
 Baca Berry Boozman
 Bachmann Biggart Boswell
 Bachus Bilbray Boucher
 Baldwin Bilirakis Boustany

Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bright
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 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)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Djou
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Driehaus
 Duncan
 Edwards (MD)
 Edwards (TX)
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Emerson
 Engel
 Etheridge
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Flake
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gallegly
 Garamendi
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert

Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Hall (NY)
 Hall (TX)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hereth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Insee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 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
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo

Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahan
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meeeks (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, Tim
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Olson
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 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
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes

Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Sires
 Skelton
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Tsongas

Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Weiner
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NAYS—2

Brown (GA)

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman Fleming
 Baird Giffords
 Bishop (GA) Gutierrez
 Blunt Hodes
 Boren Kennedy
 Brown-Waite, Marchant
 Ginny Meek (FL)
 Davis (AL) Mollohan
 Delahunt Murphy, Patrick
 Ellsworth Obey
 Eshoo Putnam
 Fallin Radanovich

□ 1430

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, 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. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 531.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unable to participate in a series of votes on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 529, on agreeing to the Holden amendment to H.R. 4785—Rural Energy Savings Program Act, I would have voted “aye” on the question.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 530, on the passage of H.R. 4785—Rural Energy Savings Program Act, I would have voted “aye” on the motion.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 531 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1613—Expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating floods that began July 22, 2010, I would have voted “aye” on the question.

□ 1430

SUPPORTING CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1612) expressing the support for and honoring September 17, 2010 as “Constitution Day”.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) may be recognized on the legislative day of Wednesday, September 22, 2010, to offer the resolution that he noticed on Thursday, September 16, 2010, without further notice under clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2010

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 21, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

IT'S TIME TO END THE ONE-PARTY MONOPOLY IN WASHINGTON

(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, 20 million people are out of work or have given up looking for work. Contrary to history and common sense, the Democratic Party actually thinks that raising taxes is going to create jobs.

The national debt has set a new record, but congressional Democrats still want to spend more, yet they won't offer a budget this year to tell the American people how they want to spend their money. That's disrespectful of hardworking Americans.

How bad does it have to get before voters say we've had enough? America's values, America's economy, and America's greatness are threatened. It's time to end the one-party monopoly in Washington.

A TRIBUTE TO TAN ESCO

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

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a woman of the Northern Mariana Islands for her enduring entrepreneurial spirit—Senora Escolastica Tudela Cabrera, more popularly known as “Tan Esco.”

Born in 1930, Tan Esco grew up in difficult times during the Japanese administration and, as a teen, witnessed the atrocities of World War II in the battle for the Northern Mariana Islands.

After the war, still just a girl, Tan Esco opened Saipan's first beauty shop. She then expanded into retail, selling clothes and shoes. She and her husband, the late Gregorio Camacho Cabrera, started a gasoline station, began manufacturing charcoal and tapioca, and opened Saipan's first ice cream shop. Tan Esco's true legacy, however, will forever be her bakery. People from all over the Marianas and from across the Pacific know and love the local Chamorro treats offered at Esco's, including bibingka, rosco, apigigi, and pan tuba.

The people of the Northern Mariana Islands honor the many contributions Escolastica's Enterprises has made to our community. Perhaps her greatest contribution is Tan Esco's work ethic, her drive to succeed—a shining example to us all.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, September 17 is Constitution Day. On that day in 1787, the Constitutional Convention met for the first time in Philadelphia to sign the document. It was then sent to 13 States to ratify.

In a speech to the Senate in 1850, Henry Clay said, “The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity.” He has been proven correct. The Constitution is an enduring document—the world's longest surviving written charter of government.

More than two centuries have passed and the Constitution perseveres with few changes despite the many challenges. The document bequeathed to us is the most precious gift to the United States of America—our status as free citizens.

Many countries would have stopped a minister in Florida from making threats to burn a Koran, but even he has the rights of the Constitution, no matter how much we disagree with what he threatened to do.

I have signed onto a measure honoring and supporting September 17, 2010, as Constitution Day, and I would challenge all citizens to read their Constitution on that date each year. It will help your understanding and strengthen your values.

CONSTITUTION DAY

(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 commemorate the United States Constitution, which has guided our great Nation for 223 years. Constitution Day serves as a reminder that our country is blessed with the fundamental freedoms and liberties that our Founding Fathers laid out for us.

The Constitution not only serves as the basis of our laws and helps shape our values as a Nation, but it also outlines the limited role that government should play in our citizens' daily lives. This is something we must remember in light of the many struggles that currently face this country.

Madam Speaker, there are those in Congress who try to circumvent the Constitution. So let today be a reminder that the original leaders of our country did not intend for America to be governed by partisan political agendas but by the wishes of the American people.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2010.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania, and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 16, 2010.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5297. An act to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, and for other purposes.

□ 1440

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.

GROUND ZERO—MOSQUE OR MONUMENT

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, history is the great predictor. To understand today, all you have to do is to look at last Saturday. We all remember where we were when hijacked planes hit the World Trade Center. We remember the billowing clouds of smoke blacking out the New York skyline. Those towers—once pillars of strength and freedom—became mass graves in the space of a few moments. Firefighters, police officers, innocent men women and children all died in a firestorm of hate.

Our country men and women were killed at the hands of radical Muslim extremists. People who believe their religion tells them to be violent in the name of that religion.

Now, 9 years later, it's clear that some Americans have forgotten the horror caused by these terrorists, and they expect us to forget as well. However, forgetting is not an option.

Even though we don't show the pictures anymore except on the anniversary of September 11. We don't talk about those responsible for plotting and carrying out these deadly terrorist attacks against America. We're told we can't be angry. We are expected to blindly accept the hatred for America in the name of tolerance. Under this guise of "religious tolerance," we're told we must allow a mosque to be built near Ground Zero.

No one disagrees with the legal right to build a mosque, but the builder's decision is ill-advised and it's insensitive. This is a building where the landing gear from one of the hijacked planes tore through the roof.

The media scolds those of us who disagree with this building. They say to be tolerant, be respectful and accepting of other people's religions. But why is not the same expected of those individuals? Is this really about tolerance?

The day the two planes hit the World Trade Center, that piece of land in New York City took on a whole new meaning. Ground Zero is no longer just a location in New York. It is a symbol of America as powerful as the stars and stripes. It is hallowed ground of the victims who were victimized because of hate.

Iman Feisal Abdul Rauf—the man behind the Ground Zero mosque—should instead build a memorial to the victims of the radical Muslim extremists instead of a mosque. That would be sensitive. That would be compassionate.

The history books show "victory mosques" have been built in or near locations of Muslim conquests throughout history. In 1453, Mehmed II, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, conquered Constantinople. One of his first acts was to convert a Christian church for more than 900 years—the Hagia Sophia—into a mosque.

Iman Rauf calls his project the Cordoba House. The first great mosque of Cordoba was built by medieval Islamic invaders. They built it on the site of a ransacked Roman Catholic cathedral in Spain. The name Cordoba—is that just a coincidence—the Cordoba mosque initiative at Ground Zero—too many in America thinks this mirrors history too closely.

One of our greatest freedoms in America is our right to worship as we please. Our Nation was founded on liberty and freedom for everyone. Do not Muslims, like most religions and cultures, believe in tolerance and respect for other religions?

Thousands of sons, daughters, fathers, and mothers at this very moment are stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. They're fighting the terrorists in the deserts and in the rough mountain terrain. Thirty-five American warriors from my congressional district area

gave their lives in these two wars. They died protecting us from these same radical extremists that murder in the name of religion. It seems to me that the tolerance lesson is being preached to the wrong part of the world.

Many Christians, Jews and other non-Muslims are offended by the building of this mosque and believe it is disrespectful and dishonors those who were murdered on 9/11. If building this mosque is meant to truly promote education and understanding of the Muslim religion, I suggest the supporters take a look at history. And rather than repeat history, they should remember history.

Ground Zero is off-limits.

And that's just the way it is.

AFGHANISTAN STUDY GROUP SAYS "ABANDON THE CURRENT STRATEGY"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, yesterday Speaker PELOSI and the Congress recognized the anniversary of 9/11 with a moving remembrance ceremony on the steps outside the Capitol. It's critical that we never forget the cruelty of those attacks and the tragedy of so many innocent lives.

But just as importantly, we must use this occasion to examine the war that we launched in response to 9/11. Nine years later, have we achieved our original objectives? Is the continued military occupation advancing or undermining our national security interests?

You'll recall that the original purpose was to clear al Qaeda out of Afghanistan. That's been accomplished. There are barely any al Qaeda operatives left in the country, and there is little hope that they could gain a foothold there in the future. But our continued military footprint is not helping us realize any worthy goal.

In addition to putting our troops' lives in danger, it is fueling the rise and aiding the recruitment of Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan. And on a global level, Madam Speaker, it is stoking the extremism of al Qaeda and other anti-American jihadists.

But it's just not me saying that. The Afghanistan Study Group comprised of centrist experts and academics just issued a report concluding that, and I quote them as saying, "It is time to abandon the current strategy that is not working. The continuation of an ambitious U.S. military campaign in Afghanistan," the group adds, "will likely work against U.S. interests."

Madam Speaker, the report notes that the war costs more annually than does the new health care reform bill. And yet curiously, very few of my friends on the other side of the aisle are railing about the excessive spending on Afghanistan. It appears that in their eyes, a failed war is worth the investment, but health security for millions of Americans is wasteful.

The Afghanistan Study Group offered some prescriptions and alternatives, including political reconciliation; an emphasis on regional diplomacy; and investments in Afghanistan's economic development—all of which are developments of the SMART security plan that I've been promoting for years.

But instead of heeding this advice, we're pressing forward stubbornly with failed policy. And the more it fails, the more resources we devote to it. As Robert Dreyfuss writes in *The Nation*, the prevailing wisdom (if you can call it that) seems to be . . . if sending 30,000 troops to the wrong place isn't getting results, sending 30,000 more to that same wrong place might help, and then when that doesn't work, why, send another 30,000 troops."

□ 1450

Madam Speaker, conditions in Afghanistan have gotten so bad that humanitarian groups can't move freely to deliver the aid that is so badly needed. The gruesome murders of medical aid workers last month underscored the deteriorating security situation. The *New York Times* cites the Afghan NGO Safety Office as saying there were more than twice the number of insurgent attacks this August than August of 2009.

I don't agree with everything the Afghanistan Study Group has to say. In fact, by calling for a gradual military drawdown, I believe they are just not being bold enough. But Madam Speaker, this disastrous war has gone on long enough. It's done enough damage. It's time now to bring our troops home.

DEPARTMENT OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

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, for 10 years the House of Representatives, under the leadership of DUNCAN HUNTER and IKE SKELTON, have brought to the floor of the House in our Armed Services bill language to honor and respect the Marine Corps by changing the name of the Department of Navy to be known as the Department of Navy and Marine Corps. For 10 years we sent this language over to the Senate. For 10 years the Senate rejected the House position.

This year, under the leadership of IKE SKELTON and BUCK MCKEON, the Armed Services Committee decided to bring this language to the floor as what's called a stand-alone bill. We had 425 House Members—there are only 435—425 signed this bill to recognize the Navy and Marine Corps as one fighting team. And the bill passed the House, as you know, Madam Speaker, by what's called unanimous consent.

Well, at that period of time Senator PAT ROBERTS from Kansas, a former Marine officer, put the same bill in. It's what is called a companion bill. And by

the time we had passed our bill, he had 80 Senators in the U.S. Senate sign his companion bill to rename the Department of Navy to be Navy and Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, I have said many times in the last few weeks that I don't think you could get 80 Senators to agree there is a Santa Claus. But the Senators do recognize the importance of honoring the Marine Corps by letting them share in the name of the family, the family being the Navy and Marine Corps family.

It's my hope if the Senate brings this bill up next week, or the week after, or maybe during a lame duck session, that Senator ROBERTS will offer an amendment to that debate on the Senate side. And I would hope that those 80 Senators that have signed his bill will vote to honor and give this respect to the Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, a year ago this September we did a news conference, the Marine Corps League, and we had generals here, former commandants to speak on behalf of the bill. But two people I wanted to make quick reference to. One was Eddie Wright. Eddie Wright is from Texas. He is a young Marine—he is not in the Marine Corps now—but he lost both hands in Iraq. He has picks for his hands. And he said at the news conference that, "If it had not been for a Navy corpsman, I would be dead. But he saved my life. We are one fighting team. And it should be in the name."

Madam Speaker, I have got these posters, as I begin to close. This is the real thrust of what we are trying to do. There would be no cost to the Department of Navy if we changed its name to be Department of Navy and Marine Corps. But this is an actual condolence letter that a Marine captain who was killed for this country—the family received this condolence letter. And Madam Speaker, it says at the top the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., with the Navy flag, extends its condolence to this Marine who died. It's almost like it's a stepchild. It's not really part of the family. All we're trying to do, Madam Speaker, is to make this one family.

Madam Speaker, I am now showing that this same family whose loved one was killed, if this bill becomes law, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, with the Navy flag and the Marine flag will send the condolence letter to the Marine family.

Madam Speaker, it's time that we do this for the Marine Corps. I want to thank my House colleagues who have helped us with this for 10 years. And I hope that the Senate will certainly support Senator ROBERTS in honoring the Marine Corps by renaming it the Department of Navy and Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, as I do every time before I close, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families

who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. I will ask God to please bless the President, Mr. Obama, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, please, God, continue to bless America.

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.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF BEULAH SHEPARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is a special time that we have an opportunity to listen closely to our colleagues and to share some of the pearls of those who live in the United States with our colleagues. And it gives me great pleasure to be able to come today and to express my deepest love and affection for a wonderful woman, a woman of strength, who has gone home to rest and to receive joy.

Beulah Shepard is a very special person in the eyes of our community, Houston and Texas. And today I stand on the floor of the House to call her an American hero. Beulah Shepard passed away this last week, and so we have only our memories. But I want to say to those of you who have known someone that has touched your life, let me just simply tell you the story of my friend Beulah Shepard.

She of course was a mother, was a wife. She has children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. And of course she understood the Constitution, and believed in one vote for every human being. I had a chance to talk to her wonderful daughters, Bobbie and Dianne, and the wonderful family that she has as she lived her last years. And I will tell you our community will remember her as a political icon, someone you went to if you knew what was right, if you wanted to be part of the Houston political community.

But my husband and I know her as friends. And she greeted us as a young couple, and told us how to stay on the straight and narrow. I know her wonderful grandson, who was challenged, and how she was endeared with him. And everywhere Sister Beulah went, her grandson went with her. I loved watching him grow up.

Yes, a political icon she was. But she was more than that. As a mother she loved, as a grandmother she loved. But she believed in public service, not in just the idea of the name of politicians. She believed that if you accepted the

oath of office you must serve the public. She did so.

As a member of the United Way board, one of the first African Americans to ever serve on our Harris County United Way board, she made sure that the vulnerable were taken care of. A member of the Harris County Council of Organizations. An active and loving member of the Galilee Baptist Church, where she loved her pastor, Pastor Davis, and the first lady.

More importantly, let me tell you that she was a woman of courage and strength and inspiration. I loved her when she stood and fought. She would understand all the debate, those who are against and those who are for. But I tell you she would tell it straight. And the way she would say it is that health care is going to help those who have never had health care before. She would say to those soldiers “thank you” for fighting on the front lines for our freedom. And she would say to them, I am using that freedom.

Because you know, Beulah Shepard had to buy a poll tax to vote. She bought it in 1948. She came to Texas from Louisiana. She was named for her grandmother. She came from the salt of the earth. But she is an inspiration to all of us.

And I am excited today to be able to say that Beulah Shepard lived to be 87 years old and had as one of the starring moments of her life to be able to vote for President Barack Obama. And why do I say that? Because Beulah Shepard walked and fought so that there might be those who would vote who had never voted before to have the opportunity to choose someone of their choosing.

Let me tell you what she did in Commissioner Squatty Lyons’ office. Yes, she worked historically for this commissioner as the first African American among some that came after in those offices. I am gratified for that, because she took care of the vulnerable, those who were afraid to come downtown, those who didn’t think government would work for them. Beulah Shepard took care of them.

She will be laid to rest in these next hours. And I will simply say that we have the flag waving over this great woman’s life and legacy.

□ 1500

Why do I say that, having not had her serve in the United States military? Because I know that our military represents the people of the United States and all of us have the opportunity to represent the value of the flag of this country. That value is to be able to cherish democracy, justice and to have the courage to fight for it, a loving mother who nurtured her children, a loving friend who cared for everyone, someone who brought joy.

And it was a great joy to me to spend time with her in these last few years as she was so joyful with her family members all around her. She smiled, what a beautiful smile. When we took our pictures together in the front yard and in-

side the house, I know that she had great joy.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great sympathy to the family that I offer, on behalf of the United States Congress, this tribute to Beulah Shepard. God bless you, may you rest in peace, and we love you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the last action that we took in this body today was a resolution honoring the Constitution, which we celebrate tomorrow. Since we are not in session tomorrow, I wish to talk for a moment about that inspired document this evening.

It’s difficult to do that, because as we talk about the Constitution, I am looking straight at the relief of George Mason, who was one of those unique characters in American history, one of three men who spent the entire time at the Constitutional Convention and then refused to sign the document.

When I was teaching school, I always insisted my students had to tell me why Mason refused to sign it, which, of course, was because it did not have the Bill of Rights. But I was always hoping, and hoping in vain, that some bright student would ask the better question, which is not why did Mason not sign, but why did all the other people who were there at the Founding Fathers convention not go along with Mason for a Bill of Rights?

It was certainly not because they were opposed to civil liberties, but because the rest of the Founding Fathers realized that they could accomplish the same goal by the structure of government, by dividing power by the three branches of government horizontally so no branch had too much power, but equally by dividing power vertically between the Federal and State level. So no level of government had too much power; you could accomplish the same goal of protection of individual freedoms.

The issue at the Constitutional Convention was that of power. As the States met and then ratified this document, the issue of power was still there. We, of course, know of course that two States, North Carolina and Rhode Island, did not ratify the document until after the country was established. But five States, Virginia, Massachusetts, New York, Maryland and

South Carolina, sent specific amendments that should be added to the document.

Foremost in each of those State’s amendments was the concept of sovereignty or the ability of States to make decisions. Their goal and their concepts were incorporated in the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, which put in written form the unnamed structure that the Founding Fathers had established in the Constitution.

As one of our Justices on the Supreme Court said, the Constitution protects us from our own best intentions. It divides power among sovereigns, among branches of government, precisely so that we may resist the temptation to concentrate power in one location as the expedient solution to the crisis of the day.

For a century and a half, this Nation basically honored that concept. In the last half century, though, we have stretched the idea significantly. Starting with the progressive era at the early 1900s, it was President Wilson who called this concept the separation of powers political witchcraft. He said that separating powers into hidden corners prevented us from consolidating powers to be used.

In the early 1900s, the politicians and the philosophers who believed this did not do so because they misunderstood the Constitution, but because they understood it and did not like the fact that it prevented them from doing what they said were marvelous things.

We, today, still have this issue of power before us. For the last couple of years we have debated on this floor the idea whether it is better to consolidate power in Washington with the ultimate goal of uniformity or to hold fast to the idea that States should be allowed to have alternative ideas and that our ultimate goal should be creativity.

The 10th Amendment is not just about smaller government. It’s about more effective government, what works best for people and the idea that not all programs have to be evolved from Washington. They also have their idea because the 10th Amendment talks power for States and individuals. In a concept that many of us on this floor can never get, there are some problems that don’t need a solution by government at all.

The issue is creativity, efficiency, and justice. The issue is can those best be resolved.

We still have this question of power that we are dealing with today, and I would hope that we would reject the revisionist idea and, instead, go along and support the Founding Fathers. For both the constitutional structure and the 10th Amendment meant that our Founding Fathers were inspired to get it right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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.)

THE FREEDOM TO . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are more than a dozen countries in this world that restrict freedom of religion, including Iran and China. Imagine being told your religion was unacceptable and being carted off to jail for offering a Bible to someone. This is not an unusual occurrence in some countries with state-sponsored religions.

In this country, we have a few sacrosanct words known as "First Amendment to the Constitution" that guarantee no one will be punished for the religion that they choose to follow: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

When a person decides to burn the Koran, the Bible, or any other sacred document in this country, he has the freedom to do so even if the overwhelming majority of us vehemently disagree with his decision. It is difficult for the citizens of some other countries to understand or to tolerate this kind of freedom. Yet it is the bedrock of our democracy.

We have the right to disagree, to ignore, to protest against or to take the matter to court for a ruling, but we do not have the right to determine what another person is to believe. Unfortunately, that kind of freedom challenges other governments and cultures.

The freedoms we hold dear seem uncontrollable to those who would dictate what people wear, worship, and support. For example, some governments think that if their citizens are educated the next thing that will happen is that they will begin to think and ask questions, and that can't be tolerated by those in power. Or they believe that only one religion is true and, therefore, no others can be taught or people might stray from the religion and the religion might falter. In the United States, we have no such fear because our Constitution gives us the confidence and the courage to tolerate diversity.

September 17 is Constitution Day and a time that we should all take to be

grateful for the strength and breadth of our system of government. We should reflect on our freedoms and know that they are protected.

That date was chosen because on September 17, 1787, the Constitutional Convention met for the last time in Philadelphia to sign the document before it was sent to the 13 States to be ratified. The Founding Fathers drew upon the wisdom of the ages to give us a gift that has endured for more than two centuries, the United States Constitution.

The blueprint for our government is not a long document. You can keep a copy in your shirt pocket. I happen to have one here, Mr. Speaker. The basic document is under 5,000 words, but it covers the building blocks for our three equal branches of government: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial arms of government.

The first 10 amendments lay out the rights of every citizen. How many times have you heard the phrase, "I know my rights." Well, we know them because they have been delineated for us in the Bill of Rights.

Winston Churchill famously said in a speech in the House of Commons in 1947: "Many forms of government have been tried, and will be tried in this world of sin and woe. No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

Today I issue a challenge to the citizens to read their Constitution on September 17 each year. It will help your understanding of what and who you are in this country, and it will strengthen your values.

In a speech to the Senate in 1850, Henry Clay said: "The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity, unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity."

He has been proven correct, Mr. Speaker, and let us all work to protect it and keep it that way.

□ 1510

WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we celebrate the 223rd anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution. As we do so, I think it is important to consider the humbling legacy bestowed by those who founded this country and the lawmakers who actually did come before us; because each day those of us who are currently holding office, we are so mired in the challenges and complexities of modern public policy, we scurry through these stately, ornate halls, often without so much as a glimpse at

or a thought of the profound history that is depicted around us.

For instance, just steps away, within the interior of the majestic Capitol Dome, is the Rotunda. I spent some time there recently, Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the moments in our Nation's history that gave rise to the gift of liberty we strive to safeguard each day in this body. Inside the Rotunda is a series of paintings that offer rich glimpses into some of these moments, starting with the Landing of Columbus in 1492, the Discovery of the Mississippi by DeSoto in 1541, as well as the Baptism of Pocahontas in 1613. They all depict the opening of a new, mysterious world full of promise and things yet to come.

The painting, the Embarkation of the Pilgrims in 1620, also speaks of opportunity, the anticipation of realizing a dream of freedom. The Declaration of Independence in 1776 follows. The Surrender of General Burgoyne in 1777, and the Surrender of Lord Cornwallis in 1781, as well as George Washington Resigning His Commission in 1783 are all celebrated pieces depicting the first moments of that new Republic.

Possibly the most famous of these paintings is John Trumbull's 12-by-18-foot-large Declaration of Independence. This historical piece of art depicts the presentation of the Declaration to the Second Continental Congress. Standing at the forefront of this painting are Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Roger Sherman, Robert Livingston, and Benjamin Franklin, the authors of the profound document that gave way to the birth to our Nation.

Painstaking care was given to each word in the Declaration, none of which may be more memorable than these: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." You see, the Declaration built upon a theory of natural and universal rights, the consent of the governed, and a right of redress when government was in violation of those essential principles. After setting forth those standards, the Declaration continued with a litany of grievances against King George, which, Mr. Speaker, is a very interesting prospect to reread that part of the Declaration.

And then the Declaration finally concludes by saying, "We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by the Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States . . . And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

Fifty-six individuals signed the Declaration, though it is possible that few knew the historical significance the document would ultimately bear. Historians suggest that the list of grievances against King George was of the highest importance to the signers, but today, like the revival of nationalism that did follow after the War of 1812, we perhaps find the greatest profundity and timeliness in the Preamble of the Declaration, and I think it bears repeating. “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, and that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

These words inspire reflection on our personal independence as American citizens secured through times of tumult and uncertainty.

Not long after these words were handed down, another extraordinary document expressing our rights as American citizens was given unto the people. On September 17, 1787, 39 individuals signed the United States Constitution, a document that changed the history of our nation—and the world.

The Constitution holds special meaning for this body. We placed our hands on a Bible and swore to uphold the Constitution. It is because of that deep abiding commitment to the Constitution that Congress prioritized celebration of the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution many years ago, and why we now celebrate “Citizenship and Constitution Day” each September 17. This 223rd Citizenship and Constitution Day, let us recall the extraordinary circumstances that gave rise to our great nation, and the words of our founding documents that endure as a call of conscience to a world crying out for meaning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SABLAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CULBERSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COVENANT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I’m here to urge our Democratic leaders to listen to the Republican Party, to listen to the Republican Party’s bipartisan plan for taking immediate action on our already ailing economy.

If we let the Bush tax cuts expire, those tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003, Americans nationwide will face the largest tax hike in United States history. Indeed, that tax hike will amount to \$3.8 trillion, and this at a time when unemployment hovers at around 10 percent and our national debt has hit an all-time high at \$13 trillion—yes, \$13 trillion with a “T,” an unbelievable amount of debt.

We need to freeze Federal spending. We need to cut taxes across the board, for everyone at every marginal tax rate level across the board. The state of the economy today is that 16 million people are unemployed. That equates to a 10 percent unemployment rate. Indeed, it is probably close to 17 percent. Mr. Speaker, if you count people who have just given up, who have been looking over 6 months for a job, there are none to be found, and also the number of people who are employed, yes, but underemployed, it would be close to 17 percent. So, indeed, the Republican Party and our leader says we need to freeze Federal spending, indeed, roll it back to the level of 2008, and cut taxes across the board.

And if we don’t do that, Mr. Speaker, many companies that might have been in a position to expand and, therefore, put people back to work will choose not to because of the uncertainties associated with these tax hikes as well as other disastrous Democratic policies like ObamaCare. We need to come together, and we need to pass legislation immediately that cuts spending and kills all of the pending tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, we just returned to Washington, did we not, after 6 weeks in our districts, all 435 of us? I had many opportunities during that 6-week period of time to meet with my constituents face to face, eyeball to eyeball at town hall meetings. We called them America Speaking Out meetings, wanting the American people to know that at least one party wanted to hear from them, wanted to hear from Main Street, and did not want to force-feed on the American people, on our constituents, some grandiose plan that Members of Congress come up with. God knows that plans that Members of Congress have come up with over the last 4 years have certainly not helped one iota.

So I used this opportunity, my colleagues, I used this opportunity to speak to my constituents, but mainly to listen to them and to find out and

write it down and bring it back to Washington to share it with my colleagues so we can make a pledge and make a commitment.

Indeed, one person, Mr. Speaker, suggested that why don’t you call it this time, rather than a Contract with America that we remember from 1994, why don’t you call it a Covenant with America, just like the covenant that God had with Moses and the Jewish people, something that is an absolute pledge of your sacred honor. Sacred honor, you heard my friend from Nebraska, Representative FORTENBERRY just moments ago on the floor, talk about the Constitution, sacred honor and our sacred documents.

And I think that is what the American people want. I don’t think they will accept anything less. They are tired of the same old same old—excessive government spending and higher taxes that are making our country look a lot like Greece, Mr. Speaker.

So, I’m happy to have this opportunity, under the direction of my leadership, to take this time to talk to my colleagues about what we really need to do and what we really need to do in a bipartisan way.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the approval ratings of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle is 11 percent. People wanted to change 2 years ago.

□ 1520

People wanted a change 2 years ago. They made a change, but, indeed, it was not quite the change that they expected.

I want to refer my colleagues to this first poster, this first slide that I have here in the way of a cartoon, and hopefully all of you Members in the back of the Chamber can see this. It is a china shop, and it shows this depiction of our President going into the china shop talking to the clerk. And the caption is, as the President is speaking, “Now, give me one good reason why you’re not hiring.” And of course behind the President are all of these bulls, these bulls in a china shop. This bull of cap and trade, this bull of health care reform, breaking all of the china.

Mr. Speaker, to ask the question: Now, give me one good reason why you’re not hiring. Well, the American people can give a lot of good reasons why they are not hiring if indeed they have any capital left with which to hire or to expand their business, to increase the square footage, to put in a new product line, and to bring in additional workers for their small business. It is not happening because of bad policy, bad policy coming from inside the Beltway, not bad policy on Main Street.

Mr. Speaker, again as I did these town hall meetings, and I guess we did six or eight of them across the 11th Congressional District of northwest Georgia, nine counties that I represent, a great district, and I guess I would not be unique among us to say I think I have the best district of all 435, but I

know we all feel that way about our districts. But the people told me, when I asked about the economy, what was concerning them the most, and we discussed the economy, and I asked, Why are we faced with a 10 percent unemployment rate? Why are 16 million people out of work, and why is it getting worse?

This is what they said: Excessive taxation; insufficient liquidity, which means they can't borrow any money. The banks are not lending. The small banks are having to set aside money to cover loan loss reserves and to abide by this mark-to-market accounting principle. People who have loans and are making payments on those loans, all of a sudden these loans are called and they have to come in and put up more collateral. And, of course, the regulators are really cracking down to the lending institutions. Poor mom and pop businesses can't borrow any more money. And if they have some money, or maybe there is someone who is unemployed who has a little nest egg who would like nothing better than to finally start that small business that they have wanted to start for years, they are finally almost forced into a situation. There are no jobs out there, so maybe they have \$25,000 or \$30,000 saved up and they want to start that little restaurant on the corner. They are not going to do it because of economic uncertainty, not knowing. Mr. Speaker, what is coming next that is going to hurt them rather than help them.

And the last bullet point on this particular slide, Mr. Speaker: Redtape, government mandates. OSHA. EPA. The new health care law. ObamaCare. The requirements for providing health insurance—and not just any health insurance, but one policy dictated by the Federal Government that these people understand they can't afford to abide by, so they don't start that business. So the unemployment rate, it continues and it gets worse.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this next poster that I want to share with you has a lot of verbiage on it, and I know that it is difficult to read, so I will go through the bullet points with you. This is what it says. The latest Congressional Budget Office, CBO, that's the bipartisan accountants hired by the House of Representatives, the director of course is chosen by the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, but the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office and their economic outlook, the first bullet, this year's deficit is estimated to reach \$1.3 trillion. As a share of the overall total economy of this country, the deficit is 9.1 percent, roughly three times the average of the past 40 years. Let me say that again. The deficit for this year, \$1.3 trillion, is 9.1 percent of the total economy of the whole country, and that is three times what it has averaged over the last 40 years. Amazing.

The second bullet, the debt held by the public, is projected to rise to \$9

trillion, or 62 percent of the economy this year, nearly twice the 40 year historical average. Total debt, including borrowing from the Social Security trust fund and other Federal funds, will rise to \$13.5 trillion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the CBO also estimates that economic growth will remain sluggish over the next few years and unemployment will remain unbearably high for years to come. The looming tax increases and health care overhaul both contribute to slower growth and fewer jobs.

Colleagues, this next poster that you see basically depicts the slide that I just read to you in regard to the budget doubling and the tripling of the debt held by the public in billions of dollars, and this does not even include the Social Security trust fund that has been raided of about \$1.5 trillion that has to be paid back.

So, colleagues, as we spend the next couple of weeks here in Washington before we break and go home before these midterm elections, what do we have to do? The President is talking about, and the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, and the leader of the Senate, Senator HARRY REID, are talking about letting the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 remain in place for all taxpayers except those who have an adjusted gross income of \$200,000, or \$250,000 for a family.

□ 1530

These are the very people who create the jobs in this country because many in that category are small business men and women who are not C corporations; they are subchapter S, or they pay their taxes as individuals. If you let those tax rates go from 33 percent to 36 percent or in some cases go from 36 percent to 39.6 percent and you leave the corporate income tax rate at 35 percent—and I have a flyer that I will show you, colleagues, in just a few minutes comparing the corporate tax rate in this country with other industrialized countries across the globe—it's astronomically high.

So how do we expect to get out of this deep recession, this economic morass, this high unemployment rate of 16 million-plus unemployed by raising taxes on anybody? It makes absolutely no economic sense.

I would urge my colleagues to come together with us in a bipartisan way. Let's do what Leader BOEHNER has suggested, which is to leave the tax cuts in place for everybody at every marginal rate at least for the next 2 years, and let's cut spending this year to 2008 levels.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be joined by my classmate and colleague from the great State of Minnesota, the ranking member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Representative JOHN KLINE. I will gladly yield to Representative KLINE.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank my colleague. I thank my colleague for his words here this evening and for his leadership on this and on so many issues.

I just found it striking, Mr. GINGREY, that what you are talking about here is not only staggering debt, as the current chart indicates, but that you are talking about taxes. I want to take just a minute to put this into context.

We have been suffering with a struggling economy. We have watched the gross domestic product decline each quarter for the last three quarters. As you know very well, we have been looking at unemployment above 9 percent for 16 consecutive months, and this is after the passage of the trillion-dollar stimulus bill that the President said would keep unemployment below 8 percent. We have been at 9 percent or more and at 9.6 percent most recently, and now there is a proposal to impose the largest tax increase in American history on January 1, which is, of course, what will happen unless Congress takes action, unless the majority party in this body brings forth legislation that will keep that from happening.

I just wanted to join with my colleague, with Leader BOEHNER, with everybody on this side of the aisle, and with a growing number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say let's don't do that, who say let's don't raise taxes on any American. Particularly to the point you were making earlier, let's don't raise taxes on the job creators. We are trying to create jobs. We are trying to let the private sector create jobs at the same time the majority party here is talking about imposing a crushing tax increase on the very people on whom we are relying to create those jobs.

So I just wanted to stop by to applaud your efforts here, to thank you for doing this today, and to add my voice to a growing number in this body who say let's don't do this.

Madam Speaker, let's don't do this.

Mr. President, let's don't do this.

Let's do not add to the tax burden of those who are creating the jobs in the private sector. Let's don't increase taxes on anybody in America. I think we need to say that loudly and clearly, and I have increasing hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will recognize that that is a terrible thing to do in this economy and that we must move quickly.

As my colleague knows very well, there is an election coming. Congress will go into recess again here in 3 weeks or maybe 4 weeks or sometime, and I don't think we should leave and go into recess until we have taken care of this issue.

Again, I thank my colleague, and I yield back my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank so much my colleague from Minnesota, Representative KLINE, for dropping by and for pointing out the things that we have been talking about.

Quite honestly—and he alluded to the fact, I think, that we are beginning to get a little bit of bipartisanship on this issue. In fact, I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a colloquy today between Majority Leader HOYER and the minority whip, Representative ERIC CANTOR from Virginia. I wanted to hear what Mr. HOYER might have had to say about this.

I've been reading in the newspaper—and maybe some of my colleagues have seen these articles, too—that maybe the Democratic leadership, represented so much so, of course, by Majority Leader STENY HOYER and hopefully by the leader, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Ms. PELOSI, would begin to sort of go our way on this. I know a lot of Democratic rank-and-file Members, particularly those, Mr. Speaker, of the conservative wing of the Democratic Caucus—the so-called Blue Dogs—are very concerned about increasing taxes on anybody at a time such as this.

As Representative KLINE pointed out, the tax increase of letting every one of those marginal rates go back up to the pre-2001 level basically eliminates the 10 percent tax bracket, and it expands the 15 percent tax bracket. I pointed out earlier that it raises the 36 bracket out to 39.6, 33 to 36, 28 to 33, and 20 to 28.

In addition to that, what is expiring is the Child Tax Credit of \$1,000, which will go back to \$500, Mr. Speaker. The tax on dividends, which under the current law and enacted in 2003, is 15 percent, but if we let that expire, that tax rate on dividends will go to whatever one's marginal rate is, and if you happen to be at the 39 percent tax rate, that will be the tax on dividends. Many, many of our seniors are relying on dividends—on dividends and their Social Security—as their only sources of income. To tax that at nearly 40 percent, in some cases, is just cruel. It is unconscionable.

So, again, I do thank my colleague for weighing in on this; and this current slide, my colleagues, kind of shows that. The blue line on the graph shows the Democrat projection with the stimulus spending that was enacted and passed in February of 2009. So we're talking—what?—a year and a half ago. It was \$862 billion, I believe, in that stimulus program that was supposed to get our economy back on track. That money, by the way, was money borrowed—yes, borrowed, in large part, from China and Japan. We hear that concern voiced so often. Yet that's what we did. We borrowed \$862 billion, a lot of it from China and Japan, to stimulate our economy.

The pledge from the administration, from President Obama and from Congress was that this is what we need. If you pass that, our pledge to the American people is this unemployment rate, which was at 7.6 percent back a year and a half ago, will not get above 8 percent. We will stop this hemorrhaging of jobs by creating all of this spending for shovel-ready projects. I don't know

how much of it went to that, but it was probably less than 5 percent of the \$862 billion. Here, the graph depicts it.

So in the first quarter through the third quarter of 2009, that unemployment rate, which was 7.5 to 7.6 percent, wasn't going to go any higher. This is what the projection was going out to 2013. It was that our unemployment rate, because of the stimulus package, would gradually come back down to traditional levels of 4.5 to 5 percent, which was essentially full employment.

□ 1540

But this is what happened, my colleagues. The red line is what happened, unfortunately. And here we are in the third quarter of 2010, and what is our unemployment rate? Darn close to 10 percent. In fact, a couple of quarters ago it was over 10 percent. And as I said earlier about the unemployment rate, it's really worse than 10 percent, because many people have been out there beating the pavement, wearing out that shoe leather trying to find a job for 6 or more months, and they are still unemployed. And a lot of them, unfortunately, have just given up. Many of the jobs that we saw were census workers. That work has been completed, and unfortunately they're back in the ranks of the unemployed.

My colleagues, what I've been talking about, of course, in this next slide depicts it—the Bush tax cuts and what to do with them. The first bullet, "Democrats are poised to let the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts expire at the end of this year." The effect of that would be a \$3.8 trillion tax increase that will affect every American who pays income taxes. Unfortunately, only about 53 percent of Americans do pay income taxes, and that's part of our problem. But how in the world could we do this to the hardworking, tax-paying people?

Go back to that first slide of the bull in the China shop. Colleagues, that's what we're talking about. You break a lot of dishes when you raise taxes \$3.8 trillion over a 10-year period of time. And answer this question for me—rhetorically, of course. What tax increase ever created a job? I don't think one ever did, and I don't think one ever will.

I spoke a little earlier about the corporate tax rate. Why is our corporate tax rate higher than—I don't know the total number of countries that we have here listed along the X-axis, but it's about 20, 25—Iceland, Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Turkey, Switzerland, Korea, and on and on and on? And our corporate tax rate, effective, is almost 39 percent. That's the green column. Only Japan, at 40 percent, has a higher corporate tax rate than the United States. That makes no sense. We can't compete in the global economy with taxes like that.

I had talked a little earlier about the different tax rates and what will happen if we let the tax cuts, the lower rates, expire and we go back to those rates prior to 2001. I talked about divi-

dends going from a 15 percent rate to, in some cases, a 39.6 rate. I didn't mention capital gains, but capital gains are now at 15 percent. That will go back up to 20 percent. And we, of course, talked about ordinary income and how those tax rates will go up for every marginal level.

We mentioned the Child Tax Credit of \$1,000 per child, which will go back to \$500 per child. I did not mention, but it's on this slide. I didn't talk about the marriage tax penalty, which under the current law had been eliminated, but starting January 1 of 2011, that marriage tax penalty kicks back in, costing a couple an additional \$595 a year. That might not sound like a lot of money to Members sitting in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but it's a lot of money for a man and woman in their retirement twilight years on a fixed income. And, of course, I did mention that the lowest tax bracket marginal rate of 10 percent would completely be eliminated.

Well, let's get back for a few minutes to what I think we can do in a bipartisan way. This particular slide, Mr. Speaker, says it's the Republican plan. But you know what? I wish I had changed this slide before I got here on the floor this afternoon and scratched that out and put the "Bipartisan Plan." Because other than the point that my people made to me at town hall meetings during the August recess about wanting us to do something about the economy, stop taxing them and regulating them to death, leave them alone, give them the opportunity to show their entrepreneurial skills, they said this, too: Why is it that you men and women in the Congress can never seem to work in a bipartisan way and do something for us, all of you? We love you, Congressman GINGREY, but you're part of the problem, too. You're all worried, it seems to us, about the next election, and you don't seem to be thinking about the next generation.

And I had to look them in the eye, eyeball to eyeball, and say, You know what? You're right. And my pledge, if I become part of the majority in 2011, is that we will work in a bipartisan way. And I hope my leadership is listening, and I hope that that will be part of their pledge.

So this poster really should scratch out the "Republican Plan" and put "Bipartisan Plan." And I don't know why in the world we couldn't all agree on this. And we ought to do it now, not wait to see who's in control. The American people, I don't think—in many instances, they don't care who's in control as long as we're doing the right thing, as long as we are doing the right thing.

But this slide says, number one, freeze all of those tax rates for 2 years. We're in a desperate situation. Is that asking too much to not increase the tax burden on the American people and small businesses and corporate America for 2 years? And secondly, cut spending back to 2008 levels.

There is a little asterisk, colleagues, on this poster. If you can't see it, I'm going to read it for you: "If the President is serious about job creation, there's one clear way forward, and that is for us to come together and pass legislation immediately that cuts spending and stops all of the approaching tax hikes." The bipartisan plan; that's what we need, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what we need. That's what the American people are expecting of us.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to shift gears just a little bit because it does pertain to the economy. I want to talk a little bit about illegal immigration. There is a situation in this country that has got to stop, and that is this idea that children born in this country of illegal immigrants are automatically United States citizens. Now, that's based on a misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment. I keep the Constitution with me all the time. Representative FORTENBERRY, Mr. Speaker, was talking about the Constitution, our sacred document, a little bit earlier. But the 14th Amendment was ratified to our Constitution in 1868.

□ 1550

There were no immigration laws in 1868. It had nothing to do with illegal immigrants and bestowing citizenship on a child born of illegal immigrants. No. It was all about giving rights, constitutional rights, to former slaves, just as was the 13th Amendment and the 15th Amendment.

The 15th Amendment: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The 13th Amendment: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for a crime, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Slavery was abolished by the 13th Amendment. The 14th Amendment says, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." Illegal immigrants are not subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

And the reason I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, is because it costs about \$10,000 for every childbirth in this country. When 10 percent of those births are illegal immigrant births, you're talking about close to 400,000 times \$10,000, pretty soon you get to about \$40 billion worth of cost, something that this country cannot afford. And that is why people are insisting that we abide by our immigration law, not enact new law but just simply abide by what has already passed.

It's something that I'm going to continue to talk about. I look forward to having a dialogue with my other colleagues that have been so active and involved in this issue, folks like Representative GUTIERREZ from the great State of Illinois, and I think we can talk and do this in a bipartisan way and come together, because people

want a secure border and they want to abide by the rule of law. And they realize when they are among the 10 percent, Mr. Speaker, who are unemployed, that have been out of work for more than 6 months, and there are 16 million of them, that you can't afford to not have a secure border. You can't afford to have yet another magnet to attract more people to risk their lives trying to come into this country illegally. All of these things are inter-related. We need to be sensible about this, and we need to recognize so many of these problems.

Mr. Speaker, again as I said at the beginning of the hour, I appreciate the opportunity that my leadership has given to me to talk to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle about what we can do to restore this economy and have a recovery that is not a jobless recovery, to put people back to work. And it starts with lowering the amount of Federal spending. Can you believe that we are this year going to spend \$1.3 trillion more than what we take in in revenue? And we're on the track over the next 10 years to triple our national debt? In fact, it will be by the year 2020, if we continue at this rate, over \$20 trillion of debt. That is more than our gross domestic product. So let's draw a line in the sand, let's go back to 2008 spending, that's the least we can do, and let's not raise taxes on anybody.

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

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SABLON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KENNEDY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, 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, September 23.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 23.
Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CULBERSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 20, 2010, at 2:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9383. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting A Request For Budget Amendments For Fiscal Year 2011 proposals in the Fiscal Year 2011 Budget for the Department of Health and Human Services; (H. Doc. No. 111—139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9384. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a supplemental update of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2011, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(a); (H. Doc. No. 111—143); to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed.

9385. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a declaration of a national emergency with respect to blocking the property of certain persons with respect to North Korea, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1631; (H. Doc. No. 111—141); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9386. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to certain terrorist attacks is to continue for one year beyond September 14, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 111—142); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9387. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 111—145); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9388. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-30, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9389. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-42, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9390. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-23, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9391. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-34, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9392. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting various reports in accordance with Sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9393. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-20, pursuant to

the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9394. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's first quarter report for calendar year 2010 as required by the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9395. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq, pursuant to Section 1508(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for 2009, Pub. L. 110-417; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9396. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-076, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9397. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-064, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9398. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-058, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9399. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-095, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9400. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's letter in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9401. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 09-069, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9402. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 09-135, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-024, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-038, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9405. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-089, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9406. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-088, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9407. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-078, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-027, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-10-2137); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9410. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-067, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 09-117 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-044 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on CWC Compliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9414. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 47th report required by the FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Act, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3204(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9415. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Paragraph (5)(D) of the Senate's May 1997 resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9416. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a designation pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1189; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a continuation of the national emergency regarding export control regulations, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 111-140); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9418. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Pacific Grove Feast of Lanterns Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0722] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9419. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Labor Day Sky Concert, South Lake Tahoe, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0723] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9420. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River, Pittsburgh, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0728] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9421. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pittsburg Seafood Festival Air Show, Pittsburg, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0730] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9422. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers, Pittsburgh, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0731] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9423. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone: Old Sauvie Island Bridge Roadway Deck Demolition Safety Zone, Multnomah Channel, Portland Oregon [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0700] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9424. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Helicopter Event within the Sector Delaware Bay Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0701] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9425. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Sparrows Point Steel Work Channel, Baltimore County, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0702] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9426. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Detonation of Underwater Ordnance; Northwest Harbor, San Clemente, California [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0703] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9427. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area: No-Wake Zone; Port Huron to Mackinac Sailboat Race, St. Clair River, Port Huron, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0707] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9428. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Area; Detroit APBA Gold Cup, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0708] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9429. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; French Festival Fireworks, St. Lawrence River, Cape Vincent, NY [Docket No.:

USCG-2008-0710] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9430. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Area; Tug Across the River, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0712] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9431. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Area; Trenton Rotary Roar on the River, Detroit River, Trenton, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0713] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9432. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Swim Event, Boston Light Swim, Boston, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0715] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9433. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations, Seattle Seafair, Lake Washington, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0733] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9434. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River, Mile 616.0 to 622.0 [COPT Upper Mississippi River-07-034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9435. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kaskaskia River, Mile 010.0 to 011.0 [COPT Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9436. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Casino Queen Grand Opening, Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 179.2 to Mile Marker 180.0, St. Louis, MO [COPT Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9437. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 791.0 to 792.0 [COPT Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9438. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Croix River, Mile 016.7 to 017.3 [COPT Sector Upper Mississippi River-08-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9439. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 183.4 [COPT Sector Upper Mississippi River-06-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9440. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [COTP Savannah-06-061] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9441. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chicago Red Bull Flugtag, Lake Michigan, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2008-098] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9442. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Joseph River, St. Joseph, MI [USCG-2008-0901] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9443. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; PRA San Diego Fireworks Display; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0910] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9444. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; I.C.E. Special Events Fireworks Display; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0911] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9445. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland National Air Show, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0913] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9446. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Charles County, MD, and Gunston Cove, Accotink Bay and Pohick Bay, Fairfax County, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0916] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9447. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mark Albury Memorial Regatta, Biscayne Bay, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0917] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9448. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Delta Thunder Powerboat Race, Pittsburg, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0918] received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9449. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Equinox Creative Fireworks Display;

San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0919] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5194. A bill to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5131. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of expanding the boundary of Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (Rept. 111-597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5110. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4823. A bill to establish the Sedona-Red Rock National Scenic Area in the Coconino National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3914. A bill to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5388. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico; with an amendment (Rept. 111-601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4195. A bill to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4347. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4888. A bill to revise the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as it applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5494. A bill to direct the Director of the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain properties to the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. 111-605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5152. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1745. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 111-607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3199. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to State emergency medical service departments to provide for the expedited training and licensing of veterans with prior medical training, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3470. A bill to authorize funding for the creation and implementation of infant mortality pilot programs in standards metropolitan statistical areas with high rates of infant mortality, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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 Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 6144. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 6145. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability, require an ethics inquiry, and garnish the wages of a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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 Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 6146. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent home loan guaranty programs for veterans regarding adjustable rate mortgages and hybrid adjustable rate mortgages; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 6147. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare Program; 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 6148. A bill to combat trafficking in human organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 6149. A bill to require disclosures to consumers by coin and precious metal bullion dealers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACA, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 6150. A bill to amend the limitation on liability for certain passenger rail accidents or incidents under section 28103 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6151. A bill to charter an organization and establish a medal program to honor first responders in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 6152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exemption from employer Social Security taxes with respect to previously unemployed individuals, and to extend the credit for the retention of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 6153. A bill to authorize appropriations of United States assistance to help eliminate conditions in foreign prisons and other detention facilities that do not meet minimum humane standards of health, sanitation, and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of certain veterans who serve in support of Operation New Dawn for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 6155. A bill to expand the Pajarita Wilderness and designate the Tumacacori Highlands Wilderness in Coronado National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 6156. A bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of

Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution supporting the ideals and objectives of the United Nations Millennium Declaration and related Millennium Development Goals and calling on the President to ensure the United States contributes meaningfully to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals by the year 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 1627. A resolution recognizing the 110th anniversary of the Northwest Labor Press; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KILLDEE:

H. Res. 1628. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to efforts to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit to provide access to affordable healthcare for Delphi retirees and other eligible individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 1629. A resolution honoring the service and accomplishments of Colonel Steve Buyer, United States Army Reserve, on the occasion of his retirement from the Army Reserve; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. AL-EXANDER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. HILL, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DJOU, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LINDER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H. Res. 1630. A resolution expressing support for National POW/MIA Recognition Day; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SPACE):

H. Res. 1631. A resolution calling for the protection of religious sites and artifacts from and in Turkish-occupied areas of northern Cyprus as well as for general respect for religious freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 1632. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require officers and employees of the House to read the Constitution of the United States each year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. CORRINE

BROWN of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. MCCOLLUM;

H. Res. 1633. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Lights On Afterschool!", a national celebration of after-school programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H. Res. 1634. A resolution congratulating Taos Pueblo, its leaders and its people, on the 40th Anniversary of the return of their sacred Blue Lake lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 1635. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of an annual "National Yellow Ribbon Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. BACA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HELLER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. FARR):

H. Res. 1636. A resolution celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H. Res. 1637. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month 2010 and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should continue to raise awareness of domestic violence in the United States and its devastating effects on families and communities, and support programs and practices designed to prevent and end domestic violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 211: Mr. DJOU.
 H.R. 442: Mr. PAUL and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 532: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 610: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 673: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 678: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 789: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 868: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 878: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 886: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 917: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 968: Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 980: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 988: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1036: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 1093: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1205: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1643: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1646: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 1792: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 1806: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 1818: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1868: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 1995: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 2060: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2085: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2089: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2149: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2324: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 2378: Mr. PETRI, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 2417: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 2443: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 2565: Mr. WALZ and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2746: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2855: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 2882: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 3035: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 3243: Mrs. CAPPs.
 H.R. 3308: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 3320: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3431: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3441: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3666: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 3668: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 3764: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3974: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 4048: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 4054: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 4063: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 4088: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 4237: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
 H.R. 4269: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 4322: Mr. KRATOVIL.
 H.R. 4339: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 4544: Mr. HILL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 4594: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 4638: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4650: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4676: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 4689: Mrs. CAPPs and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 4720: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 4746: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 4755: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4796: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 4808: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARR, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER of New York,

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 4819: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 4844: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 4846: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4923: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4999: Mr. WAMP and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 5033: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5040: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 5043: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5056: Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 5081: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 5141: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MACK, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 5162: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 5235: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 5300: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. CHU, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 5318: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 5369: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 5400: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5441: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 5472: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 5487: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 5524: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 5538: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 5543: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 5564: Ms. CHU and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 5568: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 5575: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 5628: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5718: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 5746: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HODES, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CHU, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5807: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5819: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 5882: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MACK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 5894: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5928: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5933: Mr. WEINER, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. FOX, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 5936: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 5939: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 5948: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 5967: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 5982: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 5984: Ms. WATSON and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 6043: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 6072: Mr. MICA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 6081: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 6087: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 6098: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 6108: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 6113: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 6127: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 6139: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. McMAHON.

H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MICA.

H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. SPACE.

H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 303: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 316: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 99: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 111: Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H. Res. 252: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 349: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 986: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 1122: Mr. BAIRD.

H. Res. 1207: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 1217: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 1226: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 1264: Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 1311: Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 1343: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 1377: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WU, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. BECERRA.

H. Res. 1431: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H. Res. 1442: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 1452: Mr. DUNCAN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 1461: Mr. HALL of New York.

H. Res. 1482: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 1485: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BUYER, Mrs.

BONO MACK, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SPACE.

H. Res. 1507: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 1523: Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 1528: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 1529: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 1560: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 1576: Ms. MEEKS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CAO, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WU, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 1588: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. STUPAK.

H. Res. 1598: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Res. 1604: Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FALCOMAVEGA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H. Res. 1615: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CAO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1617: Ms. BEAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 1618: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 13, September 15, 2010, by Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN on the bill H.R. 5141,

was signed by the following Members: Daniel E. Lungren, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Frank A. LoBiondo, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Steven C. Latourette, Doug Lamborn, Peter T. King, John Campbell, Cynthia M. Lummis, Leonard Lance, John Boozman, Walter B. Jones, Mike Rogers (AL), Dana Rohrabacher, Glen Thompson, Todd Russell Platts, Edward R. Royce, Harold Rogers, Tom McClintock, Gary G. Miller, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Ken Calvert, Judy Biggert, Jerry Lewis, Darrell E. Issa, Jeff Miller, Vernon J. Ehlers, David G. Reichert, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Dave Camp, Don Young, Mary Bono Mack, Charles W. Dent, Jason Chaffetz, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Michael K. Simpson, Bill Cassidy, Lynn Jenkins, Rodney Alexander, Pete Sessions, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Parker Griffith, Denny Rehberg, Charles K. Djou, Ted Poe, JoAnn Emerson, Gus M. Bilirakis, David P. Roe, Tom Graves, Joe Wilson, Steve Austria, Geoff Davis, Jim Gerlach, Jean Schmidt, Bill Posey, Peter J. Roskam, Lynn A. Westmoreland, K. Michael Conaway, Erik Paulsen, Joseph R. Pitts, Christopher John Lee, Pete Olson, Howard Coble, Tom Latham, Connie Mack, Dan Burton, Duncan Hunter, Timothy V. Johnson, Adrian Smith, Trent Franks, Jo Bonner, Michele Bachmann, Kevin Brady, Wally Herger, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Gregg Harper, John Abney Culberson, Randy Neugebauer, Mike Coffman, Michael T. McCaul, Jerry Moran, John L. Mica, Aaron Schock, Ron Paul, Vern Buchanan, Thomas J. Rooney, Virginia Foxx, Fred Upton, John Shimkus, Mark Steven Kirk, Jeff Fortenberry, and John Kline.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 11 by Mr. KING on the bill H.R. 4972: Jim Gerlach, Gene Taylor, and Steve Buyer.

Petition 12 by Mr. HERGER on the bill H.R. 5424: Mark Steven Kirk, David G. Reichert, Gary G. Miller, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Parker Griffith, Trent Franks, Mike Rogers (AL), Jo Bonner, John L. Mica, and Aaron Schock.