

AMERICAN TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS—IMAGINE THIS SOLUTION

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, there is a common misconception in Washington that simply talking about a problem is as good as solving it. However, we know that actions speak louder than words. In 34 of the last 38 years, the Federal Government hasn't balanced its own checkbook.

It's time Washington stop looking for ways to afford bigger government. Yesterday, the Republican Study Committee introduced the Taxpayer Bill of Rights to restore budget accountability to Washington's checkbook, and it couldn't come at a better time. It is imperative that we prioritize America's financial responsibilities and reform the way Washington spends hard-earned taxpayer money. We can't expect different results if we keep on doing the same thing.

This is all about accountability, about reducing wasteful Washington spending, about balancing the budget, about fundamental tax reform, and about adapting programs to America's changing demographics.

Madam Speaker, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights isn't merely a slogan, it's a solution, a way we should all be thinking. Imagine this positive change to the way Washington spends hard-earned taxpayer money. Just imagine.

□ 1015

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1362, ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 242 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 242

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. 1362) to reform acquisition practices of the Federal Government. 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 clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and 20 minutes, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services 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 sub-

stitute 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 clauses 9 or 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 such 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clauses 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1362 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. CASTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 242.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 242 provides for consideration of H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 80 minutes of general debate, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI.

The rule provides that in lieu of the substitutes recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the Rules Committee report shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. All points of order except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI are waived against the substitute, and the substitute shall be considered as read.

The rule makes in order the two amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report and by the Member designated in the report. The amendments are considered as read, are debatable for 10 minutes each, are not subject to amendment and are not divisible. All points of order against the amendments except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI are waived.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, this rule and the legislation before us today is the Accountability in Contracting Act. This new act will restore accountability in Federal contracting. It targets conflicts of interest that have become too prevalent over past years.

During the first 100 hours of this new Congress, we charted a new direction in response to the American people's call for change and reform. We passed pay-as-you-go budgeting to require greater fiscal responsibility, we passed Medicare part D reform to require the executive branch to negotiate lower drug prices for our seniors and help the Federal bottom line, and we eliminated unnecessary tax subsidies for big oil companies that were making record profits while we paid record prices at the pump.

But if you recall, Madam Speaker, the first item of business during the first 100 hours of this new Congress was ethics reform. After the scandals of the past years, our commitment to the American people is to fight for higher ethical standards in the United States Congress and for all of the Federal Government by severing the connection between lobbyists and legislation, by banning gifts and travel from lobbyists, and ending the abuses of privately funded travel.

Today, the new Democratic Congress will continue our fight for ethics reform while we are still in the first 100 days through this rule and the Accountability in Contracting Act. This bill targets waste in Federal contracting, limits the use of no-bid contracts, minimizes sole-source contracts, and closes the revolving door between purchasing officers and private contractors. This bill addresses the past problems with wasteful and fraudulent contracts in Iraq, the Defense Department and in relation to Hurricane Katrina.

Congressional hearings have already shown that an estimated \$10 billion in

Iraq reconstruction funds was wasted as a result of overcharging, poor tracking and mismanagement by U.S. contractors, three times more than was estimated just last fall. Unfortunately, these accounts have abounded under the Bush administration. Defense auditors estimate that at least one out of six dollars spent in Iraq is suspect, including \$2.7 billion in Halliburton contracts.

Almost 19 post-Hurricane Katrina contracts worth a total of \$8.75 billion have been plagued by waste, fraud and mismanagement; and only 30 percent of the more than \$10 billion in Katrina contracts were awarded with full and open competition. And when it comes down to the small contractors who are actually hauling away the rubble and debris, they were not getting paid properly. This bill will help stop these kinds of wasteful contracts that keep the real work from getting done, that keep our neighbors from recovering from a natural disaster, and that keep the real workers from getting paid.

In my Tampa Bay area district, the Federal defense procurement revolving door has been the subject of Federal investigations in Federal district court proceedings in Tampa over the past several years. So it is vital we stand up for the folks we represent and demand their Federal tax dollars are spent correctly, especially when it comes to national security. That means having tough and fair oversight and a transparent system so there are no conflicts of interest.

So I commend the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Chair, Mr. WAXMAN, for his diligent efforts. I also commend the House Armed Services Chair, Ike Skelton, and my fellow members of the Armed Services Committee for their work on this legislation. When we marked this bill up in the House Armed Services Committee on Tuesday, this effort won bipartisan and unanimous support. It deserves no less by the full House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the financially irresponsible underlying legislation. I also rise with great regret to report to the American people that for the third week in a row the Democrat leadership is bringing legislation to the House floor that stacks the deck in favor of big labor bosses at someone else's expense.

Madam Speaker, in just a few minutes I am going to ask that we submit this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill will cost a new \$20 billion for 4 years after it is implemented. \$20 billion. Yet we have just heard from the other side that this is responsible and the right way to do things. What do we expect? An addi-

tional \$20 billion worth of spending. It is a real sad day, Madam Speaker.

Two weeks ago, American workers were the main losers in the Democrat-controlled House when the majority leadership forced through legislation that would provide for an unprecedented intimidation of employees by union bosses under a fundamentally anti-democratic process known as "card check."

Last week, in another unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon to important water projects across this country, the Democrat leadership set its sights on one of their all-time favorite targets, the American taxpayer. Other losers that were targeted in that bargain included some other perhaps more surprising targets, including local communities, small and minority-owned businesses and, perhaps most of all, the environment.

But I suppose that that is everything that the Democrat-controlled leadership says is good. Everything is a fair game when tilting the playing field in favor of labor bosses. That is what this new Democrat majority is about.

Given this well-established track record, it should come as no surprise that today, once again, the Democrat majority has placed a bull's eye squarely on the American taxpayers' back on the floor of this people's House. The legislation that we are being asked to consider today represents the triumph of politics over policy by attempting to taint every government contractor with the high-profile transgressions that only a few have done.

I do commend Chairman WAXMAN for his desire to provide proper and appropriate oversight for the use of government funds, and I do share his desire to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse in government contracting. However, the approach that he has brought to the floor is far-reaching and intrusive, expensive; and it misses the mark. The problem is primarily one of enforcement, and this is where Congress should be focusing its efforts on behalf of the taxpayer.

While these proposals may seem beneficial and look good on paper, in practice they add up restrictions upon restrictions simply for the sake of regulation. They would increase the cost and reduce government access to the solutions it needs, while increasing the burden on an already-overworked Federal contracting workforce.

While I am concerned about fiscal responsibility as a Member of this body, I do not believe that adding layer upon layer of additional regulations is a way to save taxpayer money or to be responsible.

Every day, private contractors provide the entire Federal Government with effective cost-saving solutions, and this legislation represents a large step backwards in giving these contractors the flexibility they need to provide these vital services. Rather than taking Chairman WAXMAN's approach and discouraging the vast majority of con-

tractors that do not play by the rules from wanting to do business with the government, Congress should focus on dealing with those bad actors that have violated the public trust.

□ 1030

Right here on our Capitol campus, private contractors provide us with the services that we need to function on a daily basis. They include inspecting and delivering the mail, mowing the Capitol grounds, installing signs, repairing sinks, providing IT consulting and technology systems maintenance, and they do so at the lowest cost to taxpayers through competition.

The Federal Government should not be competing with a vibrant private sector that can provide these services better, faster, and cheaper than we can do them ourselves. I find that a good rule of thumb that I have used for years is if you can open up the Yellow Pages and find professionals willing to do the same services listed, then the government should not try to perform these tasks on its own, because it will end up costing the taxpayers a great deal more money.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the Democrat Party wants to change this slowly and to stack the deck in favor of big labor bosses whose ranks have dwindled to 12 percent from a high of 35 percent in the 1950s. I understand that a very few contractors have behaved dishonorably and illegally, and for that they should reimburse the taxpayer and be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

But I simply don't believe that limiting the Federal Government's flexibility to contract, especially in the case of an emergency, is the answer to this problem. Nor do I believe that this legislation that is a new private sector mandate and that the CBO estimates will cost taxpayers over \$20 billion, 20 billion new dollars, should be considered reasonable or should be considered financially responsible. This is not the correct solution to this problem.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the CBO cost estimate for H.R. 1362.

H.R. 1362—ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

Summary: H.R. 1362 would amend federal contracting rules. Specifically the legislation would require federal agencies to limit the length of noncompetitive contracts and limit the use of sole source and cost-reimbursement contracts when possible. H.R. 1362 also would authorize an increase in funds used to pay for contract oversight, planning, and administration equal to 1 percent of the value of an agency's contracts. The legislation would require various reports to the Congress on noncompetitive contracts and contractor overcharges and amend employment restrictions on federal procurement officials.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1362 would cost \$20 billion over the 2008–2012 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts to provide additional resources for contract oversight, planning, and administration. That estimate does not include any costs or savings that could result

from implementing the legislation's provisions regarding the use of noncompetitive and cost-reimbursement contracts. CBO has no basis for estimating any costs or savings for those provisions. Enacting the bill could affect revenues by increasing collections of civil penalties, but CBO estimates that any increase in revenue collection would not be significant. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending.

H.R. 1362 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

H.R. 1362 would impose a private-sector mandate, as defined in UMRA, on certain former federal officials that were substantially involved in the awarding of contracts. CBO expects that the direct cost of com-

plying with the mandate would fall well below the annual threshold for private-sector mandates (\$131 million in 2007, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1362 is shown in the following table. The cost of this legislation falls within all budget functions that provide contract funding.

	SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Estimated Authorization Level						
Estimated Outlays		4,000	4,070	4,145	4,220	4,295
		3,440	3,900	4,090	4,165	4,240

Basis of estimate: H.R. 1362 would amend federal contracting rules and authorize the appropriation of additional funds for contract oversight, planning, and administration. CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1362 would cost about \$20 billion over the 2008–2012 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary funds. For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted before the start of fiscal year 2008 and that spending will follow historical patterns for contract oversight activity.

SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION

Contract Oversight. Section 203 would authorize the appropriation of additional funds for contract oversight, planning, and administration equivalent to 1 percent of the value of contract awards. Those funds would be used for hiring and training of acquisition workforce personnel, as well as contract planning, administration, and oversight. Based on information from the General Services Administration, CBO estimates that federal government awards contracts with a value of about \$400 billion annually. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1362 would require additional appropriations of about \$4 billion annually (with adjustments for inflation). As a result, we estimate a cost of about \$20 billion over the 2008–2012 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, and that the value of federal contracts increases at the rate of anticipated inflation.

Federal Contracting Rules. H.R. 1362 would amend various contracting rules regarding the use of noncompetitive, sole-source, and cost-reimbursement contracts by the federal government. This would include restrictions on the contract period for noncompetitive contracts and limiting the use of sole-source and cost-reimbursement contracts.

The provisions of the legislation that would impose restrictions on the length of noncompetitive contracts and limit the use of sole-source and cost-reimbursement contracts could increase costs for contract administration, but could also result in the use of other types of contract procurements that may lower costs to the government. CBO has no basis for estimating the net impact on the budget of those provisions. The circumstances involving the use of cost-reimbursement and noncompetitive contracts by federal agencies and the potential to use other types of contracts in those situations is often unique. At this time, CBO does not have sufficient information relating to the use of noncompetitive and cost reimbursement contracts to determine the magnitude of any cost or savings that could result from implementing H.R. 1362.

Other Provisions. The legislation also would require federal agencies to report to the Congress on noncompetitive and contractor overcharges. In addition, H.R. 1362 would require reviews and reports by the Government Accountability Office on the use of federal contracts. H.R. 1362 would amend

employment restrictions on federal procurement officials. Based on the cost of similar activities, CBO estimates that those provisions would increase federal administrative costs by a few million dollars a year.

REVENUES

Enacting H.R. 1362 could affect federal revenues as a result of new civil penalties for violations of procurement employment restrictions. Collections of civil penalties are recorded in the budget as revenues. CBO estimates, however, that any change in revenues that would result from enacting the bill would not be significant.

Estimated impact on state, local, and tribal governments: H.R. 1362 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated impact on the private sector: H.R. 1362 would impose a private-sector mandate, as defined in UMRA, on certain former federal officials that were substantially involved in government contracts awarded in excess of \$10 million. The bill would expand an existing one-year restriction that would prohibit those officials from accepting compensation as an employee, officer, director, or consultant from contractors receiving such awards. The mandate would apply to those officials that leave government service after March 31, 2007, but before the date of enactment. The cost of the mandate would be the potential loss of net income resulting from the restriction on those former federal officials. Because the bill would limit the restriction on compensation to apply to lines of business directly related to the awarded contract, CBO expects the direct cost of complying with the mandate would be minimal and would fall below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$131 million in 2007, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Matthew Pickford; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Lisa Ramirez-Branum; Impact on the Private Sector: Amy Petz.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and the well-intended underlying legislation which quite simply misses the mark and will be a huge net cost to taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, to correct the record, the cost that the gentleman from Texas referred to was in section 203 of the bill. That section was deleted in the Armed Services Committee markup and is not in the base text.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, and I thank her for her leadership on this rule and to get this bill to the floor so we can begin the big task of restoring accountability and oversight in our Federal contracting system.

I rise in support of the rule today and in support of H.R. 1362. I strongly believe we must restore the American people's faith in our government, and that is what this bill is about.

This bill will help stop the abuses of the Federal contracting system, a system that has deservedly come under fire recently, and sadly, whether it is in Iraq, Walter Reed, or many other places.

H.R. 1362 will increase transparency and accountability to help bring back the integrity to a system that has lost so much of the public's trust, and it is no wonder that we have lost so much of the public's trust when we have government auditors testifying that an estimated \$10 billion in reconstruction spending has been wasted as a result of overcharging, poor tracking, and mismanagement by U.S. contractors. But this is not only an issue about waste, abuse and fraud, it is about getting the job done right and ensuring we have the proper people in place to help those who need Federal Government services.

Recent hearings brought to light an Army memorandum showing that the decision to privatize support services at Walter Reed was causing an exodus of "highly skilled and experienced personnel." And as a result, the "patient care mission are at a risk of mission failure," the memorandum continued.

So not only do we need to end the waste and ensure taxpayer dollars are being used wisely, we need greater oversight and accountability on the contracting decisions that are being made in the first place. And we need to tell these contractors that if they are going to get a contract with the Federal Government, they must play by the rules and they must fulfill their responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

Passing H.R. 1362 and the other bills that have been on the House floor this week are important steps in our effort to restore the faith in government that has been lost by the American people. I understand that additional legislation regarding contractor oversight and accountability is in the pipeline,

and I look forward to working with this new Congress and chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction on this most important issue.

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

Madam Speaker, this is a costly bill. This is a bill that is an intrusion not only upon a system that works well, but it is also aiming at an unintended consequence, and that is it is not only going to be more expensive for the government to pay for those services that it wants to buy, but it is going to make it also more costly to the taxpayer in the amount of spending that takes place.

We think there could be better ways that this could be accomplished. I ask all of my Members to oppose this bill.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

From day one, this new Congress has been working to restore accountability in Washington, including adopting fiscally responsible pay-as-you-go budgeting and fighting for higher ethical standards in government.

It is heartening to the American people, I know, that much of this has been done in a bipartisan way. And indeed, on this bill this morning, I anticipate that the House will follow the unanimous and bipartisan votes of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

As part of our ongoing effort to fight for fiscally responsible budgeting and higher ethical standards, this week I know, today, we will pass this legislation and this rule that changes the way that Congress and the Federal Government does business. It shines a bright light on how government operates. We will continue to answer the call of the American people for change and reform.

I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and on the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Allen	Andrews
Ackerman	Altmine	Arcuri

Baca	Herseth	Oberstar	Goode	Manzullo	Rogers (MI)
Baldwin	Higgins	Obey	Goodlatte	Marchant	Rohrabacher
Barrow	Hill	Olver	Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bean	Hinchey	Ortiz	Graves	McCaull (TX)	Roskam
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pallone	Hall (TX)	McCotter	Royce
Berkley	Hirono	Pascrall	Hastert	McCrery	Ryan (WI)
Berman	Hodes	Pastor	Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Sali
Berry	Holden	Payne	Hayes	McHugh	Schmidt
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Perlmutter	Heller	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Peterson (MN)	Hensarling	McMorris	Sessions
Blumenauer	Hooley	Pomeroy	Herger	Rodgers	Shadegg
Boren	Hoyer	Price (NC)	Hobson	Mica	Shays
Boswell	Inslee	Rahall	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Boucher	Israel	Rangel	Hulshof	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Reyes	Hunter	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez	Inglis (SC)	Moran (KS)	Smith (NE)
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Ross	Issa	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Rothman	Jindal	Musgrave	Smith (TX)
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Allard	Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Souder
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppertsberger	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Stearns
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rush	Jones (NC)	Nunes	Sullivan
Capuano	Kagen	Ryan (OH)	Jordan	Paul	Tancredo
Cardoza	Kaptur	Salazar	Keller	Pearce	Terry
Carnahan	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda	King (IA)	Pence	Thornberry
Carney	Kildee	T.	King (NY)	Petri	Tiahrt
Carson	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta	Kingston	Pickering	Tiberi
Castor	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes	Kirk	Pitts	Turner
Chandler	Kucinich	Schakowsky	Kline (MN)	Platts	Upton
Clarke	LaHood	Schiff	Knollenberg	Poe	Walberg
Cleaver	Lampson	Schwartz	Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Walden (OR)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (GA)	Lamborn	Price (GA)	Walsh (NY)
Cohen	Lantos	Scott (VA)	Latham	Pryce (OH)	Wamp
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano	LaTourette	Putnam	Weldon (FL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sestak	Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Weller
Costa	Lee	Shea-Porter	Lewis (KY)	Regula	Whitfield
Costello	Levin	Sherman	Linder	Rehberg	Wicker
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Shuler	LoBiondo	Reichert	Wilson (NM)
Cramer	Lipinski	Sires	Lucas	Renzi	Wilson (SC)
Cuellar	Loebssack	Skelton	Lungren, Daniel	Reynolds	Wolf
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter	E.	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Smith (WA)	Mack	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Snyder			
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Solis			
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Space			
DeFazio	Markey	Spratt			
DeGette	Marshall	Stark			
Delahunt	Matheson	Stupak			
DeLauro	Matsui	Sutton			
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher			
Doggett	McCollum (MN)	Taylor			
Donnelly	McDermott	Thompson (CA)			
Doyle	McGovern	Thompson (MS)			
Edwards	McIntyre	Tierney			
Ellison	McNerney	Towns			
Ellsworth	McNulty	Udall (CO)			
Emanuel	Meehan	Udall (NM)			
Engel	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen			
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez			
Etheridge	Melancon	Visclosky			
Farr	Michaud	Walz (MN)			
Fattah	Millender-Filner	Wasserman			
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Schultz			
Giffords	Miller (NC)	Waters			
Gillibrand	Mitchell	Watson			
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Watt			
Gordon	Moore (KS)	Waxman			
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Weiner			
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)			
Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)			
Hall (NY)	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey			
Hare	Murtha	Wu			
Harman	Nadler	Wynn			
Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth			

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.	
Akin	Buyer	Doolittle	
Alexander	Calvert	Drake	
Bachmann	Camp (MI)	Dreier	
Bachus	Campbell (CA)	Duncan	
Baker	Cannon	Ehlers	
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	Emerson	
Bartlett (MD)	Capito	English (PA)	
Barton (TX)	Carter	Everett	
Biggert	Castle	Fallin	
Bilbray	Chabot	Feeney	
Bilirakis	Coble	Ferguson	
Bishop (UT)	Cole (OK)	Flake	
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes	
Blunt	Crenshaw	Fortenberry	
Boehner	Cubin	Fox	
Bonner	Culberson	Franks (AZ)	
Bono	Davis (KY)	Frelinghuysen	
Boozman	Davis, David	Gallegly	
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Garrett (NJ)	
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)	Gilchrest	
Buchanan	Dent	Gillmor	
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gingrey	

NOT VOTING—20

Baird	Dingell	Miller, George
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Peterson (PA)
Brown-Waite,	Gerlach	Radanovich
Ginny	Gohmert	Saxton
Clay	Gutierrez	Tanner
Crowley	Kanjorski	Westmoreland
Davis, Jo Ann	Kind	Wexler

□ 1105

Messrs. BOOZMAN, NEUGEBAUER, PICKERING, BISHOP of Utah and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act.

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

There was no objection.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 242 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. 1362.

□ 1109

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole