

As a matter of fact, the Democrat Party is on record and it's going to get worse next year and we're planning on it already. We already understand that. We ought to be saying that instead of extending benefits that it's going to cost another billion dollars.

Why are my friends on the other side afraid of risking more of the taxpayer dollars to provide Federal employees who already have the most job security and excellent benefits? Why are they afraid to back away and wait on this? Why are they pushing this? I wonder.

I wonder really who is more important and who they're hearing from, because evidently it's not people back home. Maybe it is the government workers that they're listening to. Maybe government workers are more important to this party than people back home. Maybe that's why this is happening.

Look, Republicans are providing quality solutions. We think we understand what the American people are going through. We understand what's happening with the taxing, the borrowing and the spending. Huge deficits and unemployment rates continue on and on and on.

I oppose this bill, and I hope that the American people understand that the taxpayer was heard today on the floor of the House of Representatives. They were heard by the speakers of the Republican Party who said we should not be extending benefits right now. We should not increase the spending and the cost of \$1 billion over the next 5 years. We should understand what real people are going through.

I'm going to vote against this bill.

I yield back my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I've sat here and listened this evening to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) talk about how this is a terrible waste of dollars, and how the Republicans are saying that this is a terrible waste of money.

But I'd wish to correct the gentleman. Today this isn't a partisan issue. In fact, I would predict that there are a number of his colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, on the Republican side of the aisle, like Mr. WOLF, who understand what this is about.

This is about America's children, about children coming into this world and bonding with a mother and a father and having the opportunity to do that in this hectic world that we live in today. It's about foster parents that come in and do the right thing, taking care of abused and victimized children, and needing that time to do it right.

It's about adoptive parents who, when they reach out and bring into their home permanently children who have been victimized by society's ills, having the opportunity to do it right so we can start healing those children.

There are a number of Republicans on that side of the aisle that are going to do the right thing tonight. They're going to vote for this rule, and they're

going to vote for this bill because it's the right thing for America and building families.

They call themselves the "Family Values Party." Tonight they can prove it by coming in here and voting to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I'd like to submit for the RECORD the statement of administration policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The Administration supports the goal of H.R. 626, which would provide Federal employees with access to paid leave upon the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child.

Being able to spend time at home with a new child is a critical part of building a strong family. The initial bonding between parents and their new child is essential to healthy child development and providing a firm foundation for the child's success in life. Measures that support these relationships strengthen our families, our communities, and our nation. The Federal government should reflect its commitment to these core values by helping Federal employees to care for their families as well as serve the public. Providing paid parental leave has been successfully employed by a number of private-sector employers, and can help to make job opportunities accessible to more workers.

The Administration is currently reviewing existing Federal leave policies to determine the extent of their gaps and limitations. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to refine the details of this legislation to make sure it meets the needs of Federal agencies and employees, as well as their families.

You know, the gentleman from Texas talks about how much money this government has wasted. He's right, there's a lot of money that gets wasted.

But over the last 8 years, as our country was being absolutely raped by those defense contractors in the Middle East with no accountability, where was the gentleman to stand up against that?

No, ladies and gentlemen, he's not willing to stand up against that, or wasn't during the last 8 years. But tonight he will criticize us spending a few dollars to get it right for our families in America.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that while most parents wish to stay home with their new child, they just can't afford to take unpaid leave, which directly affects that child's well-being.

We can start with having the Federal Government lead by example to set the stage for making changes across the table. To paraphrase Mahatma Gandhi, we must be the change we wish to see in this world. I believe that couldn't be more true.

I ask the Members of both sides of the aisle to support the parents of America, to support the children of America, and be the change that we wish for our world.

I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and on the previous question.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 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. 626.

□ 1743

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. 626) to provide that 4 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes, with Ms. DEGETTE 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.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Madam Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009, which was introduced by our colleague, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, on January 22, 2009.

As chairman of the subcommittee on the Federal Workforce, Postal Service and District of Columbia, I'm proud to serve as an original cosponsor of this bill, along with 55 other Members of Congress.

H.R. 626 takes an important step toward improving the Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain a highly qualified workforce by providing paid parental leave to Federal and Congressional employees for the birth, adoption or placement of a child for foster care, which is a benefit that is extended to many in the private sector as well as to all government employees in other industrialized countries.

□ 1745

In considering H.R. 626, the Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia marked up the bill on March 25, 2009, and favorably recommended the measure to the full Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The full committee then held markup on H.R. 626 on May 6, 2009, and ordered the bill to be reported to the floor by a voice vote.

The bill being considered today will allow all Federal and congressional employees to receive 4 weeks of paid leave taken under the Family Medical Leave Act, also called the FMLA, for

the birth, adoption or placement of a foster child.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the current FMLA statute provides workers up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for the birth, adoption or placement of a foster child with an employee. Madam Chairman, the bill before us does nothing more than permit those Federal employees, first, to receive paid leave for 4 weeks out of the 12 weeks to which they already have access and if the leave is connected to the birth, adoption or placement of a foster child; and secondly, provides employees the option to use accrued sick or annual leave, if available, for the remaining 8 weeks.

Let us be clear. The bill currently being considered does not provide Federal workers any additional time or expand beyond the 12 weeks already given under current law.

The bill before us has also been strengthened by granting the director of the Office of Personnel Management the authority to increase paid parental leave from 4 weeks to 8 weeks after considering a thorough cost and benefit analysis.

Parental leave is a pertinent concern around the world, and unfortunately, America is lagging behind in offering paid leave for parents. The governments of 168 countries offer guaranteed paid leave to their female employees in connection with childbirth. Ninety-eight of these countries offer 14 or more weeks paid leave. Currently, the Federal Government, as an employer, guarantees zero paid leave for parents in any segment of the workforce. However, H.R. 626, once enacted, will, in fact, change that.

While the 12 weeks of unpaid leave, as authorized by the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993, has helped millions of families during some of the most precious moments or, in some cases, the most challenging times of their lives, most Federal employees cannot afford to take unpaid leave. This often forces these employees to choose between spending more time with their newborn child or maintaining an income to support their families, which is a difficult decision that Federal workers will hopefully not have to make after the passage of this Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act.

The United States of America, and in particular, the Federal Government, is supposed to be a world leader in this area. Yet, for years, we have been followers. I'm sure you will agree with me when I say that it is high time for us to catch up with the rest of world and provide our dedicated employees with paid parental leave of this limited time.

Providing Federal employees with paid parental leave will increase worker morale and improve productivity by creating a more family friendly environment for Federal employees. Further, providing 20 days, or 4 work weeks, of paid leave to our dedicated Federal employees should not be de-

scribed as an overgenerous or excessive fringe benefit, but rather, as a necessary benefit to help strengthen American families and promote the healthy development of our children.

We also need to recognize that the Federal Government is the largest employer in the United States, and its policies in this area do set a tone for the country. No employee should have to choose between caring for a newborn child or their paycheck. This is especially true during an economic downturn.

Therefore, Madam Chairman, I'd like to once again reiterate my support for H.R. 626, the Federal Employee Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this measure.

I reserve the balance of our time.

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

Madam Chairman, H.R. 626 sends the wrong message at the wrong time to working American taxpayers and families that are struggling in difficult times. Our economy is in crisis, and deficits are already soaring.

Excess government spending created record deficits that have continued to rise for years, in good times and bad, meaning government already spends too much of the taxpayers' money and has been running deficits before, and now during, the Obama administration.

But more than that, jobs are being lost. In the time since the last time this bill was considered and not passed into law, 4.3 million Americans have lost their jobs, while 36,000 net new Federal jobs have been created. My voters, my taxpayers, my constituents are suffering. So are yours, Madam Chairman. So are the people on the other side. But in fact, there's no suffering in Washington.

We have some of the lowest unemployment. We have a growing quality of life, and even home prices are not falling very much here. It's not a surprise why. Salaries are not falling here. Those of us who will speak here today are making nearly \$170,000 a year, and many of our staff, a great many of our staff, make over \$100,000 a year, as do a great many of the Federal workforce.

This bill does not have one provision to say if you make \$170,000 a year, why do we have to give you this benefit, because you have to choose between feeding your children and being with your children? Certainly not. There are no protections against, in fact, those who do not need this special benefit getting it. There are no safeguards at all. As a matter of fact, this bill envisions the \$1 billion over 5 years or more than \$2 billion over 10 years swelling to \$4 billion over 10 years or more because, in fact, they believe it should be 8 weeks of special leave.

Now, in the Rules Committee, I was told I just didn't understand, that Germany gives a year when you have a child. You know, the amazing thing is Germany and France and many of these countries are now going the op-

posite direction because they recognize that they were losing competitiveness and that these generous benefits, although good to have, were unsustainable, and they're particularly unsustainable when the only people that can afford it are those of us who live off the taxpayers'—I'd like to say generosity, but in fact, it's not generosity. This money is taken involuntary and spent at the whims of Congress.

Madam Chairman, Federal employees enjoy one of the highest levels of job security, without a doubt, anywhere in the United States. I would venture to say many of them the highest. More importantly, in good times and bad, they keep their jobs.

Even if you look at the protections against being arbitrarily let go or hired at will, that's not even the point. The point is, in a bad time, when tens of thousands of auto workers are being laid off, when 40,000 employees of Chrysler dealerships have just gotten from this administration a 26-day pink notice to go because their franchise has been taken arbitrarily, at that time we have grown the Federal Government by 36,000, and we're looking at a new benefit that could easily cost \$4 billion over the next 10 years.

Now, this bill was scored at nearly \$1 billion over 5 years, but of course, that's only if it remains at 4 weeks. And let's talk about those 4 weeks. This bill is not 4 weeks. This is 12 weeks.

Most Federal workers when they retire have a significant amount of, even when they leave in general, accrued sick leave, and you might ask why. Well, because the typical sick leave for Federal workers is 13 days a year. That's nearly 3 weeks a year you get to be sick, depending upon your seniority, 20 to 26 days a year of vacation. So you're looking at 5 weeks of vacation. On top of that you're looking at nearly 3 weeks of sick leave, and we're being told by the majority that they can't make those tradeoffs to use some of that when a child is born.

It's a joyous occasion when a child is born. It's an important occasion when a child is adopted. It's sometimes a critical time when a foster child, battered, beaten, or simply unloved, is brought into the home. The minority has no question at all about the importance of this. It's been a long time since 1993. This is well-established to be something in which people make the sacrifices without sacrificing their jobs, and we certainly have no objection to the current practice which is common throughout the Federal workforce to allow employees to take some or all of their sick leave.

As a matter of fact, an amendment which has been ruled in order, will be considered tonight, calls for employees, Federal employees to be not only able to use all of their accrued sick leave, but to borrow against future sick leave. So, if they want to take the whole 12 weeks and every single day receive a full paycheck, we're willing to

meet the majority more than halfway. We're willing to make the kind of compromise the American people would like us to make with the majority. It doesn't mean that this is the ideal solution. There are safeguards that are not in this legislation that we would like to see, and we will work with the Senate to see if we can't get that, but in fact, we offer an amendment that would at least cause there to be no net new cost to the American people.

And I know that the majority will come back and say this is PAYGO neutral. Well, PAYGO is a wonderful term but let's understand. If you create additional days the Federal workforce will be off, you can only have one of two choices. Either their labor wasn't needed and, as a result, doesn't need to be replaced, or their labor was needed and will be replaced. Replacement costs money. That ultimately will lead to a higher cost.

I believe CBO's scoring of approximately \$1 billion over 5 years is, in fact, low, but I'm not going to argue with it. We accept theirs because they are, in fact, a neutral arbiter of these differences about what something costs or is worth.

So here the Republicans are going to offer to support codifying what many agencies are already doing in the Federal Government, but not without the American people understanding that if we add a new additional off-time benefit of 4 or 8 additional weeks, on top of the 5 weeks and nearly 3 weeks that are already granted to most Federal employees, I think that the American people, rightfully so, will send us packing. They will send us packing because we would be so out of touch, so inconsistent with what the small mom-and-pop and the not-so-small companies in America are experiencing.

Earlier, Madam Speaker, I said that 4,353,000 net jobs have been lost since the last time this bill was considered. That's not the true story. The true story is reflected in the State tax revenues and now in the Federal tax revenues, where we realize it's not just those who lost their jobs; it's those who lost a great percentage of the earnings they were making on their job. Overtime is gone, and in fact, profits, profit-sharing and additional commissions are generally gone. As a result, people aren't just out of work, but people who were still technically fully employed may be making less than half of what they were making just a year or two ago.

So, Madam Chairman, we on this side of the aisle will oppose the bill in its current form but not without offering viable alternatives, reasonable alternatives, some ruled, some not ruled, so that we can make this at least a bill that America can understand why we would consider doing it at a time in which so many Americans are suffering.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chairman, I just want to address a single point that's

been made by a number of the speakers on the other side who I have great respect for, the gentleman from Texas earlier and now the gentleman from California.

There is a drumbeat of justification that seems to be grounded in the fact that the economy is not in good shape right now, and that's a fact in my State, in my district, as well as all across America. But before we accept the argument that this is why it's being opposed, this bill is being opposed at this time, I just want to give a little brief history.

This bill has been presented for 15 years. This bill has been presented for 15 years before this body. In 2008, when a majority of the Republicans opposed this important benefit, the unemployment then was 5.6 percent, pretty good.

□ 1800

During the 109th Congress when the Republicans refused to bring this bill to the floor, the unemployment rate was never higher than 5.4 percent. During the 108th Congress when the Republicans again refused to bring this legislation to the floor, the unemployment rate ranged between 5.4 and 6 percent, relatively low.

During the 107th Congress when the Republicans refused to bring this legislation to the floor again, the unemployment rate never rose above 6 percent, and was below 4.5 percent for most of the year. During the 106th Congress when the Republicans again refused to bring this legislation to the floor, the unemployment rate never rose above 4.4 percent.

So there's a whole history here of my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle opposing this bill, during good times and average times, and now in lousy times. But that is not the underlying reason that they're opposing the bill. The evidence does not support that.

At this time, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the lead sponsor of this bill, who has been there for the entire 15 years fighting for this measure, our chairwoman from the 14th District, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in moving this bill to the floor and so many other areas in this Congress. And I'd like to thank all of my colleagues that have supported this on both sides of the aisle in its overwhelming passage in the past Congress, and of course today, especially Majority Leader STENY HOYER who, with me, introduced this bill 15 years ago. And Chairman TOWNS, who has led our committee so well, and Ranking Member WOLF, DAVIS, LYNCH, and former Congressman Tom Davis for all of their leadership on this issue.

We are here today to show that this Congress doesn't just talk about family values; it values families. This bill, H.R. 626, that grants 4 weeks of paid leave for the birth or fostering or adop-

tion of a child is the first bill to pass balancing work and family since 1993.

In 1993, we passed the landmark Family Medical Leave Act that provided 12 weeks of unpaid leave, which allowed women to have children and not lose their jobs. And this is very important since most women have to work. Many are single heads of household, but it takes two family incomes to make ends meet. This bill builds on those 12 weeks by providing 4 weeks of paid leave.

Many on the other side of the aisle have said that this economy is in recession and we should not be doing this. But I'd like to point out, in addition to the points that Mr. LYNCH made earlier, that they have been opposed to it in good times, bad times. They're just opposed to it.

But paid leave ensures that the birth of a child does not further destabilize families who are struggling to make ends meet during these troubled times. During this recession, working families need all the help they can get. 11.6 million Americans are unemployed today, which means that every paycheck counts more than ever.

Millions of dual-earner couples were struggling to stay afloat on two incomes before the economic crisis, and massive job losses mean that many of those families are now scrambling to pay the bills on just one income.

Without paid leave, the birth of a child means that many working families are left with no income at all. By extending benefits to Federal workers, we can diminish the risk of real economic hardship for the 1.8 million employees of America's largest employer, the Federal Government.

A new parent spends an average of \$11,000 in additional spending in the first 2 years of a child's life, according to a study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. By ensuring that family incomes remain steady while a parent is at home taking care of a new child, paid leave ensures that new parents' consumption remains steady, too. This consumption drives economic growth, which is precisely what our economy needs to recover.

In a downturn, workers who take parental leave without pay are at risk of serious financial hardship. Those workers may qualify for Federal or State benefits such as TANF or SNAP, which places an additional burden on our systems that are already strained by ballooning caseloads.

I have a great deal more to say on this issue, and I will place in the RECORD the remainder of my comments.

We need common-sense reforms like this, that reflect the way families live now. Many workers today, including Federal employees, simply cannot afford to go without a paycheck for any length of time.

Most families rely on two incomes to get by, and having one parent stay at home may not be an option. Without paid leave, the birth of a child can leave them with no income at all.

The U.S. should be a leader in family-friendly workplace policies, but unfortunately we are

falling behind. 168 countries guarantee some form of paid leave. The United States, along with Lesotho, Swaziland, and Papua New Guinea, does not.

Federal employees are noticing the lack of family friendly work policies in the Federal Government.

The Office of Personnel Management's Federal Human Capital Survey for 2008 indicates that issues of work-life balance are becoming a major concern for more and more Federal employees, because outdated leave policies are not addressing their needs.

At the same time, they report less support from their supervisors on this issue than at any time in the past. Statistics like these are clear evidence that this bill is overdue.

Our Armed Forces are to be commended for taking the lead on this issue. They already provide their new mothers with paid leave for the birth of a child.

My colleague Congressman STARK has introduced legislation which would provide paid parental leave to employees in the private sector.

It is time for us to bring the Federal Government up to speed.

Opponents of this bill say it will cost too much, but H.R. 626 is PAYGO neutral, and according to CBO "enacting H.R. 626 would not affect direct spending or receipts."

Let me be clear: There are no PAYGO implications for this bill. This is not to say that implementing paid parental leave is free of cost.

CBO says that providing 4 weeks of paid leave provided for in this bill would total \$140 million starting in 2011, which would increase to \$209 million if and only if the Office of Personnel Management chooses to increase the amount of paid leave to 8 weeks.

What this number represents is the value of the salaries of the 17,800 female and 12,000 male federal employees that the CBO assumes will take 4 weeks of paid parental leave in the bill's first year of implementation.

In other words, it is what agencies currently save when those employees go without pay under the current system.

Not reflected in the CBO score is the money we can save by providing paid parental leave.

Over the next few years, providing paid parental leave will increase employee morale and productivity while reducing turnover costs.

It can also help boost the economy in general. New parents spend an average of \$11,000 in added expenses in the year a child is born. By insuring that new families' incomes stay steady, paid leave insures that their consumption remains steady too, and this is exactly what our economy needs to recover.

Critics of this bill have said that it sends the "wrong message at the wrong time" to families and taxpayers.

That is not the message I hear.

Passing H.R. 626 today would send a strong message to hardworking families across the country that healthy and happy families are central to the well-being of this country, and that we never want a parent to have to make the terrible choice between getting a paycheck and caring for their new baby.

I urge my colleagues to support working families and to vote "yes" on H.R. 626.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to a ranking subcommittee member and somebody who has worked very hard on trying to

make this bill better, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this issue and many others in the Congress.

Madam Chair, on Monday, June 1, 2009, in Ontario, Ohio, in our district, 1,200 General Motors employees found out that they're losing their job. The Obama task force said in 12 months from now 1,200 families will face the consequences of unemployment. Yet, here we are today, ready to pass a new billion-dollar entitlement for Federal workers at a time when our economy is in turmoil and millions of Americans are struggling with joblessness.

It is unconscionable that this Congress heap even more spending onto the backs of American families and businesses. At a time when taxpayers already have to tighten their belts, we are now asking them for an additional \$1 billion. And worse, the spending is unnecessary.

Federal employees are already entitled to 12 weeks of unpaid leave during any 12-month period because of a birth, adoption, or the taking in of a foster child. In many cases, Federal workers can use accrued sick leave and annual vacation leave. In fact, if you have been a Federal employee for just 3 years, you already have 4 weeks of annual leave and 2½ weeks of sick leave each and every year.

With this new benefit for the Federal Government, we are also putting small businesses at a disadvantage. Think about this. Only 57 percent of the private sector offer any independently defined sick leave. Now they will have to compete for workers against this expanded benefit for government workers. This moves us exactly in the wrong direction.

We need to incentivize the growth and renewal of a vibrant private sector, yet instead we are subsidizing an ever expanding Federal Government that will crowd out the private sector and, I think, frankly, stifle innovation and entrepreneurialship.

The American people are watching us. In these difficult economic times, they expect their government to do exactly what they have done, cut the waste and tighten our belts. That is the message I have heard all across our district. It's what I've heard from families experiencing unemployment and small businesses that have had to shut their doors. Instead, this Congress continues to spend and spend and spend.

Rather than taking steps to improve the economy to create jobs for the 14 million unemployed Americans, we are giving a better deal to the 2.7 million people who are already employed in the Federal sector. This is the wrong message to send, and I encourage my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the full chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS).

Mr. TOWNS. I would like to thank the Federal Workforce Subcommittee

chairman, Mr. LYNCH, for the outstanding job that he has done. I'd like to thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership on this issue. I would like to thank the majority leader, STENY HOYER, for his work on it, and I'd also like to thank Congressman CONNOLLY for his work as well.

The gentlewoman from New York has worked tirelessly to make the Federal Government an environment that is supportive of working mothers and fathers. I want to thank her for her efforts and, may I add, a job well done.

We need to recognize that the Federal Government is the largest employer in the United States and that its policies should set a tone for the country. H.R. 626 provides Federal employees with 4 weeks of paid parental leave for the simple reason that no employee should have to choose between caring for a new child or their paycheck.

By providing 4 weeks of paid parental leave, H.R. 626 makes a strategic investment in the Federal workforce. This bill will help the government recruit and retain young, talented employees. As the Federal Government prepares for a wave of upcoming retirements, we need to attract this segment of the population to help us take on some of the challenges facing this country.

This bill also provides potential cost savings to the American people. The taxpayers directly benefit when the government retains existing employees rather than having to hire, retrain, hire, retrain. That is expensive.

Let me also add, the country is better served by an experienced and productive Federal worker that is able to adequately provide for the health and well-being of their newborn or newly adopted child. The long-term societal benefits of promoting healthy families and early child development are enormous.

We in the Federal Government have a unique obligation to set an example for the rest of the Nation, both in values that we promote and in the way we responsibly manage taxpayer-funded programs. This bill accomplishes both goals. It benefits children and families and will enable us to recruit and retain top-notch Federal employees whose work benefits the entire Nation.

For all these reasons, I urge all the Members to support this family-friendly legislation that says to the world we care about our children.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend and our ranking minority member, Mr. ISSA, for yielding the time and for his leadership here.

In an earlier life of mine, when I was with the Select Children Family Committee back in the eighties, my then boss—I was a Republican staff director—my then boss, Dan Coats, was one of the Republicans who supported the Family Medical Leave Bill, which I didn't agree with.

But I remember when he told me I could sit in all the meetings and we worked with how that law was going to be drafted. People said, Oh, it'll never be paid. This is just to cover people for unpaid. You're just a paranoid conservative because you keep talking about this becoming paid.

We watched this move into the government arena, and all of us understand the tensions here. My daughter just had our second grandchild. She's a schoolteacher. The struggle was how was she going to deal with the time she was going to take off. Was it going to be paid? Was it during a school year? What do you do when you have—Grant's 2 and Reagan, which won't shock anybody that my daughter picked the name Reagan. She has two little kids. How do you do this? What's fair? My oldest son, Nathan, and his wife both work in the government. They would love to have paid medical leave.

But there's some problems here. Quite frankly, one of the most controversial problems is what to do with the husband and should he be able to get time off when a baby is born. Forget all the medical questions. What do we do with air traffic controllers? What do we do with DEA agents who may be working in the final bust on a drug case? What about Homeland Security, where they've been working 2 years on the case, the wife has a baby. Can they take sudden leave as this case is going to trial?

There are very complicated fundamental questions in the challenge of how this would practically work.

The second challenge is, in case people haven't heard, we've been printing a lot of money or obligating a lot of future debt, and the question is: Is this the time that the Federal Government should be doing something that is, quite frankly, generous, would help many families, but do we really have the money to do this at this time?

I represent the number one manufacturing district in the United States, both in jobs and percent of jobs, at least if you counted before the recession started. I imagine I still may be there.

My best county, where Fort Wayne is, the biggest city of around 260,000, has a 9.5 percent unemployment rate. Whitley County has 11.6; Kosciusko, 12.2; DeKalb, 13.4; Noble County, 16.6; Steuben County, 15.1; LaGrange County, 17.7; Elkhart County, 17.8, where the President went in for the first stimulus package.

Now I'm supposed to go back to my district and say that government employees are going to get paid parental leave when they're looking at how they get unemployment and how they ever get a job.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. I would yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SOUDER. That generosity and kindness to families is important, but

we also have to balance is this going to be mandated on the private sector, is this really workable. Have we thought through the particulars in the Federal sector? Do we have the money to do this? Lastly, is this the time, while millions of people are laid off, where others don't know how they're even going to pay their house payments, how they're going to pay their health care, to say, but we in the Federal Government are going to be generous with our employees and give them paid parental leave and family medical leave with their tax money?

□ 1815

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to one of our newest but most energetic and dynamic members of the subcommittee (Mr. CONNOLLY) from the 11th District of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman, and I also thank, Madam Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee and Mrs. MALONEY from New York for her leadership on this very important issue.

Madam Chairman, I thought we had finally identified an issue where we could count on the support of the minority party. After enduring decades of sanctimonious speeches about family values, here we are, poised to take action. H.R. 626, the Paid Parental Leave Act, would allow federally employed mothers and fathers to spend time with their newborn children without sacrificing their income. Surprisingly, the minority party objects to such a notion.

In the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, of which I am a member, the minority actually proposed during markup to prohibit paid parental leave being used for foster children. I can't even speculate about what the origin of that antipathy toward foster children might be; but I am reminded of a speech in this Chamber, Madam Chairman, made not so long ago by former Republican Majority Leader Tom DeLay. He spoke passionately about the plight of foster children and implored Congress to "listen to the stories of these children and the stories they tell. Study the broken system we've created for them, and help them. For God's sake, help them."

Madam Chairman, H.R. 626 will not solve all or even most problems with the foster care system, but it will allow more Federal employees to spend more time with very young foster children. We have a wealth of data that demonstrates that this parent-child interaction is essential for the cognitive and emotional development of these children. Yet the minority party introduced amendments in the committee that would actually punish foster children.

Now, here on this floor, the minority party endeavors to gut this legislation and to prevent mothers and fathers from spending time with their very

young children. This bill is what real family values are all about. I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 626.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, what we do here in the United States House and in the United States Congress—the standards that we set and the expectations that we have in terms of benefits—really sets a precedent not only for the people whom we employ in the Federal Government but also for whom small businesses and large businesses around our country employ.

Like everyone else, I enjoy Federal benefits. My employees here with me enjoy our great benefits plan. Unfortunately, back home in central Illinois, many individuals there are not employed by the Federal Government. By and large, they're employed by the private sector. Unfortunately for them, this is a time when they're not looking to expand their benefit programs, when they're not going to their employers and asking for more. They're thankful for the paychecks they've got.

It seems to me a little disingenuous by those in support of this legislation that, at a time when we're talking about stimulating the economy and at a time when we're talking about feeling the pain of the American people, we know the truth—that our constituents are having to do the opposite. They're having to cut back. They're having to do with less. This bill and this measure seek to do the opposite.

Expanding 4 weeks of paid parental leave will not only add a cost to the Federal Government by the Congressional Budget Office's own figures of \$1 billion over the next 5 years, but it will undoubtedly set a precedent for the private sector. Unfortunately, for the private sector, they cannot print the money or tax the American people to pay for their benefits.

The unemployment rate in my State of Illinois was just over 9 percent as of April. This includes over 24,000 jobs that were lost by my hometown employer, Caterpillar. When I go back there this weekend, I will have to tell those individuals who are now unemployed, not only do they not have jobs, but my colleagues in this body decided that our employees, who have not felt the economic impact of a downturn, are not only getting to keep their jobs, but they will also have added benefits at their expense as taxpayers.

I don't know how we can honestly vote for more benefits, for more pay, and for more cost to the Federal budget at the expense of taxpayers and of those people who are cutting back and losing their jobs.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California's Sixth District (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, America should be a world leader in

helping parents balance their work and family responsibilities.

As the chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I find it totally unacceptable that the country I live in—the United States of America—is one of only four countries not providing paid leave to new mothers and fathers. Today in the United States, 51 percent of new parents don't have paid leave. So, as a result, some take unpaid leave if they can afford it; some quit; and some are fired for taking too much time off.

That's why I strongly support H.R. 626, so we can ensure that Federal employees won't be forced to choose between their paychecks and their families at one of the most important times of their lives—the birth or the adoption of a child. Investing in our working families is the best way to strengthen our workforce. It is the best way to stimulate our economy, and it is the best way to strengthen our country.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation authored by Congresswoman MALONEY. Support working families. Don't force them to choose between putting food on the table and having dinner with their children and getting to bond with their new babies. Vote for this legislation because the United States of America needs to stand proud among other countries in this world.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I trust the gentlewoman from California was only misunderstood or had misspoken when she said someone would lose his job for taking parental leave. That would be a crime under the 1993 act.

I would yield to the gentlewoman to correct that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right. I said: for taking too much time off beyond the family medical leave.

Mr. ISSA. Beyond the 12 weeks?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Yes.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentlewoman. Madam Chairman, I would now like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this legislation. It offers a new \$1 billion benefit to Federal workers. I have no doubt that the Federal workers deserve this benefit, but to non-Federal workers, they don't deserve having their paychecks docked \$1 billion to pay for it. That's what we're talking about. That's if the non-Federal Government workers are fortunate enough to still have their jobs in this troubled economy. Again, it's a great benefit. I wish every new parent could have that. I want to create a more prosperous economy in America so that every American could enjoy it, but this is absolutely nothing more than a wealth transfer of \$1 billion from non-Federal Government workers to Federal workers. It is just patently unfair.

Why would you want to dock the pay of everybody else in this troubled economy to pay for this?

Already, if you look at the benefits that Federal Government employees receive—and listen, there are great Federal employees, and I want to keep them, and many of them are incredibly dedicated public servants. Yet look at the annual leave of the Federal Government versus the annual leave, on average, in the private sector. Federal workers are already receiving a better deal.

Look at the annual sick leave of the Federal Government compared to the average sick leave in the private sector. The Federal Government worker is already receiving a better deal.

Look at the family medical leave. You can see that Federal Government workers already receive, on average, a better deal than those in the private sector.

So, again, on average, when they're enjoying greater benefits and when they're enjoying greater job security, what a slap in the face to every worker in America who doesn't receive a government paycheck to see that, all of a sudden, they're going to have to pay for a new benefit for Federal workers.

This is on top of the fact that, today, the Federal Government is already having to borrow, Madam Chair, as you well know, 46 cents on the dollar. We are awash in red ink. Already, this body, under Democratic control, passed a budget that will triple the national debt in 10 years, costing taxpayers \$148,926 per household. It will triple the national debt in the next 10 years. We are about to see more debt placed on this Nation, more debt in the next 10 years than in the previous 220.

You know, Madam Chair, there was a time in America's history where you worked hard today so that your children could have a better life tomorrow. Instead, a bill like this is saying: You know what? Let's go ahead and let the government work easy today so that our children have to work even harder tomorrow. Again, it's just unfair to everybody who doesn't receive that Federal Government paycheck.

At some point, Madam Chair, you have to ask: When does the debt and the spending stop?

We will never run out of good ideas. We will never run out of opportunities to take money away from one group of citizens and give it to another group of citizens. Those opportunities are there each and every day. Again, if you care about all of the children in America, you will quit placing an unconscionable burden of debt upon them.

So this bill must be rejected out of fairness and out of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Representative from Maryland's Fourth District, DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her long-time leadership on this

legislation and for her ongoing efforts to ensure family-friendly workplaces. That must begin at least with the Federal Government.

It is so tiresome and tedious to stand on this floor every day and to listen to the demagoging of Federal employees. They are the people who get up every single day and inspect our food. They make sure that we have clean water. They process Social Security checks. They do all of the business of this government, and it is so sad that, even when offering a simple parental leave act, we have to demagogue Federal employees in the process.

The legislation provides 4 weeks of paid parental leave for new mothers and fathers for the birth, adoption or fostering of a child. America's 1.8 million Federal employees will benefit from this time to learn how to care for and to bond with their new additions to their families. It's what many in the private sector already do, and it's what we strive for. The Federal Government needs to set an example.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. I would like to yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. This will also help employee morale, and it will allow the Federal Government to attract and to retain young and talented employees in our aging workforce.

Madam Chair, as a Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland—proudly the home to at least 70,000 Federal employees—for my neighbors, for my friends, for the people who work hard every day, this important legislation will advance family-friendly policies. It will allow new parents the time necessary to care for their children, and it will set a standard for the Federal Government and for the private workforce.

There are times when it is simply the right thing to do, and this is one of those times. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1830

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and somebody who well knows about the challenges that people face in the workforce today.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague from California for yielding the time.

Madam Chairman, some of the greatest joys in my life were the two births of my daughter and son. Two years ago, my daughter, Madison, I was able to be there for the birth with my wife, one of the great joys of my life. And then just 4 weeks ago tomorrow, the birth of my baby boy, Harrison, and I was there as well. Just wonderful, wonderful times that every family should spend together. Those opportunities already exist today in law. There is nothing in this bill that either takes away or

gives the ability of parents to do that. They already have that right today, as they all should.

Why I rise in objection to this bill is it adds an extra \$938 million in new entitlements, in new debt, money that we don't have in this country, to an already growing deficit. We're at a \$1.9 trillion deficit this year alone. Projections are that in the next 5 years, this administration will double the national debt. And at what time do we stop and look out for those children? My son that was born 4 weeks ago, when do we look out for his future, his opportunity, so that he doesn't have to inherit another billion dollars in debt that this bill will give him?

I think it's very ironic in the same week that General Motors became "Government Motors" because of primarily health benefits, benefits that were added on and added on for employees to the point where the benefits of the employees bankrupted the company. And so what's Congress' answer to that? Congress' answer in the same week is to add more benefits at a time when people are losing their jobs, money that we don't have, almost a billion dollars. There used to be a saying "a billion here, a billion there, pretty soon you're talking about real money." I think the public has spoken out. They said, Enough is enough. We've got to control spending and look out for our future generations.

Mr. LYNCH. I just want to clarify.

The way this has been scored by CBO is that the salaries are paid to the employees already. The cost and/or savings recognized in the CBO estimate that has been cited here reflect the fact that by forcing Federal employees to take leave without pay, they realize a savings from that. But there is no new debt acquired here.

What the savings here that CBO is recognizing is the fact that they have budgeted for these salaries but then people take a certain amount of time off without pay, and that realizes a gain in the budget that's recognized in the CBO estimate.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I very much thank my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and Mrs. MALONEY and my colleagues who have fought hard for this bill.

There are a couple of reasons why I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation. One is that we are in the midst of an economic crisis in this Nation, and who do we turn to? We turn to the Federal workforce to reset our economy, to put our Nation's investments where they need to be. We turn to them because we know that they are incorruptible. This is the most professional, least corruptible organization, civil service, in the world. We should be very proud of our civil servants.

Now, as the corporate board of directors of the largest workforce in the Nation, it's incumbent on us to let them

know how we see them, to recognize them, to incentivize them, to recruit the very best and brightest people in this Nation and to retain them. And how do we do that? By leading in terms of the benefits that other large corporations provide. We should be leading by example. But the reality is that other large workforces oftentimes provide much better benefits than the Federal Government. We need to be in the leadership. This enables us to catch up. We recognize these employees by doing things that are tangible, and this is a tangible benefit.

The second reason is that we recognize that the most important time in anyone's life are those first few weeks after birth where a parent has the opportunity to nurture, where the child can bond, where the child's brain can be stimulated, where the child can understand they will grow up in a secure, safe environment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I very much thank my good friend.

And I would hope that those who are in kind of knee-jerk opposition to this legislation would reconsider, because Mr. WOLF perhaps expressed it best: These are the days that matter, the weeks that matter. We want the healthiest workforce, we want the strongest society possible. And if we are to do that when we are the corporate board of directors of the largest workforce, we should lead by example by providing paid parental leave so a child can bond with their parents, so they can get them off to a healthy start. That's what this is all about. A strong society, enabling every child born in America to have the full opportunity to realize their potential.

This legislation enables the Federal workforce to achieve that objective. It's a noble national objective. It's what America ought to be about. Let's get this legislation passed.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LYNCH. I am prepared to close, so I reserve at this time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, in a few short minutes we will complete general debate; we will go to amendments. At that time, I'm hopeful that the amendment offered by the committee, the Republicans on this committee, will be considered favorably. If it is, then what seems to be unreconcilable as our differences can be resolved.

Clearly, we agree that 14 million Americans are out of work. We agree that we're in a recession. We agree that Americans are suffering. We agree that

whether you're having a child, adopting a child, or bringing a foster child in need into your home, that that bonding time is worthwhile now, just as it was in 1993 when we overrode all States and all employers to provide that option without fear of retaliation or loss of a job.

I think we agree that this bill is 12 weeks, 8 of which may be paid by the use of sick and other leave. I know we agreed that if you serve 15 years in the government you'll have about 8 weeks a year of paid leave already accrued. We only disagree on whether or not a new cost, a new entitlement will be borne by the American people. We seem to disagree on whether going from not paying somebody when they're off to paying them is, in fact, a cost to the government. We certainly disagree on whether or not when it becomes an additional 4 weeks of pay, many will choose to take it. As a matter of fact, Madam Chair, when the CBO scored, they made the assumption that half of all men would not take any benefits under the Parental Leave Act as they currently don't. But, of course, when you're offered 4 weeks free, completely free of sick leave, perhaps it will be irresistible to take some, in which case the \$1 billion over 5 years could rise above that figure.

So there are some things we disagree on.

But if we take what we agree on, which is the American people are watching mounting deficits, the American people do believe that at times we're out of touch, that we don't feel their pain. The gentleman from Virginia talked about the Federal workers in his district. The Federal workers have grown in his district at a time in which the gentleman from Illinois has seen 40,000 workers lose their job at Caterpillar. Those were good-paying jobs. They had benefits. They may have even had some parental leave benefits. Today, they have no benefits. They're not choosing between having a paycheck or being with their child; they're choosing whether or not to go out and find some minimum-wage job or do something to try to bring a little money into the house, because in fact, they no longer have the good-paying jobs that have evaporated in this recession.

We did a stimulus package, and we disagreed on a lot of how it was done, but we understood we needed to get Americans rolling again, we needed to get them the opportunities. What those 14 million have given up—and countless millions more have given up in loss of some of their income—is what we disagree about.

So, Madam Chair, I would ask that the CBO document scoring this be placed in the RECORD so there is no question as to what we all agree on, the NFIB letter opposing this, and the letter from the Independent Electrical Contractors also be placed in the RECORD at this time.

H.R. 626 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ACT OF 2009

Summary: H.R. 626 would amend title 5 of the United States Code, the Congressional Accountability Act, and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) by creating a new category of leave under FMLA. This new category would provide four weeks of paid leave to federal employees following the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child. In addition, the legislation permits the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to increase the amount of paid leave provided to a total of eight weeks based on the consideration of several factors such as the cost to the federal government and enhanced recruitment and retention of employees.

Under current law, federal employees who have completed at least 12 months of service are entitled to up to 12 weeks of leave without pay after the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child. Upon return from FMLA leave, an employee must be returned to the same position or to an "equivalent position with equivalent benefits, pay, status, and other terms and conditions of employment." Employees may get paid during that 12-week period by using any annual or sick leave that they have accrued. The leave provided by this bill would be available only within the 12-week FMLA leave period.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 626 would cost \$67 million in 2010 and a total of \$938 million over the 2010–2014 period, subject to appropriation of the necessary funds. Enacting H.R. 626 would not affect direct spending or receipts.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 626 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation would fall in all budget functions (except functions 900 and 950).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010–2014
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Estimated Authorization Level	69	215	219	221	224	947
Estimated Outlays	67	209	218	221	223	938

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 626 will be enacted by October 1, 2009, and that the necessary amounts for implementing it will be appropriated each year. Under the legislation, the new category of leave would become available six months after enactment (that is, around April 2010). As a result, the cost of the legislation in 2010 reflects implementation for only half of the year. After 2010, CBO has included in its estimate a 50 percent probability that OPM will use its authority to increase the amount of paid leave available from four weeks to eight weeks. Costs in future years are projected to grow with inflation.

CBO assumes that the potential users of the new leave would be primarily the roughly 700,000 civilian employees who are between the ages of 20 and 44 and have been employed at least 12 months. (This figure excludes employees of the Postal Service because H.R. 626 amends title 5 of the United States Code, which does not apply to them.)

Estimating an adoption rate based on data from the Department of Health and Human Services and applying birth rate information for the relevant age cohorts from the National Center on Health Statistics to the roughly 313,000 women eligible for the new

leave yields about 17,800 women who might give birth or adopt in a given year. Based on average salary information from OPM, CBO estimates that four weeks of paid leave—the maximum amount guaranteed by the bill—for female employees would cost between \$2,800 (for those in the youngest age cohort) and \$5,400 (for those in the 40–44 age cohort). Assuming that nearly all of those women took the maximum amount of leave, CBO estimates the cost of the leave to be \$77 million this year (if it were available for the entire 12-month period).

Applying those same calculations to the 390,000 men in the affected age groups, CBO estimates that roughly 24,000 men would be eligible for the four weeks of paid leave, at an average cost of between \$3,100 and \$6,000 per male employee. Assuming that eligible men would take the leave at about one-half the rate of women, CBO estimates that men would use another \$54 million worth of leave this year (if it were available for the entire 12-month period), bringing the total to \$130 million.

Since CBO assumes that the new leave would not be available until half-way through fiscal year 2010, there would be no costs for 2009 and the 2010 costs would represent only six months of the year, totaling \$67 million. Beyond 2010, CBO assumes a full year of availability and has included a 50 percent probability that OPM would increase the amount of paid leave available to employees. As a result, anticipated costs increase to \$209 million in 2011. (The 2011 costs would be about \$140 billion if the benefit were kept at a maximum of four weeks.)

The effects of this bill on the budget derive from the provision of a new form of paid leave. To the extent that such a new benefit enables people to take advantage of paid leave rather than taking leave without pay, the costs are clear. However, employees who would currently use annual or sick leave upon the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child may choose to use this new form of paid leave and save their accrued leave for a later date. CBO has no basis for estimating the magnitude of such substitution, but the deferral of annual and sick leave also represents a cost either in terms of increased availability of paid leave or cash payments upon separation.

In addition, providing a more generous benefit to employees may enhance the federal government's ability to retain employees after the birth or adoption of a child and thereby lower recruitment and training costs. CBO estimates that such potential savings are likely to be relatively small over the next five years.

Intergovernmental and Private-Sector Impact: H.R. 626 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Barry Blom, Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Elizabeth Cove Delisle, Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate Approved by: Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,

Washington, DC, June 3, 2009.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing to notify you of our opposition to H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009.

The legislation mandates an alarming expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), from an unpaid leave program

into one that would provide partial paid parental leave for federal employees. By carving out 4 of the 12 weeks of FMLA as paid parental leave, NFIB is concerned that H.R. 626 sets a precedent for future discussions over expansion of FMLA.

In addition to creating a new paid leave component of FMLA, the bill does not require federal employees to first use accumulated vacation or sick leave before taking the paid parental leave. Currently, if an employee has accrued paid time off, an employer may require them to use some or all of their accrued paid time for some or all of the FMLA leave.

Small businesses are struggling to survive in our tough economic times, and are very concerned that creating an expensive, new paid leave benefit for federal employees will eventually lead to new paid leave mandates on small business. I urge your strong opposition to this legislation.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy.

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS,

Alexandria, VA, June 3, 2009.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing on behalf of the 2,700 merit shop contractor members of the Independent Electrical Contractors (IEC), who urge you to oppose H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act, which would expand the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as it applies to federal employees, to mandate four weeks of paid FMLA leave, on top of existing leave.

Please let me be clear that our opposition to this bill is based solely on the precedent it sets for the private sector, and has nothing to do with the individuals who work for the federal government.

IEC is concerned that, in radically expanding FMLA to include paid leave, Congress is laying the groundwork for mandating paid sick leave on private sector employers. One-size-fits-all leave mandates, such as the Healthy Families Act (H.R. 2460/S. 1152), fail to take into account the varied natures of our nation's industry segments, and the individual employers whose unique business models are exactly the factor that determines their success or failure.

And, most importantly in this debate, it is paramount that Congress ascertain the real world impact of mandating paid sick leave on the private sector. Small business owners craft their pay, leave, and work rules based on the business model that keeps them competitive, grows their business, and creates more jobs. If Congress stunts the flexibility of these individual business models, then it will be directly threatening this competitiveness and the jobs that come with it.

IEC encourages Congress to seriously consider the precedent that is set by this expansion of FMLA, and oppose H.R. 626.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BRIAN WORTH,
VP of Government and Public Affairs.

Lastly, Madam Chair, I believe that the intentions of the majority are generally good, but I believe that this bill contains something the American people may not have heard, and in closing, I want them to hear.

This bill not only gives 4 weeks of new paid leave for the mom who may be coming home immediately following the birth of the child, but it gives that 4 weeks of additional pay to the father. It does so whether it's an adult child

they're adopting, someone 15 or 16 going off to school every day. It does it for both mom and dad, and it does it on top of the 8 weeks they can take in other ways already.

So I want the American people to understand not only does it do that, but it is anticipated by the majority that after an OMB study—which they fully believe will show that on balance this is still a good motivator and positive for the workforce—this benefit will rise from 4 weeks of additional pay to 8 weeks of additional pay for both men and women in the Federal workforce at a time in which 14 million Americans have no income at all.

With that, Madam Chair, I hope that the majority will see that they're out of touch if they don't think the American people are concerned that this is, in fact, showing a disconnect between the American people suffering and in fact, the new benefits to the one portion of the workforce that is not suffering, the one portion that has not seen a pay cut but in fact a pay raise, the one portion that has not seen cuts in their numbers but in fact increases in their numbers, and that's the wonderful men and women who make up the Federal workforce in all areas. They're good people, but they understand. And listening tonight, I believe the Federal workers in my district will understand that in fact this is a time for them not to look for big gains when, in fact, people on both sides of their homes are losing their homes.

So, Madam Chair, I would urge that we not support the bill in its current form, and I look forward to the amendment that we plan to offer being in fact favorably considered so we can make a bill that balances this good effort with those 14 million people who today have no solution for parental leave and in fact do not understand why we would add 4 or 8 weeks of additional paid time for people at this time no matter how well-intentioned.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, this bill is narrowly tailored to specific circumstances. It would provide 4 weeks of paid parental leave. The specific instances are the birth of a new child, an adoption, or someone taking a child into foster care. That's how you qualify for receiving these 4 weeks of benefits. And I think that this makes a strategic investment in the Federal workforce.

□ 1845

This will help the government retain and attract young talented employees; and in so doing, it provides potentially an ultimate savings to the American people since there's a direct benefit when the government retains existing employees rather than having to hire and retrain new ones. We are all familiar with the revolving door in the Federal Government, where we bring in people, we train them, they become very competent in their areas of exper-

tise, and then private industry steals them away because they can offer them much greater benefits and much, much higher pay. This provides a basic and decent benefit of 4 weeks for the occasions that I mentioned.

Before closing, I'd like to also point out that the Obama administration, in their recently issued statement of administration policy on H.R. 626, also recognized the benefits of supporting families during the birth of a child, adoption of a child or for foster care. According to the President's policy position, the Federal Government should reflect its commitment to helping Federal employees care for their families as well as serve the public. Measures such as H.R. 626 support this commitment and strengthen our families, our communities and our Nation. Given that statement alone, I urge my fellow Members to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 626.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act.

H.R. 626 provides four weeks of pay to federal employees to use while they are on family or medical leave. Having this option is of special importance to our younger employees and employees seeking to start a family.

As the federal workforce ages, the government will have to hire many new workers. Indeed, by 2010, more than 50 percent of managers, and almost 50 percent of other federal workers will be eligible for retirement. The federal government will have to compete with the private sector to attract the best and brightest to federal service to replace them. But the federal government lacks an important benefit enjoyed by 75 percent of Fortune 100 companies—paid leave for parents of newborns.

This legislation permits federal employees to take up to four weeks of paid leave for the birth or adoption of a child. For younger employees, the lack of paid leave forces them to choose between using accrued sick leave or vacation time, which for newer employees is in short supply, or to simply go without pay when having a newborn.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in helping to show the public that the federal government values families. Support H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act.

Mr. STARK. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009. As a long-time advocate of paid family leave, I believe our nation's largest employer—the U.S. Government—must also be our nation's model employer and set a progressive example for healthy workplace policy. The legislation on the floor today will provide real security to those who serve our nation's government and their families.

The 1993 Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) was landmark legislation that established job-protected leave and it has helped millions of workers care for their families without fear of losing their job. The FMLA, however, requires only unpaid leave, and many workers must choose between taking leave to care for their families or not paying their bills. Research has shown that nearly 75 percent of FMLA-eligible workers do not take leave because they cannot afford it. Even before the

hardship caused by the current recession, millions of workers could not access family or medical leave because of financial constraints. Paid leave is a vital resource to help workers balance their family and work obligations.

Paid parental leave provides benefits well beyond the purely monetary. It also benefits our society as a whole. A 1999 report by the President's Council of Economic Advisers found that since 1969, children have lost 22 hours per week with their parents. Studies have shown that increased parental involvement and care giving are linked to gains such as shorter hospital stays, improved behavior, and higher educational achievements for their children. Providing paid parental leave will make leave more accessible, allowing parents to spend more time with their children—clearly an investment worth making.

Individual states have begun to successfully implement paid family and medical leave programs. Since 2004, my home state of California has led the country in the provision of paid leave and the law has been a boon to both the state's families and businesses. According to a Harvard study published four years after the enactment of California's paid leave policy, California had a lower rate of foreclosures than other states due to income loss arising from the need to care for a household member. We can and should replicate this success nationwide.

It is the responsibility of the Federal government to take the lead in the promotion of workers' economic security and family-friendly policies, which is why I am pleased to lend my full support to the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act. Providing parental leave to federal workers is an important first step toward what must be our ultimate policy goal of providing paid family and medical leave to all workers, and I look forward to the day when all workers have the chance to care for their families and still be able to pay the bills.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009. Let me thank my friend from New York, Mrs. MALONEY for her continued dedication to this issue. I also applaud Chairman TOWNS and my colleagues on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee for championing the cause of paid parental leave for federal employees.

This legislation helps families employed by the government, offering up to four weeks of paid leave for parents to care for a new child. It recognizes a fundamental and basic need of new parents, namely, the importance of caring for and spending time with their young children.

As Americans workers struggle to weather the economic storms that have beset our nation, we need to ensure that our primary safety net—the American family—remains strong and intact. In doing so, this bill establishes the federal government—as an employer—as a champion for the American family, making it a model for the rest of the country to follow.

The Federal government is one of the country's largest employers, with over 1.8 million civilian employees. According to the Department of Health and Human Services 18,000 women and 24,000 men will qualify for parental leave this coming year.

Under existing law, federal employees are allowed to take unpaid parental leave. Sadly, in 2000, it was reported that as many as 78 percent of these eligible employees did not

take leave, simply because they could not afford it. Under present economic conditions, the desire to remain at work and forgo unpaid leave is even stronger. With the government playing such a significant role in the American workforce, we can no longer afford to punish such a large portion of our workforce for taking a few weeks leave to help raise a child.

Economic loss affects not just the worker, but all those who rely on the head wage-earner for support, and oftentimes the hardest hit group is the American family.

Today, in the midst of a recession, it is essential that working parents have the resources to care for and support both themselves and their families. This bill provides a necessary lifeline for new parents who must simultaneously provide round-the-clock care for their young children and keep their jobs in an increasingly competitive and shrinking economy.

Too often, families are forced into a bind, having to choose between earning enough to survive and caring for a child. No parent wants to decide between a child and work, but under current conditions, many federal employees must.

Families are helpless in this situation, and it is both the employer and employees that suffer for it. Federal employers have a high turnover rate, due to families searching for employers with better benefits or leaving the workforce to care for a child.

Even more importantly, this bill encourages parents to provide care during a period of crucial development for children. The education of children starts from day one, and in many ways, it is the earliest experiences of a child that will set the course for the rest of their life. The care children receive in their earliest days can provide them with the necessary building blocks to succeed in school and the workforce later on.

This bill also takes steps to accommodate the changing and often varied types of households that make up the American family, which current law does not take into account. Many families today don't have a stay-at-home member, making it all the more difficult for working parents to accommodate their family needs. Stay-at-home dads, friends, partners, siblings, aunts, uncles, or grandparents are all assuming the role of primary care-giver. Federal employee benefits need to take these new family dynamics into account.

This legislation will provide a gain to federal employers as well as the economy. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), this legislation accrues no extra cost for taxpayers. Federal employers can save losses from turnover rates and improve retention of some of its most reliable and adept employees.

In times of economic turmoil we must keep families strong. By strengthening the family, in turn we strengthen our workforce. Healthy families make productive employees and raise engaging and innovative children, giving an extra boost to the economy and the current and future American workforce.

Madam Speaker—this legislation is needed today, more than ever before! It will create a more progressive and family-oriented benefit system for the current federal workforce, setting an example for similar positive developments within all sectors of the economy. It will help working families to care for and support their young children, during a time when eco-

nomical struggles often overshadow parents' most basic duties of childcare.

On behalf of all those who have spent time in creating this bill, as well as almost two million federal employees and their families, I urge my colleagues to support and vote "yes" on H.R. 626.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 626—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL
LEAVE ACT OF 2009

(Rep. Maloney, D-New York, and 55
cosponsors, June 3, 2009)

The Administration supports the goal of H.R. 626, which would provide Federal employees with access to paid leave upon the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child.

Being able to spend time at home with a new child is a critical part of building a strong family. The initial bonding between parents and their new child is essential to healthy child development and providing a firm foundation for the child's success in life. Measures that support these relationships strengthen our families, our communities, and our nation. The Federal government should reflect its commitment to these core values by helping Federal employees to care for their families as well as serve the public. Providing paid parental leave has been successfully employed by a number of private-sector employers, and can help to make job opportunities accessible to more workers.

The Administration is currently reviewing existing Federal leave policies to determine the extent of their gaps and limitations. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to refine the details of this legislation to make sure it meets the needs of Federal agencies and employees, as well as their families.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 626, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act, which would provide four weeks of paid parental leave and eight weeks of unpaid leave for all federal employees after the birth or adoption of a child. Under this measure, these employees may also use accrued annual or sick leave to receive compensation for the unpaid weeks. Currently, employees may take up to twelve weeks of unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act to care for a newborn or adopted child.

H.R. 626 will help the United States Government compete with the private sector in order to recruit the best and brightest employees and retain that talent. In 2007, a Government Accountability Office report found that countries offering paid parental leave experienced increased employee retention and a reduction in the amount of time women spend out of the workforce. Disappointingly, the GAO also reported that the U.S. lags behind other industrial nations in providing policies that support working parents and their children. In fact, 169 countries guarantee women leave with income in connection with childbirth.

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that women are more likely to work before and after pregnancy than they were 30 to 40 years ago, and Congress must legislate according to the changing makeup of our workforce. So far, we have not met that mark. I know that many of my colleagues have already met or exceeded the requirements of this bill, and I applaud their efforts. I know from firsthand experience that allowing new parents guaranteed paid leave helps balance the demands between work and family. For the hard work they provide for us, we owe our employees the time to enjoy the bonds that matter most in their lives.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure. It is time that the Federal Government sets the standard for working parent policies.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, I rise today to express my strong support for the Federal Employee Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009 (H.R. 626). As the country's largest single employer, the Federal Government is responsible for over 2.7 million employees. The Federal Government is facing the retirement of 40% of its workforce over the next ten years and must be able to compete with private sector opportunities in order to attract talented new employees. Under current law, federal employees who want paid time off for the birth or adoption of a child only have the option of using their accrued sick days and vacation time to supplement unpaid leave. It is difficult for relatively new employees or those who experience reoccurring health problems to save up enough time for paid parental leave. Even for older employees who rarely get sick, unpredictable life events can make it equally difficult to accrue sufficient parental leave time. Parents should not be forced to choose between their new child and their paycheck.

The Congress' Joint Economic Committee has found that Fortune 100 firms offer paid leave that typically lasts six to eight weeks. This is also consistent with the amount of leave typically offered by Congressional offices. The lack of a Paid Parental Leave policy for newly born or adopted children puts the Federal Government in the minority, not only in relation to U.S. companies but also among developed nations. The European Union requires that member countries offer 14 weeks of paid maternity leave and most offer more than the required amount, and the U.S. is one of only five countries out of 165 surveyed that does not guarantee paid parental leave.

The Federal Employee Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009 will make the Federal Government a more family-friendly, competitive employer. It will cost relatively little compared to the benefit to American families and workers that it would bring. It is past time for federal employees to enjoy the benefits offered to employees of private companies and fix a flaw in our current system.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chair, I am proud to support this bill to strengthen America's families. Strong families are the cornerstone of our Nation's future. They enhance children's well-being, improve their self-esteem, and significantly increase the odds that they will succeed in school and grow up to be good parents themselves. And study after study shows that a strong predictor of child well-being is the degree to which a parent and child bond in the first months after birth. The more constant and nurturing that bond is in the early months of life, the better off that child will be in the years to come.

One of the most important things Congress did to help parents and children strengthen that bond was to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) in 1993. It was the first bill signed by President Clinton. Under its protection, eligible workers receive 12 weeks of leave every year, so that they can care for a newborn or adopted baby, or help a loved one recover from illness, or get better themselves—without the worry that, when they return, their job will be gone.

The FMLA has been an outstanding success. But it has not been enough. Because

the FMLA does not entitle anyone to receive an income while on leave, far too many people with the right to leave are unable to take it. They rush back to the workplace after giving birth, or send their sick children to school, or leave their ailing parents at home to somehow make it through the day—because there is no other option. In fact, when it comes to the failure to guarantee paid maternity leave, America stands virtually alone in the world.

It's time to realize that a right to paid leave, especially for new parents, is more than a family matter—it is a public good that means healthier families, more productive children, and, in the end, a stronger economy for all of us.

Today, we have a valuable chance to establish that right for some of our most dedicated public servants: Federal employees. Currently, the Federal Government does not provide them with paid parental leave. This bill would change that—providing four weeks of paid leave to Federal employees for the birth, adoption, or foster placement of a child.

As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government has the opportunity to set a valuable and lasting example for a responsible leave policy. It is time for America to catch up with the rest of the world, and this bill is a vital step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 626, the "Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009."

This legislation will update federal employee benefits to reflect the way families live today by providing four weeks of paid parental leave for federal employees. The 90,000 federal employees living in my home state of Georgia need us to pass this bill.

A generation ago, the overwhelming majority of families had a mother who stayed at home to provide full-time childcare.

Today, tens of thousands of families depend on the income of more than one income-earner to make ends meet.

When these families prepare to welcome a new child into their homes they are often faced with an impossible decision—forgo a paycheck or forgo the most critical period of time to care for and bond with their new baby.

As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government should lead the way in establishing family-friendly leave policies.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 626 to ensure that no federal employee is forced to choose between their new child and their job.

Mr. LYNCH. 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 read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 626

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. PAID PARENTAL LEAVE UNDER TITLE 5.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 5.—Subsection (d) of section 6382 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (d)(1);

(2) by striking "subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or" and inserting "subparagraph (C) or"; and (3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) An employee may elect to substitute for any leave without pay under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) any paid leave which is available to such employee for that purpose.

"(3) The paid leave that is available to an employee for purposes of paragraph (2) is—

"(A) subject to paragraph (6), 4 administrative workweeks of paid parental leave under this subparagraph in connection with the birth or placement involved; and

"(B) any annual or sick leave accrued or accumulated by such employee under subchapter I.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to require that an employee first use all or any portion of the leave described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) before being allowed to use the paid parental leave described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3).

"(5) Paid parental leave under paragraph (3)(A)—

"(A) shall be payable from any appropriation or fund available for salaries or expenses for positions within the employing agency;

"(B) shall not be considered to be annual or vacation leave for purposes of section 5551 or 5552 or for any other purpose; and

"(C) if not used by the employee before the end of the 12-month period (as referred to in subsection (a)(1)) to which it relates, shall not accumulate for any subsequent use.

"(6) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management—

"(A) may promulgate regulations to increase the amount of paid parental leave available to an employee under paragraph (3)(A), to a total of not more than 8 administrative workweeks, based on the consideration of—

"(i) the benefits provided to the Federal Government of offering increased paid parental leave, including enhanced recruitment and retention of employees;

"(ii) the cost to the Federal Government of increasing the amount of paid parental leave that is available to employees;

"(iii) trends in the private sector and in State and local governments with respect to offering paid parental leave;

"(iv) the Federal Government's role as a model employer; and

"(v) such other factors as the Director considers necessary; and

"(B) shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection, including, subject to paragraph (4), the manner in which an employee may designate any day or other period as to which such employee wishes to use paid parental leave described in paragraph (3)(A)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall not be effective with respect to any birth or placement occurring before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. PAID PARENTAL LEAVE FOR CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT.—Section 202 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1312) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by adding at the end the following: "In applying section 102(a)(1)(A) and (B) of such Act to covered employees, subsection (d) shall apply.";

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

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

"(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR PAID PARENTAL LEAVE FOR CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—A covered employee taking leave without pay under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 102(a)(1) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612(a)(1)) may elect to substitute for any such leave any paid leave which is available to such employee for that purpose.

"(2) AMOUNT OF PAID LEAVE.—The paid leave that is available to a covered employee for purposes of paragraph (1) is—

"(A) the number of weeks of paid parental leave in connection with the birth or placement involved that correspond to the number of administrative workweeks of paid parental leave available to Federal employees under section 6382(d)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(B) any additional paid vacation or sick leave provided by the employing office to such employee.

"(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to require that an employee first use all or any portion of the leave described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) before being allowed to use the paid parental leave described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2).

"(4) ADDITIONAL RULES.—Paid parental leave under paragraph (2)(A)—

"(A) shall be payable from any appropriation or fund available for salaries or expenses for positions within the employing office; and

"(B) if not used by the covered employee before the end of the 12-month period (as referred to in section 102(a)(1) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612(a)(1))) to which it relates, shall not accumulate for any subsequent use."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall not be effective with respect to any birth or placement occurring before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT FOR GAO AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EMPLOYEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993.—Section 102(d) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR GAO AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EMPLOYEES.—

"(A) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—An employee of an employer described in section 101(4)(A)(iv) taking leave under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) may elect to substitute for any such leave any paid leave which is available to such employee for that purpose.

"(B) AMOUNT OF PAID LEAVE.—The paid leave that is available to an employee of an employer described in section 101(4)(A)(iv) for purposes of subparagraph (A) is—

"(i) the number of weeks of paid parental leave in connection with the birth or placement involved that correspond to the number of administrative workweeks of paid parental leave available to Federal employees under section 6382(d)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(ii) any additional paid vacation or sick leave provided by such employer.

"(C) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be considered to require that an employee first use all or any portion of the leave described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) before being allowed to use the paid parental leave described in clause (i) of such subparagraph.

"(D) ADDITIONAL RULES.—Paid parental leave under subparagraph (B)(i)—

“(i) shall be payable from any appropriation or fund available for salaries or expenses for positions with the employer described in section 101(4)(A)(iv); and

“(ii) if not used by the employee of such employer before the end of the 12-month period (as referred to in subsection (a)(1)) to which it relates, shall not accumulate for any subsequent use.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall not be effective with respect to any birth or placement occurring before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 111-133. 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 of the amendment, 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. ISSA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-133.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Issa:

Page 3, strike lines 9 through 13 and insert the following:

“(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an employee may not use any paid parental leave described in paragraph (3)(A), in connection with a birth or placement, until such employee has exhausted all annual and sick leave which, as of the date of such birth or placement—

“(A) has been accrued or accumulated by such employee under subchapter I; and

“(B) may, under applicable provisions of law, rule, or regulation, be used for the purpose involved.

Page 6, strike lines 17 through 22 and insert the following:

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an employee may not use any paid parental leave described in paragraph (2)(A), in connection with a birth or placement, until such employee has exhausted all annual, sick, and other paid leave which, as of the date of such birth or placement—

“(A) has been accrued or accumulated by such employee under a formal leave system; and

“(B) may, under applicable provisions of such leave system, be used for the purpose involved.

Page 8, strike lines 18 through 24 and insert the following:

“(C) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an employee may not use paid parental leave described in subparagraph (B)(i), in connection with a birth or placement, until such employee has exhausted all annual and sick leave which, as of the date of such birth or placement—

“(i) has been accrued or accumulated by such employee under subchapter I of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(ii) may, under applicable provisions of law, rule, or regulation, be used for the purpose involved.

Page 9, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL PAID PARENTAL LEAVE TO BE TREATED AS A REPAYABLE ADVANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any amendment made by any other provision of this Act, any paid parental leave under section 6382(d)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by section 2), section 202(d)(2)(A) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (as amended by section 3), or section 102(d)(3)(B)(i) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (as amended by section 4)—

(1) shall be treated as an advance of paid leave; and

(2) shall be subject to recovery by the United States to the same extent and in the same manner as any other advance of paid leave.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My amendment to H.R. 626 is a commonsense amendment. I believe the legislation bridges the differences between the majority and the minority, recognizing that the Federal workforce should, in fact, be able to use accrued and earned time they have, recognizing that it is already the policy of many, but not all, Federal agencies to allow all accrued leave, both vacation, if you will, and sick leave, to be used by somebody wishing to avail themselves of their 12 weeks of family medical leave.

Having said that, we do take away the question of 4 weeks of additional paid or 8 weeks of additional paid leave. We recognize, though, that not every person, particularly a young family new to the Federal workforce, may have accrued leave sufficient to do 12 full weeks. Therefore, my amendment allows for that worker to take an advance against future sick leave and other leave in order to ensure that they may remain with their new child for the full 12 weeks allowed within the law. This would, in fact, eliminate the contradiction between various government agencies. It would streamline the process. It would make clear that no Federal worker would ever have to choose between being with their newborn and receiving a paycheck.

So with that, I urge the strong support of this amendment as a commonsense middle ground.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Madam Chair, I absolutely cannot support the amendment at hand, as it totally goes against the bill's fundamental purpose. To begin, this amendment actually guts the bill. It does lit-

tle more than restate the status quo with regard to the type and amount of leave that is currently available to new parents in the Federal Government.

To be clear, I support H.R. 626 because I want to support working families across the country. I oppose the amendment because we should not replicate the current inadequate system that forces new moms and dads to choose between their paycheck and caring for a newborn. The gentleman's amendment, however well intended, would strike the bill's core requirement that Federal employees receive 4 weeks of paid parental leave. Instead, it would require new mothers and fathers to take advance leave in order to take care of their newborn or newly adopted child. In other words, new employees would be required to go into debt in their available leave as a cost of caring for their child.

I do want to point out an odd result of the gentleman's amendment. For the new employees who have unpaid leave right now, it would force them to take unpaid leave at a point in time—for instance, for a new mom right after she has the baby, it would force her to take unpaid leave; and then later on after the 8 or 12 weeks had expired, at a point maybe when that mom was ready to come back to work, it would then give those employees, mom and dad, 4 weeks of paid leave. So rather than come back to work, they'd be facing the opportunity to take paid leave at that point; and I think in some cases it may turn out that this may increase the cost. While it actually devalues the benefit to the employee up front, it also, by perhaps getting a higher utilization rate, in the end may cost the government more money. So it's sort of a lose-lose situation. Longer-term employees would be required to exhaust any available prior leave before being eligible to take the additional advance leave; and under most circumstances, they may already do this.

So the amendment's only alleged new benefit to employees is to allow newer hires to go into a deficit on their leave in order to get some days paid during their parental leave. But, again, Federal agencies can already offer employees advance leave, so there's really no new benefit here. The true effect of this amendment is to gut the primary purpose of the bill, which is to support families and child development by providing 4 weeks of unconditional paid leave to new mothers and fathers in the Federal workforce.

In addition to gutting the bill, the amendment is inequitable because it would impact new employees and older employees differently. Moreover, the amendment is not good policy because employees should not be forced to use up all of their accrued annual sick leave to care for a new child. This can leave employees in a desperate situation if any emergency arises or if they become seriously ill down the road.

This amendment is somewhat short-sighted. It ignores the strategic investment that H.R. 626 makes in the Federal workforce at a time that we need to be attracting young talented employees to prepare for a wave of upcoming retirements. Currently we have about 315,000 Federal employees that are eligible to retire; and unfortunately those are the most experienced and, in some cases, the most ablest employees that we have in the Federal Government.

This amendment ignores the social benefits to society as a whole that result from supporting families with progressive work-life policies, such as a paid parental leave program. Because this amendment guts the pending legislation, I do have to oppose it for all the reasons that I have stated in spite of the gentleman's good intentions. I ask that Members continue to support the bill and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I now proudly yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the subcommittee, somebody who is very aware of family values and the importance of this legislation, Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, there's no more precious time than those with your children. We want to be as compassionate as we can. But at a time when we have literally millions and millions of people who are out of work, when we are looking at a \$1.8 trillion budget deficit just this year alone, I don't want to saddle leave that new child who is coming into the world with this unbelievable debt. So it's something that I would like to do. But I think what Mr. ISSA's amendment offers is a very reasonable alternative to create the atmosphere and create the program and create the way that our Federal employees can tap into something that they have earned. But I think we have an obligation to recognize the proper role of government. We have to remember for every dollar, every benefit that we want to hand to a Federal worker, we're going to have to take that money from somewhere; and we're going to have to take it from the American people's pockets to give it to someone else.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I appreciate what Mr. ISSA is proposing here. Let's remember that it's the American people's money. It's not Congress' money. It's the American people's money. At a time of deficit, now is not the time to go out and spend billions of more dollars when we're so far in debt.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close and continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam Chair, I just want to review one more time why we believe that doing this within the existing means of the program dollars that are already available to the Federal workforce is a commonsense compromise.

Meeting the majority halfway, recognizing that 14 million Americans are making no money, except for their unemployment insurance, and those who are making so much less this year demand that we find ways not to increase our spending. So, Madam Chair, I would just like to review one last time. The Federal workforce, if you've been in for only 3 years, you have 4 weeks of paid vacation and 13 days, which is nearly 3 weeks, of sick leave per year. You already have that every year. Isn't it family values to be willing to give up some of that to be able to stay with your family? Why wouldn't you use some of that first?

Madam Chair, I want to recognize that the Federal workforce is a good workforce, and we want it to be a great workforce. But at a time in which 14 million Americans are looking for jobs, we are actually not having a hard time finding people who would like to come to work for the Federal Government. We're offering jobs. We're hiring. We're growing. So if we're ever going to need an inducement, it will be at a boom time, at a time in which we have to compete against higher salaries and bonuses, not at a time in which Americans are suffering and being laid off in record numbers.

Lastly, Madam Chair, I would like to refer to the President's statement, which was quite a weak statement, in support of this bill. He recites the bill and then says, "The administration is currently reviewing existing Federal leave policies to determine the extent of their gaps and limitations. The administration looks forward to working with Congress to refine the details of this legislation to make sure it meets the needs of the Federal agencies and employees, as well as their families."

Madam Chair, what that says to me is, this is not the right bill. They'd like to work with us to make it better. Hopefully this amendment will make it better here today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, for the purpose of closing, I would like to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) who, along with Congressman HOYER, has championed this bill for the past 15 years.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 30 seconds.

□ 1900

Mrs. MALONEY. I appreciate my colleagues' hard work and effort, but I rise in opposition to this amendment. The amendment would do absolutely nothing but maintain the status quo. It asks Federal employees to continue to cobble together sick and annual leave if they want to get a paycheck while they care for their new child.

This policy does not help relatively new employees, younger workers, or those with health problems who have little accrued leave to draw on. And it also puts the health and well-being of our employees and their families at risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to place in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 626—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ACT OF 2009

(Rep. Maloney, D-New York, and 55 cosponsors)

The Administration supports the goal of H.R. 626, which would provide Federal employees with access to paid leave upon the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child.

Being able to spend time at home with a new child is a critical part of building a strong family. The initial bonding between parents and their new child is essential to healthy child-development and providing a firm foundation for the child's success in life. Measures that support these relationships strengthen our families, our communities, and our nation. The Federal government should reflect its commitment to these core values by helping Federal employees to care for their families as well as serve the public. Providing paid parental leave has been successfully employed by a number of private-sector employers, and can help to make job opportunities accessible to more workers.

The Administration is currently reviewing existing Federal leave policies to determine the extent of their gaps and limitations. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to refine the details of this legislation to make sure it meets the needs of Federal agencies and employees, as well as their families.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

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

Mr. ISSA. Madam 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-133.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

Page 4, line 19, strike "and".

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following: "(v) the impact of increased paid parental leave on lower-income and economically disadvantaged employees and their children; and"

Page 4, line 20, strike “(v)” and insert “(vi)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, this bill allows OPM, that is the Office of Personnel Management, to increase the amount of paid parental leave up to 8 weeks. It allows this after considering a variety of factors: benefits to the Federal Government, cost to the Federal Government, trends in the private sector, the government's role as a model employer, and such other factors as the director considers necessary.

This amendment, Madam Chair, will require the Office of Personnel Management to consider the needs of some of our lower-level employees. This amendment would not require any additional funding. It merely requires the office to consider the impact that increasing the number of weeks will have on some of our lower-level employees.

Now, I would like to introduce a term that I'm not exceedingly pleased with. It is called a “poverty spell.” A poverty spell is defined as entering poverty for at least 2 months. Twenty-five percent of all poverty spells begin with the birth of a child, 25 percent. I would also note that 78 percent of the persons who are eligible for FMA, this leave that we have been discussing today, do not take it because they cannot afford to lose a paycheck.

No one should go into poverty because of the birth of a child if we can prevent it. This bill will help many of our lower-level employees avoid a poverty spell.

I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, because there is no objection to this common-sense evaluation as to the low-income and economically disadvantaged, we claim in opposition and then yield back immediately.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I will yield to the manager such time as he may consume.

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank the gentleman for his thoughtful and prudent amendment, and we are prepared to accept it at this time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. At this time, Madam Chair, I'm grateful to Mr. LYNCH. I'm also grateful to Mrs. MALONEY for her outstanding work on this. It has been a tireless effort over many years, and I'm honored that they are accepting this amendment. And I am going to ask all of my colleagues to please vote for it if a recorded vote is called for. I shall not be calling for one.

I yield back.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BRIGHT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111-133.

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BRIGHT:
At the end of the bill insert the following:
SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES.

(a) EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of determining the eligibility of an employee who is a member of the National Guard or Reserves to take leave under paragraph (1)(A) or (B) of section 6382(a) of title 5, United States Code, or to substitute such leave pursuant to paragraph (2) of such section (as added by section 2), any service by such employee on active duty (as defined in section 6381(7) of such title) shall be counted as service as an employee for purposes of section 6381(1)(B) of such title.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of determining the eligibility of a covered employee (as such term is defined in section 101(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act) who is a member of the National Guard or Reserves to take leave under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 102(a)(1) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (pursuant to section 202(a)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act), or to substitute such leave pursuant to subsection (d) of section 202 of such Act (as added by section 3), any service by such employee on active duty (as defined in section 101(14) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993) shall be counted as time during which such employee has been employed in an employing office for purposes of section 202(a)(2)(B) of the Congressional Accountability Act.

(c) GAO AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of determining the eligibility of an employee of the Government Accountability Office or Library of Congress who is a member of the National Guard or Reserves to take leave under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 102(a)(1) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, or to substitute such leave pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 102(d) of such Act (as added by section 4), any service by such employee on active duty (as defined in section 101(14) of such Act) shall be counted as time during which such employee has been employed for purposes of section 101(2)(A) of such Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act. Put simply, this amendment would ensure that Federal employees called to active duty in the National Guard or Reserves are not penalized for their service. It would clarify the intent of the bill so that these individuals can count the time they serve in active duty towards the time they are employed so they may remain eligible for the benefits under this bill.

Too often we have seen our servicemen and women across all branches de-

nied the benefits they rightly deserve due to governmental red tape. There is absolutely no reason that National Guard or reservists should be denied any of the benefits they deserve after honorably serving their country.

Again, this amendment will allow members of the Guard and Reserve to be able to count the time they were deployed towards their total time of employment. If passed, this amendment will give the men and women who have served our country needed time with their newborns and tend to their family responsibilities after a birth. This time is even more important when you consider that these warriors have already spent months on end away from their families.

Madam Chair, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It clarifies the intent of the bill for our guardsmen and our guardswomen and our reservists and ensures that they won't be penalized for their service to our great country.

I urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, although we do not object to this, we claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, briefly, this amendment seems to be a good one that would try to clarify some of the many, many, many, many elements of this bill that were not worked through thoroughly in committee, so I applaud the gentleman. I believe that, in fact, if we would have done more of this in committee, if more people would have looked and said, We want, as the committee that is charged by the Congress to fight waste, fraud, and abuse, that, in fact, if we had tightened up this bill much better earlier, we would have been more accountable to the taxpayers.

So I applaud the gentleman and recommend that this be voted positively.

I yield back all time.

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Chair, I would yield 1 minute of my time to Mr. LYNCH.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also thank the gentleman from Alabama for his thoughtful amendment. This amendment makes certain that Federal employees who are members of the National Guard or Reserve will remain eligible for this benefit and be able to care for their newborn children in the same manner as all other employees. I thank the gentleman for his astute observations and his clarification.

I urge the Members to support this amendment.

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Chair, in closing, I would like to thank Congresswoman MALONEY from New York. Thank you very much for your hard work on this, and also Chairman TOWNS and his staff on the Oversight

and Government Reform Committee for their attention to this issue and for working with my staff to draft this amendment. I would also like to thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER on the Rules Committee for ruling in favor of the amendment and allowing me to offer it on the floor today. Finally, I want to thank my colleagues for their continuing support and commitment on this issue. And, again, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 157, noes 258, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—157

Aderholt	Fallin	McCarthy (CA)
Akin	Flake	McCaul
Alexander	Fleming	McClintock
Austria	Forbes	McHenry
Bachus	Fortenberry	McKeon
Bartlett	Fox	McMorris
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers
Biggart	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Billbray	Gallely	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	Minnick
Blunt	Gohmert	Moran (KS)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bonner	Granger	Neugebauer
Bono Mack	Graves	Nunes
Boozman	Guthrie	Olson
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Paul
Brady (TX)	Harper	Paulsen
Broun (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Brown (SC)	Heller	Petri
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Pitts
Ginny	Hergert	Platts
Buchanan	Hoekstra	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Hunter	Posey
Burton (IN)	Inglis	Price (GA)
Buyer	Issa	Putnam
Calvert	Jenkins	Radanovich
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Campbell	Jones	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Capito	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Castle	Kingston	Rooney
Chaffetz	Kline (MN)	Roskam
Childers	Kosmas	Royce
Coble	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Scalise
Cole	Latta	Schmidt
Conaway	Lee (NY)	Schock
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Linder	Sessions
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Dent	Lummis	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Dreier	E.	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Mack	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Manzullo	Souder

Terry	Turner
Thompson (PA)	Walden
Thornberry	Wamp
Tiahrt	Westmoreland
Tiberi	Whitfield

NOES—258

Abercrombie	Harman
Ackerman	Hastings (FL)
Adler (NJ)	Heinrich
Altmire	Hereth Sandlin
Andrews	Higgins
Arcuri	Hill
Baird	Himes
Baldwin	Hinchee
Barrow	Hirono
Bean	Hodes
Becerra	Holden
Berkley	Holt
Berman	Honda
Berry	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	Israel
Bocchieri	Jackson (IL)
Boren	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Kagen
Braley (IA)	Kanjorski
Bright	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy
Butterfield	Kildee
Cao	Kilpatrick (MI)
Capps	Kilroy
Cardoza	Kind
Carnahan	Kirk
Carney	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Kissell
Castor (FL)	Klein (FL)
Chandler	Kratovil
Christensen	Kucinich
Clarke	Lance
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	LaTourette
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)
Conyers	Levin
Cooper	Lewis (GA)
Costa	Lipinski
Costello	LoBiondo
Crowley	Loebsack
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe
Cummings	Lowe
Dahlkemper	Lujan
Davis (AL)	Lynch
Davis (CA)	Maffei
Davis (TN)	Maloney
DeFazio	Markey (CO)
DeGette	Markey (MA)
DeLahunt	Marshall
DeLauro	Massa
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson
Dicks	Matsui
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)
Doggett	McCollum
Donnelly (IN)	McCotter
Doyle	McDermott
Driehaus	McGovern
Edwards (MD)	McHugh
Edwards (TX)	McIntyre
Ellison	McMahon
Ellsworth	McNerney
Emerson	Meek (FL)
Engel	Meeke (NY)
Eshoo	Melancon
Etheridge	Michaud
Faleomavaega	Miller (NC)
Farr	Miller, George
Fattah	Mitchell
Filner	Mollohan
Foster	Moore (KS)
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)
Fudge	Moran (VA)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Gordon (TN)	Murphy (NY)
Grayson	Murphy, Patrick
Green, Al	Murphy, Tim
Green, Gene	Nadler (NY)
Griffith	Napoliitano
Grijalva	Napolitano
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Hall (NY)	Norton
Nye	Nye
Oberstar	Oberstar

NOT VOTING—24

Baca	Blumenauer	Boyd
Bachmann	Bordallo	Capuano
Barrett (SC)	Boswell	Carter

Wilson (SC)	Courtney
Young (AK)	Davis (IL)
Young (FL)	Giffords
	Hinojosa
	Jackson-Lee
	(TX)

Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Marchant	T.
Rogers (MI)	Skelton
Ruppersberger	Stearns
Sablan	Sullivan
	Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1934

Messrs. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, RODRIGUEZ, PALLONE, BERMAN, HILL, SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 308, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 308, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 308, I arrived on the floor and the vote had closed. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Ms. DEGETTE, 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. 626) to provide that 4 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 501, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ISSA. In its present form, yes, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Issa moves to recommit the bill H.R. 626 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if the deficit for fiscal year 2009 or any subsequent fiscal year exceeds \$500,000,000,000, the amendments made by this Act shall terminate as of the 30th day of the next fiscal year thereafter.

(b) DEFICIT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the “deficit” for a fiscal year is the amount by which total outlays of the Government for such fiscal year exceed total receipts of the Government for such fiscal year, if at all.

Mr. ISSA (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit would ensure that nearly 14 million Americans who have lost their jobs will not see an additional 1, 2 or \$4 billion of the new benefits paid to Federal workers unless this Congress is able to get its house in order.

Under the motion to recommit, we recognize that according to the Office of Management and Budget the deficit is currently approximately \$1.841 trillion. The motion will very simply tie the enactment of this new and expensive and overly generous benefit to the national debt.

The motion dictates that if the deficit for any fiscal year exceeds \$500 billion, the act will then terminate on the 30th day of the next fiscal year.

Madam Speaker, in a commonsense way, it means we can have this expensive—we object to it—but this expensive new benefit go into effect this year, but if this House and this Congress cannot get its house in order in the following years, then this act would not continue.

We believe that this is the last and best effort to try to reach a compromise to allow the majority to have its way on this expensive, new benefit but not allow it to continue on the backs of 14 million unemployed Americans, until or unless we're able to bring the deficit at least in line with where it was just two short years ago.

Madam Speaker, in closing I believe that the majority in this case has ignored one after another commonsense opportunities to amend this bill. In committee, we were shut out; here on

the floor, each of our amendments, including one that would have simply allowed for every Federal worker to have 12 weeks of paid medical leave in the case of the birth, adoption or taking on of a foster child, but to do so with existing benefits, including sick leave, even allowing them to borrow sick leave.

Since that's been rejected, our motion to recommit seeks only to recognize that this new benefit on the backs of 14 million unemployed Americans and countless millions who are making much less this year than last year cannot be sustained if we cannot bring our fiscal house in order.

And with that, I would urge passage of the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit for the basic reason that it guts the entire bill. If this amendment were to pass, we would leave Federal employees exactly where we find them today.

I also want to comment on the mechanics of the motion to recommit. It basically prohibits paying parental leave to Federal employees until the deficit is below \$500 billion. I view it, I guess, that somehow that is the justification for not extending these benefits.

However, history and the evidence before us does not support this position. It's disingenuous.

I just want to point out a couple of things. Briefly, I just want to lay out what the record is here. My friends from the other side of the aisle have been consistent, and I give them credit for that. Whether we have been projecting a surplus or a deficit, the Members from the Republican Party have been opposed to this parental leave under every circumstance that we could possibly face here.

When during the Clinton administration we had projected surpluses, the Republican Members opposed parental leave. In June of 2008 when the majority of the Republicans opposed this important benefit, the unemployment rate was only 5.6 percent, and we had a very strong economy.

During the 109th Congress when Republicans again refused to bring this legislation to the floor, the unemployment rate was never higher than 5.4 percent.

During the 108th Congress when the Republicans again refused to bring parental leave to the floor, the unemployment rate was averaging about 5.8 percent.

During the 107th Congress when the Republicans refused to bring this legislation to the floor, the unemployment rate never rose above 6 percent and was below 4.5 percent for most of 2001.

And again, during the 106th Congress when Republicans refused to bring leg-

islation to the floor for parental leave, the unemployment rate hovered around 4 percent, which most economists believe is near full employment.

So, regardless of the circumstances, my friends—and again, I commend you for your consistency—you have opposed parental leave, which is a basic and decent benefit for folks in three circumstances: When they have the birth of a child, Federal employees have a birth of a child; the adoption of a child; or taking a child in for foster care.

Those are the narrow set of circumstances that this benefit is applied to. Madam Speaker, this is the 15th year—15 years ago this bill was brought to this floor, and it's been opposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle for that 15 years, and we all know our positions, and with that, I ask the Members to support this measure.

Mr. ISSA. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 241, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—171

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

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye

Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt

Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Baca
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd
Camp
Capuano
Carter
Conyers

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman

Courtney
Davis (IL)
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kennedy
Marchant

Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye

Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

□ 2003

Mr. HALL of New York changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ADLER of New Jersey and CUELLAR changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 154, answered “present” 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—258

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bocchieri
Boren
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchev
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McColum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon

Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bocchieri
Boren
Boucher
Boucher (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers

Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Portenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Galleghy
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (MI)

NOES—154

Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Sensenbrenner
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (MI)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—20

Baca	Davis (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	T.
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Skelton
Boyd	(TX)	Sullivan
Camp	Johnson (GA)	Waters
Capuano	Marchant	Wilson (OH)
Carter	Rogers (MI)	
Courtney	Ruppersberger	

□ 2011

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, due to the fact that I had to return to my district for family reasons, I was unable to take rollcall votes 308, 309, and 310. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 308; "no" on rollcall vote 309; and "aye" on rollcall vote 310, in favor of final passage of H.R. 626, The Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009.

RECOGNIZING TOYS FOR TOTS LITERACY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 232.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 232.

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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

This transparency issue has apparently come up again.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, as is usual, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete

list of the suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider Representative BETTY SUTTON's bill, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009; H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2010 and 2011; and H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009.

We will also expect to consider a conference report on H.R. 2346, the supplemental appropriation bill. I was hoping to consider that tomorrow, but discussions between the Senate and the House have not been concluded.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that he just referred to and announced that we would be considering the war funding supplemental conference report next week. I would ask the gentleman: Does he expect the very controversial Senate-passed provision providing for the IMF money to be included in the conference report?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, the Senate added the IMF funding to the bill. It is a loan guaranty. We expect the probability that there will be no out-of-pocket money for the United States, but there is a loan guaranty to the IMF.

As you know, the G-20 met. Our President, obviously, participated in that meeting of the G-20 with 19 other leaders of major nations in the world, talking about how we can bring not only each individual country out of the recession but, in some cases, depression that some countries are in; that there was a need to invest sums in assisting particularly smaller, poorer countries to try to recover from the devastation that has occurred by, in some cases, the very sharp economic downturn of the larger, more prosperous countries.

□ 2015

The G-20 agreed that they would come up with \$500 billion. The United States, the wealthiest of the G-20 by far, has a 20 percent share of that. The President agreed that the United States would, with the G-20, meet its part of the obligation that had been agreed upon. The Senate included that. And the answer to the gentleman's question is, I fully expect that to be in the supplemental that we'll consider on the floor.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that the belief on our side is the purpose of the war funding bills should be to provide our troops with the support they need, not this controversial global bailout money. Mr. Speaker, I would say more than that, what we believe is—currently from the reports is that the bill would eliminate \$5 billion from the defense spending directly for our troops and provide that \$5 billion credit towards the guarantee

that the United States would have to provide to the IMF.

Mr. Speaker, even further, we understand that in this provision in the bill, in essence we would be providing for more money for foreign countries in terms of a global bailout than we would be for our own troops.

And the even more troubling part to many of us, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the IMF program allows eligibility for countries like Iran, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, Burma and others. And that these countries, Mr. Speaker, are not necessarily in pursuit of policies that help the national security of this country. And given the fact that our President has said we don't have the money, how is it, Mr. Speaker—and I would ask the gentleman—does he think that we ought to be delaying the funding of our troops by including the provisions that we've just spoken of? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's premise is incorrect. None of us on this side think we ought to delay this bill. None of us. We believe that the troops need the funds, our President has asked for the funds, we're for passing those funds. Very frankly, in the Senate, as you know, they added a lot of extraneous matters. Some Republicans added extraneous matters that, very frankly, we're not happy about on this side of the aisle. Large sums of money which have nothing to do with the troops. They were added because those Members of the Senate, who happen to be very high-ranking Republicans, believe those matters are very important.

Furthermore, let me say to the gentleman we just honored a President that you believe was a great President of the United States. We honored him yesterday with a statue. I know you'll be interested in some quotes from that President:

"I have an unbreakable commitment to increased funding for IMF." Ronald Reagan, September 7, 1983.

He went on to say in that same speech, "The IMF is the linchpin of the international financial system."

He went on to say on July 14, "The IMF has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign economic policy under Republican and Democratic administrations for nearly 40 years." That was, of course, in 1983.

I suggest to the gentleman it has continued for the 26 years after that.

And it remains, he said, a cornerstone of the foreign economic policy of this administration.

Another President on September 25, 1990, said this: George Bush, President of the United States, "The IMF and World Bank, given their central role in the world economy, are key to helping all of us through this situation by providing a combination of policy advice and financial assistance." September 25, 1990,

He went on to say, "As we seek to extend and expand growth in the world