

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING DR. MARIO OBLEDO

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

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

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

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

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

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

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

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

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

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

And that's just the way it is.

HISTORY IS INSTRUCTIVE

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

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

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

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

□ 1020

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

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

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

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

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

Congratulations to the entire family.

SEBELIUS BULLYING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1620

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1620.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
HOME BUILDERS,

Washington, DC, September 13, 2010.

Hon. LOUISE SLAUGHTER,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JOE STANTON,

Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1040

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

□ 1050

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1110

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment to which our colleagues spoke earlier and extraneous material be placed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1120

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1620 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4735) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4735.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here’s how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly’s “American Congressional Dictionary”: “If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1620, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on the Senate amendments to H.R. 3562.

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

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—226

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

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

NAYS—186

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

Shadegg	Olson
Shimkus	Paul
Shuster	Paulsen
Simpson	Pence
Smith (NE)	Petri
Smith (NJ)	Pitts
Smith (TX)	Platts
Space	Poe (TX)
Stearns	Posey
Sullivan	Price (GA)
Taylor	Radanovich
Terry	Rehberg
Thompson (PA)	Reichert
Thornberry	Roe (TN)
Tiahrt	Rogers (AL)
Tiberi	Rogers (KY)
Turner	Rogers (MI)
Upton	Rohrabacher
Walden	Rooney
Wamp	Ros-Lehtinen
Westmoreland	Roskam
Whitfield	Royce
Wilson (SC)	Ryan (WI)
Wittman	Scalise
Wolf	Schmidt
Young (AK)	Schock
	Sensenbrenner
	Sessions

NOT VOTING—20

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

□ 1152

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

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 225, noes 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—225

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

Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McColum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson

Rodriguez
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—188

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole

Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer

Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Blunt
Murphy (IA)
Davis (AL)
Ellsworth
Eshoo
Fallin

Hodes
Marchant
Meeck (FL)
Mollohan
Putnam
Rush
Schwartz

Shea-Porter
Sutton
Tierney
Visclosky
Young (FL)

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

□ 1201

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—409

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)

Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bocciari
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman

Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield

Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith

Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Childers
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul

McColum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Luetkemeyer
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock