

Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Paulsen
Delahunt	Lee (CA)	Radanovich
Deutch	Linder	Reyes
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Ellison	Marchant	Salazar
Ellsworth	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Fallin	McCarthy (NY)	Schock
Granger	McMahon	Sires
Grayson	McMorris	Slaughter
Griffith	Rodgers	Smith (WA)
Heller	Meek (FL)	Stark
Hereth Sandlin	Melancon	Stearns
Hodes	Miller, Gary	Tanner
Honda	Minnick	Wasserman
Inglis	Mitchell	Schultz
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (NY)	Waters
Jones	Neal (MA)	Young (AK)
Kennedy	Nunes	Young (FL)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz	
King (NY)	Pastor (AZ)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1306

Messrs. WESTMORELAND and KING of Iowa changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 657 on H. Res. 1771, On Agreeing to the Resolution, Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of Rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, I am not recorded because I was absent because I gave birth to my baby daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 658 on H.R. 6540, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, Defense Level Playing Field Act, I am not recorded because I was absent because I gave birth to my baby daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 657 and 658. If I had been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 657 and "yes" on rollcall 658.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 2010, due to travel delays, I inadvertently missed rollcall Nos. 657 and 658. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on both rollcalls.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 657 and 658, I was absent because my flight from Orlando had an equipment failure in mid-flight and had to return to Orlando, resulting in a lengthy delay. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5116, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2751, FDA FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2142, GPRA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1781 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 1781

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5116) to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2751) to accelerate motor fuel savings nationwide and provide incentives to registered owners of high polluting automobiles to replace such automobiles with new fuel efficient and less polluting automobiles, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2142) to require quarterly performance assessments of Government programs for purposes of assessing agency performance and improvement, and to establish agency performance improvement officers and the Performance Improvement Council, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of I rule XXI, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

□ 1310

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 gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. Foxx. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 1781.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1781 provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 5116, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5116. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the Senate amendment shall be considered as read.

The rule also provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 2751, the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2751. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides the Senate amendments shall be considered as read.

The rule also provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2142, the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2142. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion, except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Finally, the rule provides that the Senate amendment be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, all three pieces of legislation deserve to be approved by this House.

Mr. Speaker, today we will take up a rule that helps this Congress complete the work the American people sent us here to do.

It has been far too long since this Congress has addressed the issue of food safety. Each year, 76 million Americans are sickened from consuming contaminated food, more than 300,000 people are hospitalized, and 5,000 die. In just the last few years, there has been a string of food-borne illness outbreaks in foods consumed by millions of Americans each day—from contaminated spinach to peanut butter to cookie dough.

This bill puts a new focus on preventing food contamination before it occurs—putting new responsibilities on food producers and requiring them to develop a food safety plan and ensure the plan is working.

By requiring importers to verify the safety of foreign suppliers and imported food, the American people can rest assured that the food they are eating is safe. And this bill allows the FDA to initiate a mandatory recall of a food product when a company fails to voluntarily recall the contaminated product upon FDA's request.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have asked Congress to help keep them safe. The text of this food safety legislation in H.R. 2751 is nearly identical to language passed by the House in the continuing resolution on December 8, 2010, and passed the Senate on November 30, 2010, by a bipartisan vote of 73–25.

H.R. 2751, this stand-alone food safety legislation, passed the Senate by voice vote on December 19, 2010.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 5116, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010. This bill invests in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the jobs of the future will not just be found in the industries of the past. They will be found in green technologies, biotechnology and advances in medical devices. This bill makes vital investments to keep America competitive in the global economy.

By making investments in the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Science and Technology and the Department of Energy's Office of Science, America can be put on a path to double our research and development capabilities in 10 years.

This funding will support programs to assist American manufacturers and create a loan guarantee program to support innovation in manufacturing. It will also support research and internship opportunities for high school and undergraduate students, increase graduate fellowships supported by NSF and DOE, and encourage students studying in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math areas to pursue teaching credentials, increasing the pool of qualified teachers for the next generation of young innovators. It will also promote productivity and economic growth by forming an Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship to foster innovation and the commercialization of new technologies, products, processes, and services.

The Senate took up H.R. 5116, the America COMPETES Reauthorization on December 17, 2010, and passed it with an amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can all get behind a bill that helps keep America driving the pace of technology.

I also believe that we can all get behind the final piece of this rule that allows for consideration of H.R. 2142, the Government Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Performance Improvement Act of 2010.

This bill requires each federal agency to draft plans that identify areas where the agency could improve its performance. At a time of year when many of us are making resolutions to better ourselves and to rid ourselves of our bad habits, I think it's fitting that Congress and our Federal government takes a look at itself to see where we can improve.

Mr. Speaker, we were not sent here to be lame ducks. And this Congress has proven to be anything but, despite attempts to slow or cut off the process. This Congress has been one of the most productive in history—at a time when we need to be doing a little less nation-building around the world and more nation-building here at home. These important pieces of legislation will continue that productive work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOX. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today very disturbed by the lack of respect the ruling Democrat elites have shown for the will of the American people since election day. Having lost 63 seats in the House and six seats in the Senate, one would think the liberal Democrat regime would think twice about continuing their reckless pattern of spending that has been so overwhelmingly rejected by the American voting public. However, these Washington elites have spent their last days grasping frantically to their waning power and continuing to spend, spend, spend, even in the final hours before Christmas.

This rule is a slap in the face to the institutional integrity of Congress and the way this body is intended to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I have an article that I would like to insert in the RECORD from The Wall Street Journal of November 30. This article talks about what has been happening since we have come back into session, and I think it is something that we need to be talking about.

Also, I want to say that rather than having conference committees meet to work out the differences between the House and Senate versions of bills, Democratic leaders have waited until the last minute and the House will now concur with the Senate-passed measures, sending them to the President.

Thus far in the 111th Congress, only 11 conference reports were considered in the House and 25 amendments between the House and the Senate, which denies the minority a motion to recommit. In the 109th Congress, 25 conference reports were considered and only one amendment between the Houses, on which the Rules Committee made a motion to recommit in order. The 109th was when the Republicans were last in control.

In PELOSI's New Direction for America, page 24, it states, "Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full, and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute."

It is clear that the House Democrats on the Rules Committee have not lived up to this promise. Instead of allowing sufficient time for debate on these separate measures which collectively authorize billions upon billions in new spending and grant Federal regulators even more overreaching power, the Democrat elites are arbitrarily presenting us with one overarching closed rule for three separate and enormous pieces of legislation.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying bills. [From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 30, 2010]

#### FEDERAL FREEZE PLAY

American Federation of Public Employees President John Gage yesterday derided President Obama's federal pay freeze as a "slap at working people." It might better be described as a small but symbolic first step toward reining in a ballooning federal payroll that is a slap at the non-government workers who pay the bills.

Mr. Obama proposed a two-year pay freeze for all civilian federal employees, a move that will save taxpayers \$2 billion in fiscal 2011 and \$28 billion over five years. (Congress must approve it.) As cost-cutting goes, this is modest: The freeze doesn't extend to new hiring, bonuses or step increases. It doesn't even match the three-year freeze recommended by the President's deficit commission. But it is more than this Administration has ever been willing to consider, and it suggests that Mr. Obama, post-midterm-shellacking, realizes he must show some willingness to restrain the growth of government.

It certainly needs restraint. As the nearby table shows (see accompanying table—WSJ November 30, 2010), federal employment has grown by a remarkable 17% since 2007 to an estimated 2.1 million nonmilitary full-time workers (excluding 600,000 postal workers). This is the largest federal work force since 1992, when civilian employment at the Pentagon began to shrink rapidly after the Cold War.

These federal employees operate in a pay-and-benefit universe that no longer exists in the private economy. According to recent analyses by USA Today, total compensation for federal workers has risen 37% over 10 years—after inflation—compared to 8.8% for private workers. Federal workers earned average compensation of \$123,000 in 2009, double the private average of \$61,000. Unions like to argue that federal jobs are unique, yet in occupations that exist both in government and the private economy—nurses, surveyors, janitors, cooks—the federal government pays 20% more than private firms.

Voters have swept GOP reformers like New Jersey's Chris Christie and Wisconsin's Scott Walker into gubernatorial office precisely to rein in bloated public-employee pensions and salaries. If Mr. Obama is serious about cutting spending, his pay freeze needs to be an opening bid for a leaner, more modestly compensated, federal work force.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, once again I must rise in opposition to this rule to reconsider the Senate language from S. 510, the Food Safety Modernization Act—now contained in H.R. 2751, a bill related to the Cash for Clunkers program.

As I have stated before, I believe our Nation has the safest food supply in the world. I also believe that we must continually examine our food production and regulatory system and move forward with changes that improve food safety.

I am very disappointed in the process by which this legislation is being considered. What we have here is another expansion of Federal power without benefit of thorough consideration. This is the stimulus bill, cap-and-trade, and the health care bill all over again.

The House version of this legislation was rolled out in draft form and marked up in the Energy and Commerce Committee over a couple of weeks during the summer of 2009. During all that time, members of the House Agriculture Committee stood ready and willing to work on this legislation. It is unfortunate that, despite a clear jurisdictional claim, the House Agriculture Committee did not demand that the bill be referred, conduct hearings on its provisions, and work our will to make improvements.

During the committee hearing in the summer of 2009 on the general topic of food safety, not a single producer witness would support the bill. It was a stunning failure to fulfill our legislative responsibilities. Despite this, the House Democratic leadership chose to attempt to pass this legislation under a suspension of the rules. Because of the flawed legislative process and lingering concerns about the contents of the bill, it was defeated. Failing to learn the lesson of that vote, within days, the leadership subsequently secured a closed rule denying Members the opportunity to participate in the legislative process and rammed it through the House in the summer of 2009.

□ 1320

They sent the legislation to the Senate, where it languished for over a year.

In the closing days of Congress, the Senate sent us its version of food safety legislation with an unconstitutional revenue measure, which effectively killed the bill. Then the House leadership won another closed rule, which prohibited any reasonable debate on the provisions of the legislation and sent it back to the Senate in a mammoth, irresponsible, long-term continuing resolution, which failed in the Senate.

So now the Senate sent its bill back to us as a free-standing measure. This time, it's stuffed into a Cash for Clunkers bill in order to once again bypass any reasonable debate. And here we are again with the same legislation negotiated outside of regular order. The Senate was originally unwilling to

conduct a conference with the House, claiming there wasn't enough time. The Senate continues to offer its bill to us on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Mr. Speaker, we've had nearly a month in which this side of the aisle was ready, willing, and able to sit down and resolve our issues and to move forward. Unfortunately, the majority leadership in this season of giving has chosen to once again bypass the normal legislative process, exclude nearly every Member of this body, other than a select few in the Speaker's inner circle, and ram this legislation that, for all intents and purposes, could have been a bipartisan victory. Instead, what we're left with is another example of the sort of nonsense that the voters of America rejected just a few weeks ago. This is no way to do business, and our constituents were not subtle when they spoke last November.

Mr. Speaker, let me return to where I started. We have the safest food supply in the world. Anyone who follows current events knows that our food-producing system faces ongoing safety challenges. Unfortunately, neither this legislation nor the process by which it is being considered will address those challenges. Our Nation's farmers, ranchers, packers, processors, retailers and, most importantly, consumers deserve better.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this debate, but if I could just make a couple of observations in the aftermath of the gentleman's speech. I should remind my colleagues that each year, 76 million Americans are sickened by contaminated food that they consumed. More than 300,000 of them are hospitalized and more than 5,000 each year die. We've heard about tainted eggs, tainted spinach, tainted peanut butter, tainted cookie dough. We haven't updated our food safety laws in decades.

So here's the deal. If you want to do a better job of protecting the American consumer, you will have an opportunity, if you vote for this rule, to vote for the food safety bill. If you don't, then vote down the rule and vote against the bill when it comes up.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, Mr. LUCAS has spoken very eloquently about one piece of the legislation rolled into this rule. I would like to speak about all three of them, briefly. One piece is H.R. 5116, the COMPETES Act, a behemoth, authorizing nearly \$86 billion, which is \$22 billion above the fiscal 2010 base amount and \$8 billion above the original 10-year "doubling path." This is in addition to the nearly \$5 billion in additional funding that was provided in the so-called "stimulus" bill.

When H.R. 5116 was authorized in 2007, it enacted approximately 40 new programs. The new spending under H.R. 5116 would create at least seven

new government programs, many that are not associated with research and development, and others that are duplicative and unnecessary. This is plain wrong, Mr. Speaker.

It's worth recalling that when H.R. 5116 was originally considered by Congress earlier this year, Republicans attempted to make several constructive changes which were systematically blocked by the ruling liberal majority. One of these changes would have saved billions of taxpayer dollars by reducing the authorization levels to FY 2010 levels and freezing them for 3 years. However, in an effort to obstruct Republicans, the liberal Democrat elites did the American people disservice by using a series of parliamentary tricks to shove their bill through without allowing any Republican input.

Mr. Speaker, in these difficult economic times, American families across the country are tightening their belts and cutting their spending. Why then are the Democratic elites increasing spending by \$22 billion with this legislation and creating new duplicative government programs? The American taxpayers cannot afford this bill.

The second bill encompassed by this closed rule which the Democrat elites have brought before us today is H.R. 2751, the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, again, which my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) has spoken on so eloquently. This bill increases spending by \$1.4 billion, subsequently increasing the price of food and increasing the size of government without actually improving food safety.

This hastily considered closed rule provides for consideration of yet another bill, H.R. 2142, the Government Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Performance Act of 2010, which is so riddled with problems that last week it failed to garner the votes necessary to pass under a suspension of the rules. Instead of taking this as an opportunity to fix the flaws and address the other concerns prompting the bill's failure, the ruling liberal Democrats predictably chose to ram it through by any means necessary. And since they've wasted so much time tilting at windmills, they find themselves here in the waning days of this lame duck Congress scrambling to address issues that should've been dealt with through a responsible legislative process.

As they wait for the Senate to act, they're refusing to yield any free moment to pursue one of their last opportunities to slam through another so-called rule—unworthy even to be called a rule—providing for consideration of flawed legislation, such as H.R. 2142.

This bill would amend the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA, a law which currently requires agencies to develop 5-year strategic plans, annual performance plans, and actual program performance reports. Unfortunately, under the rules of debate provided for by this rule, the ruling Democrat majority refuses to allow Members to offer these types of

real reform ideas or any other amendments, leaving this legislation unlikely to do anything to change the incentives facing decision-makers and will not end the perpetual funding of failing Federal programs.

As has been made perfectly clear to the ruling liberal Democrat leadership, many are concerned that although there's no cost estimate available for this version of the bill, it authorizes \$75 million over 5 years to establish agency performance officers and inter-agency councils, but does not contain an effective means to consolidate or eliminate ineffective programs at each agency. If you add the 17,800 employees that the food safety bill is contemplating and then the new employees that will be required under the GPRA bill, we are adding to the number of Federal employees. But we should be decreasing the number of Federal employees.

I want to talk a minute about what has happened in terms of Federal employees since the Democrats took over the Congress. In 2007, there were a total of 1,832,000 executive branch employees and in the civilian agencies there were 1,173,000. In 2010, it goes to 2,148,000 and 1,428,000. Federal employment has grown by a remarkable 17 percent since 2007, to an estimated 2.1 million non-military full-time workers. This is the largest workforce since 1992.

Also, Mr. Speaker, according to a recent analysis by USA Today, total compensation for Federal workers has risen 37 percent over 10 years, after inflation, compared to 8.8 percent for private workers. Federal workers earned an average compensation of \$123,000 in 2009—double the private average of \$61,000.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, our country cannot afford this expansion of the Federal Government. We need to be reducing the Federal Government, not expanding it.

I would like to say further this version of the bill does not contain an amendment considered in committee markup by Republican Representative SCHOCK and supported by Democrat Congressmen COOPER and QUIGLEY that would have established a more thorough process for evaluating agency performance and eliminating programs that failed performance standards, were found to be duplicative or determined to be unnecessary.

H.R. 2142 mandates the creation of several new government-wide and agency-specific management plans. However, it does not—does not—increase executive accountability for failing programs.

Mr. Speaker, again, this bill is going in the wrong direction. What it does is it allows agencies to design their performance plans and then to measure their own results, using their own performance indicators. Rather than requiring agencies to focus on achieving measurable outcomes, the bill makes the creation of outcome-oriented per-

formance measures optional. This would be like, Mr. Speaker, letting students set the criteria for getting their own grades, and we all know that doesn't work very well.

Strangely enough, also in the process, the bill directs agencies to "identify low-priority program activities," which is ridiculous because, even if agencies had an incentive to label their own programs as "low priority," they do not. This begs the question of why such programs are funded at all.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is in. The liberal Democrat agenda has failed. They need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real solutions to their real problems. This isn't the time to dither and blame the Republican minority for the disappointing collapse of governance we have seen since the liberal majority seized control of Congress in 2007.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to force the ruling liberal Democrats to rethink their misguided proposals by rejecting this rule and the underlying legislation and by protesting the liberal agenda that continues to distract from private-sector job creation and from getting the economy back on its feet.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, oh, my goodness. There are a lot of things that come before the Members of this body that, I think, are worth getting all worked up about and that, I think, sometimes understandably lead to partisan bickering; but as to what we are talking about here today, to me and to, I think, most people who are watching, this should be fairly noncontroversial.

What we are talking about is a rule that will allow us to consider three bills. One is called the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010.

What does this radical bill do?

It authorizes funding increases for the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes for Science and Technology, and the Department of Energy's Office of Science for fiscal years 2010–2013, on a path toward increasing substantially our investment in research and development over the next 10 years. It is not even an appropriation. It is an authorization.

So the Appropriations Committee next year can work their will and decide whether to invest more in science so that we can compete in this global economy, or will we not invest in science and actually do what some of my friends on the other side of the aisle will tell you about taking a meat ax to these programs, you know, and putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage?

This is a bill about supporting and expanding American energy technology so we are not so reliant on foreign oil and so we don't go to war over oil. It is a national security issue, but this somehow is a controversial bill. This should pass easily.

The other bill that is so radical, according to my colleague on the Republican side of the aisle, is called the Government Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Performance Improvement Act.

What does this bill do?

It basically says to agencies and departments, look, you need to work to come up with a plan to prevent unnecessary and wasteful spending and to help eliminate Federal Government waste by working with us to help us find where those wasteful areas are.

Now, this is what is causing such consternation on the other side of the aisle? I mean, rather than just taking a meat ax and saying an arbitrary percentage cut across the board, what this bill says is let's think about what we're doing. Maybe we can cut 5 percent; maybe we can cut 10 percent; maybe we can cut even more.

Well, let's do this in a sensible way where we don't adversely impact services that directly impact the American people for the good. Let's have a plan. Let's just not do this senselessly. Let's do this sensibly. Somehow, this radical, awful bill has caused all this noise by my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

The final bill is the Food Safety Modernization Act. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier—and it's worth repeating—in this country, literally 76 million Americans on a yearly basis are sickened by contaminated food that they digest—76 million Americans a year. More than 300,000 of them end up going to hospitals on a yearly basis, and 5,000 die.

So what is this Congress trying to do?

We are trying to find a way to protect consumers, and my colleague on the other side of the aisle is all upset about it. Oh, boy. What a terrible, awful idea to protect the health and well-being of the citizens of this country by updating our food safety rules and regulations, which haven't been updated in almost 30 years.

Come on. I mean let's move forward with this rule. Let's consider these bills. I am sure they all will pass.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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.

#### AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1781, I call up the bill (H.R. 5116) to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.