Burma that include whether U.S. national security, economic, and foreign policy interests are being served so we can make an informed decision. Perhaps the most critical aspect of the Burma sanctions program is that they require us to redirect our attention every summer to the question of whether these sanctions should be continued. They are not self-executing. We here in Congress must consider this issue and vote to continue them on an annual basis.

I continue to believe that our greatest hope for effecting real change in Burma is multilateralism. The whole world, particularly China and the ASEAN countries, must put economic pressure on this regime. I support this resolution because it increases our chances to bring about this multilateral effect.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And I couldn't agree with him more that we do need to see more of a multilateral impact on Burma, particularly China, India, and the surrounding countries of Bangladesh and Thailand and such. And it's my hope that we will continue to see further isolation of Burma. And I think we continue to stretch out a hand to encourage the regime, but they continue to keep slapping it back. And I think now is not the time for recognition; now is the time for further isolation.

So I appreciate the comments of my colleague and friend from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), and I know of his support for this.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members wishing to speak on this issue, and I am prepared to yield back my time. I look forward to working with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee in this effort to hopefully change this regime's behavior.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I appreciate my colleague's willingness to work with us in the future, and look forward to that as well on this and many other issues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 83, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: ''Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1722, TELEWORK IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1509

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 1496 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1509.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1509 provides for consideration of H.R. 1722, the Telework Improvements Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate controlled by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order the substitute reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as modified by an amendment printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule also provides one motion to recommit the bill with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying bill. Even in this July heat, it is hard to forget the historic snowfall that blanketed the Washington region this past winter. OMB estimated that for each day the Federal Government was shut down during the storms, the government lost $71 million worth of productivity. Had some agencies not allowed their employees to telecommute, the cost of lost productivity would have been $100 million.

With today's mobile technology, we can do better to ensure that Federal employees can effectively telecommute regardless of weather conditions. The Telework Improvements Act will provide a framework to expand the current telecommuting program so that all Federal employees can enjoy the benefits. Telecommuting also helps to reduce traffic congestion. I don't think you will find too many Federal employees complaining about missing out on rush-hour traffic in metro D.C.

Now, some may argue that telecommuting will just allow lazy employees to sit at home and pretend to work. That's simply not the case. This bill requires agencies to establish a telecommuting policy that authorizes employees to telecommute to the maximum amount possible only to the extent that it doesn't diminish employee performance or agency operations.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the General Services Administration have already established efficient and effective telework policies.

For those concerned about the deficit, the bill is deficit neutral and, therefore, PAYGO compliant. CBO's estimated cost of $30 million over 5 years pales in comparison to the $71 million per day the government lost due to snow last winter.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind all of my colleagues that a bipartisan majority of them supported this bill when it came to the floor under suspension in May of this year. I urge them to once again support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as has become routine in this Congress, it's my sad duty to come before you yet again today to speak in opposition to spending this House's valuable time to consider a bill that would do absolutely nothing to respond to the very real concerns facing Americans every day.

Here we are with a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, the largest deficit in our history, and the national debt at almost $14 trillion. The response of the

liberal Democratic leadership? A bill making it easier for Federal employees to stay at home to work and creating more government union jobs.

Here we are with a financial crisis of global proportions resulting from an unprecedented expansion of government. The response of liberal Democratic leadership? A resolution recognizing National Train Day.

Here we are with a torrent of oil gushing into the gulf day after day, depriving untold numbers of people of their livelihoods. The liberal Democratic response? A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of RV Centennial Celebration Month to recognize and honor a hundred years of the enjoyment of recreational vehicles in the United States.

In fact, this Congress so far has considered no fewer than 73 bills naming post offices, 36 measures recognizing sporting events and achievements, and 145 designations or recognitions for various days, weeks, months, or years.

Despite these very real problems, the liberal Democrats ruling Congress are running around the country trying to convince the American people that everything is just fine and they don't need to worry because the Democrats are solving their problems. While government employees and their union handlers might be satisfied with the liberal Democrat jobs agenda, try asking the small business men forced to close their doors or the 7 million private business employees who've lost their jobs since the liberal Democrats took control of Congress in 2007 and want to get back to work. This is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentlelady mentioned the deficit and how concerned she is about the deficit. It's somewhat puzzling to me then that she hasn't been out front wanting to pay for the Bush tax cuts that cost hundreds of billions of dollars, that there's been no effort on the other side to want to pay for the George Bush prescription drug bill which cost hundreds of billions of dollars all on to our credit card, that there is no effort on the other side to want to pay for these wars which have now cost $1 trillion—$1 trillion in borrowed money.

I should say, with one exception. The minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, suggested that we could pay for the wars with the Social Security Trust Fund, that we should raise the retirement age and whatever savings we have should not go into the Social Security Trust Fund, should go to pay for our wars so our senior citizens who have paid into the system year after year after year should be robbed of a solid program and, instead, that money should go to pay for the wars.

When they talk about deficits and debt, it is laughable, because they inherited from Bill Clinton one of the biggest surpluses in history and they squandered it on tax cuts that weren't paid for—mostly for the rich, mostly for their big contributors—and on wars that were not paid for.

And what this President and this Congress is trying to do is clean up their mess. And I'm sorry that that bothers some of my friends on the other side, but we're going to clean up their mess, and we're going to move this economy forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I have said before on the floor here to my colleagues who want to rewrite history, they can't blame everything on President Bush. They can't continue to do that. And they want to give President Clinton all the credit.

But, of course, the Congress was controlled by the Republicans for 6 of the 8 years that President Clinton was in office. It's the Congress that controls the spending. Our Democratic colleagues know that. They simply choose to ignore it when it suits their arguments.

□ 1210

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal article of the 13th of July. It's very recent, so my colleagues may not have seen it.

The Bush Tax Cuts and the Deficit Myth—and I won't read the entire article; but, Madam Speaker, I insert the entire article into the RECORD.

Let me read again a little bit from it: In short, it's all President Bush's fault. But Mr. Obama's assertion fails on three grounds.

First, the wars, tax cuts and the prescription drug program were implemented in the early 2000s, yet by 2007 the deficit stood at only $161 billion.

When our colleagues across the aisle took over the Congress, the deficit stood at $161 billion. I go back to quote: How could these stable policies have suddenly caused trillion-dollar deficits beginning in 2009? Obviously, what happened was collapsing revenues from the recession along with stimulus spending.

Second, the President's $8 trillion figure minimizes the problem. Recent CBO data indicate a 10-year baseline deficit closer to $13 trillion if Washington maintains today's tax-and-spend policies, whereby discretionary spending grows with the economy, war spending winds down, ObamaCare is implemented, and Congress extends all the Bush tax cuts, the alternative minimum tax patch and the Medicare doc fix, i.e., no reimbursement cuts.

Under this realistic baseline, the 10-year cost of extending the Bush tax cuts, $3.2 trillion, the Medicare drug entitlement and Iraq and Afghanistan spending add up to $4.7 trillion. That's approximately one-third of the $13 trillion in baseline deficits, far from the majority the President claims.

Third and most importantly, the White House methodology is arbitrary. With Washington set to tax $33 trillion and spend $46 trillion over the next decade, how does one determine which policies ''caused'' the $13 trillion deficit? Mr. Obama could have just as easily singled out Social Security, $9.2 trillion over 10 years; anti-poverty programs, $7 trillion; other Medicare spending, $5.4 trillion; net interest on the debt, $6.1 trillion; and the article goes on and on with nondefense discretionary spending.

Madam Speaker, I have a chart here which we have put together which I think does a very good job of showing deficit spending as a percent of GDP. That's what really is the way we should look at this; and let me point out that in 1992 under Democrat control the deficit as a percent of GDP is this line; 1993, this line; 1994. Republicans then take over the Congress in 1995, and look how the deficit goes down, significantly goes down. It does go up some in 2002 under a Republican Congress and Republican President but we go into war in 2003, 2004, and then what happens when the Democrats take back over? It shoots back up. The red lines are the projected deficits as percent of GDP.

Madam Speaker, this argument just won't hold. Our friends very selectively come up with numbers, and we're going to point out the facts each time that they try to make up facts.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FOXX. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I'm really struck having seen that chart with a fascinating juxtaposition that I've pointed out a couple of times here on the House floor.

There is a requirement for membership in the European Union. The requirement for a new country to join the European Union, Madam Speaker, is that they not have a debt that exceeds 60 percent of the gross domestic product of that country. Now, what does that mean? As we look at that chart today, the United States of America, Madam Speaker, interestingly enough, could not qualify for membership in the European Union because of that debt burden which is continuing to be passed on and on and on to our children and future generations.

Ms. FOXX. Reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for pointing out the very important issue of the percentage of debt to the GDP because it is an important issue and our friends across the aisle have created much of that problem along with our President. They have been in charge since January 2007, and that's where the problem comes from.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2010]

THE BUSH TAX CUTS AND THE DEFICIT MYTH

(By Brian Riedl)

President Obama and congressional Democrats are blaming their trillion-dollar budget deficits on the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. Letting these tax cuts expire is their answer.

Yet the data flatly contradict this ''tax cuts caused the deficits'' narrative. Consider the three most persistent myths:

The Bush tax cuts wiped out last decade's budget surpluses. Sen. John Kerry (D–Mass), for example, has long blamed the tax cuts for having ''taken a $5.6 trillion surplus and turned it into deficits as far as the eye can see.'' That $5.6 trillion surplus never existed. It was a projection by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) in January 2001 to cover the next decade. It assumed that late-1990s economic growth and the stockmarket bubble (which had already peaked) would continue forever and generate record-high tax revenues. It assumed no recessions, no terrorist attacks, no wars, no natural disasters, and that all discretionary spending would fall to 1930s levels.

The projected $5.6 trillion surplus between 2002 and 2011 will more likely be a $6.1 trillion deficit through September 2011. So what was the cause of this dizzying, $11.7 trillion swing? I've analyzed CBO's 28 subsequent budget baseline updates since January 2001. These updates reveal that the much-maligned Bush tax cuts, at $1.7 trillion, caused just 14% of the swing from projected surpluses to actual deficits (and that is according to a ''static'' analysis, excluding any revenues recovered from faster economic growth induced by the cuts).

The bulk of the swing resulted from economic and technical revisions (33%), other new spending (32%), net interest on the debt (12%), the 2009 stimulus (6%) and other tax cuts (3%). Specifically, the tax cuts for those earning more than $250,000 are responsible for just 4% of the swing. If there were no Bush tax cuts, runaway spending and economic factors would have guaranteed more than $4 trillion in deficits over the decade and kept the budget in deficit every year except 2007.

The next decade's deficits are the result of the previous administration's profligacy. Mr. Obama asserted in his January State of the Union Address that by the time he took office, ''we had a one-year deficit of over $1 trillion and projected deficits of $8 trillion over the next decade. Most of this was the result of not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and an expensive prescription drug program.''

In short, it's all President Bush's fault. But Mr. Obama's assertion fails on three grounds.

First, the wars, tax cuts and the prescription drug program were implemented in the early 2000s, yet by 2007 the deficit stood at only $161 billion. How could these stable policies have suddenly caused trillion-dollar deficits beginning in 2009? (Obviously what happened was collapsing revenues from the recession along with stimulus spending.)

Second, the president's $8 trillion figure minimizes the problem. Recent CBO data indicate a 10-year baseline deficit closer to $13 trillion if Washington maintains today's tax-and-spend policies—whereby discretionary spending grows with the economy, war spending winds down, ObamaCare is implemented, and Congress extends all the Bush tax cuts, the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) patch, and the Medicare ''doc fix'' (i.e., no reimbursement cuts).

Under this realistic baseline, the 10-year cost of extending the Bush tax cuts ($3.2 trillion), the Medicare drug entitlement ($1 trillion), and Iraq and Afghanistan spending ($515 billion) add up to $4.7 trillion. That's approximately one-third of the $13 trillion in baseline deficits—far from the majority the president claims.

Third and most importantly, the White House methodology is arbitrary. With Washington set to tax $33 trillion and spend $46 trillion over the next decade, how does one determine which policies ''caused'' the $13 trillion deficit? Mr. Obama could have just as easily singled out Social Security ($9.2 trillion over 10 years), antipoverty programs ($7 trillion), other Medicare spending ($5.4 trillion), net interest on the debt ($6.1 trillion), or nondefense discretionary spending ($7.5 trillion).

There's no legitimate reason to single out the $4.7 trillion in tax cuts, war funding and the Medicare drug entitlement. A better methodology would focus on which programs are expanding and pushing the next decade's deficit up.

Declining revenues are driving future deficits. The fact is that rapidly increasing spending will cause 100% of rising long-term deficits. Over the past 50 years, tax revenues have deviated little from their 18% of gross domestic product (GDP) average. Despite a temporary recession-induced dip, CBO projects that even if all Bush tax cuts are extended and the AMT is patched, tax revenues will rebound to 18.2% of GDP by 2020—slightly above the historical average. They will continue growing afterwards.

Spending—which has averaged 20.3% of GDP over the past 50 years—won't remain as stable. Using the budget baseline deficit of $13 trillion for the next decade as described above, CBO figures show spending surging to a peacetime record 26.5% of GDP by 2020 and also rising steeply thereafter.

Putting this together, the budget deficit, historically 2.3% of GDP, is projected to leap to 8.3% of GDP by 2020 under current policies. This will result from Washington taxing at 0.2% of GDP above the historical average but spending 6.2% above its historical average.

Entitlements and other obligations are driving the deficits. Specifically, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and net interest costs are projected to rise by 5.4% of GDP between 2008 and 2020. The Bush tax cuts are a convenient scapegoat for past and future budget woes. But it is the dramatic upward arc of federal spending that is the root of the problem.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My friends on the other side of the aisle can pull out all their charts and artwork that their Republican National Committee wants to put together for them; but some facts are undeniable, and that is, that when this President came to office, he inherited from George W. Bush the worst economy since the Great Depression. That is undeniable. This economy was in a tail spin, and if it wasn't for the stimulus package, this economy would have continued to go further down the tubes. There was no question about that.

When they talk about deficits, they conveniently leave out the fact that hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit spending went to pay for their tax cuts for their rich friends. That's what they did when they were in power, tax breaks, tax loopholes, all kinds of special interest breaks, for oil companies, for the wealthiest people in this country, and we went deeper and deeper into debt and they didn't care.

Two wars, none of it paid for. None of it paid for, and it should be paid for. The only people sacrificing in these wars are our soldiers and their families. The rest of us are asked to do nothing, and the only possible solution to that that we heard from the other side of the aisle came from the minority leader who said that we should raise the retirement age for those receiving Social Security and take that money and pay for the war. Our senior citizens should pay for these wars? Shouldn't we want to protect Social Security, and shouldn't we find other ways to pay for these wars?

In today's Washington Post, the editorial entitled, ''GOP has no problem extending tax cuts for the rich,'' let me quote from a couple of lines in this editorial: ''Senate Republicans, committed as they are to preventing the debt from mounting further, can't approve an extension of unemployment benefits because it would cost $35 billion. But they are untroubled by the notion of digging the hole $678 billion deeper by extending President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.''

And this is how the editorial ends: ''The issue is whether the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should be extended, adding another $678 billion to the deficit over the next decade. The tax cuts, it's worth remembering, passed originally in 2001 with the argument that the surplus was so large that rates could be cut with budgetary room to spare. Now that the fiscal picture has deteriorated so badly, the questions remains: How are you going to pay the $678 billion? And if you don't, how are you going to justify the added damage to an already grim fiscal outlook?''

I insert this article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 2010]

GOP HAS NO PROBLEM EXTENDING TAX CUTS FOR THE RICH

Senate Republicans, committed as they are to preventing the debt from mounting further, can't approve an extension of unemployment benefits because it would cost $35 billion. But they are untroubled by the notion of digging the hole $678 billion deeper by extending President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. On Fox News Sunday, Chris Wallace asked Republican Whip Jon Kyl (R–Ariz.) about this contradiction. Mr. Kyl's response is worth examining because of what it says about the GOP's refusal to practice the fiscal responsibility it preaches.

Mr. Kyl's first line of defense was to dismiss Mr. Wallace's query as ''a loaded question'' because ''the Bush tax cuts applied to every single American.'' Mr. Wallace pointed out that he was only referring to the top tax brackets, but Mr. Kyl persisted in his refusal to answer. ''So let's, first of all, start with those that don't apply to the wealthy. Shouldn't those be extended?'' Never mind that no one in a policymaking position—not President Obama, not Democrats in Congress—is arguing against extending those tax cuts, at least temporarily. So when Mr. Kyl contends that ''all of that goes away,'' he is just blowing smoke.

Eventually, Mr. Kyl trotted out the tired and unsubstantiated argument that the tax cuts for the wealthy must be extended because otherwise ''you're going to clobber small business.'' Mr. Wallace persisted: ''But,

sir, . . . how are you going to pay the $678 billion?''—at which point Mr. Kyl descended into nonsense. ''You should never raise taxes in order to cut taxes,'' he declared. ''Surely Congress has the authority, and it would be right to, if we decide we want to cut taxes to spur the economy, not to have to raise taxes in order to offset those costs. You do need to offset the cost of increased spending, and that's what Republicans object to. But you should never have to offset [the] cost of a deliberate decision to reduce tax rates on Americans.''

Huh? No one's talking about cutting taxes on the wealthy to stimulate the economy. The issue is whether the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should be extended, adding another $678 billion to the deficit over the next decade. The tax cuts, it's worth remembering, passed originally in 2001 with the argument that the surplus was so large that rates could be cut with budgetary room to spare. Now that the fiscal picture has deteriorated so badly, the questions remains: How are you going to pay the $678 billion? And if you don't, how are you going to justify the added damage to an already grim fiscal outlook?

Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle have been fighting with all their might to deny Americans who have lost their jobs, mostly through no fault of their own, they have been fighting with all their energy to deny them unemployment benefits during this very difficult time where people who can't get these benefits and whose savings are drying up are not going to be able to afford to pay their bills, be able to keep their home; and my friends on the other side of the aisle say we can't afford that, we can't afford that, notwithstanding the fact it's a one-time expenditure.

But you know, when it comes to the wars, let's vote to add another $33 billion in borrowed money on to our children's credit card and no questions asked.

I'd like to do a little nation building, Madam Speaker, here in the United States. I think we have an obligation to take care of the people here in this country, and so I'm all for working on trying to reduce our deficit and our debt. That's what the Democratic Party is dedicated to. The President is dedicated to that. He's formed a bipartisan commission, but to come on the floor and to say that somehow the policies of the previous President, the tax cuts for the rich, billions and billions and billions of dollars in added deficit spending, the war, the prescription drug benefit bill, not even paid for, to suggest that that didn't occur is ludicrous.

The bottom line is that you delivered to this President, my friends on the other side of the aisle delivered to this President, the worst economy since the Great Depression and he has been working overtime to try to dig this country out of the ditch that the Republicans dug, and we need to continue to move forward.

I will add one other thing, Madam Speaker, and that is, during the first year of President Obama's administration more jobs were created than during the 8 years of George W. Bush, and that's a fact.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

□ 1220

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to quickly respond to two things that my colleague from Massachusetts said.

He talks about the fact that the Federal Government is paying for wars. Well, let me say that the Constitution of the United States says, ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare,'' et cetera. It is the role of the Federal Government to protect us in this country. It is the only entity in our country who can do that. It is our role.

The other comment he makes is ''tax cuts for the rich.'' My colleague, just like almost all my colleagues across the aisle, have an assumption that all the money that is generated in this country belongs to the government and that if there is a tax cut provided, that that is a gift from the government to the people getting the tax cut.

No, Madam Speaker, that is not right. The government is not in control in this country. The people are in control. And for them to have that assumption is the biggest part of the problem that we have here right now.

Madam Speaker, I 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. Madam Speaker, let me at the outset say I twice asked my friend from Worcester to yield, and I will say that at any time during my remarks that he would like to challenge me, I look forward to yielding to him.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me say first and foremost that this issue of who is in fact responsible for the security of the United States of America, my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, is absolutely right. The five most important words in the middle of that preamble to the Constitution that she just read are ''provide for the common defence.'' Virtually everything else that we do can be dealt with by individuals, families, churches or synagogues, cities, counties or States. But the national security of the United States of America can only be dealt with by the Federal Government, and we should never forget that.

Now, as we listen to some of the specious charges that have been coming from the other side of the aisle, like this chart that my colleague on the Rules Committee offered, saying that this was from the Republican National Committee, this is from usgovernmentspending.com, a completely nonpartisan entity and they are facts. We have seen a dramatic increase in spending.

My friend regularly talks about the fact that this administration, this President, inherited a bad economy. We all acknowledge that. But what is it that has happened since then, Madam Speaker? Contrary to what my friend just said, we have seen the economy get worse and worse and worse.

We were promised, and I will be happy to yield to my friend if he would like to, we were promised that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent if we were to pass the $1 trillion stimulus bill. Where is it today? At 9.5 percent.

Across the country, many of us are hosting job fairs. There are people who are hurting. In the area that I represent, Madam Speaker, part of it has an unemployment rate that exceeds 14 percent.

The American people know one thing that they have learned over the past year-and-a-half, and that is you cannot spend your way to prosperity.

Now, Madam Speaker, what is it that we are trying to do? We want to ensure that future generations are not saddled with this tremendous debt burden that has been imposed.

This morning I had the opportunity to meet a young man who is very, very inspiring with what he has done over the past 39 days. He visited me. His name is Joseph Machado, and he is here with his parents and his brother Robert and his sister Mercedes. What this young man did, 13 years of age, having gone through tremendous physical adversity, having suffered over the past few years because of an accident, he has been wheelchair-bound. But what has he done over the past 39 days, Madam Speaker? He rode a bicycle from Southern California to the White House. He came here, I met him this morning here in the Capitol, and he has been doing this to raise money and focus resources on the challenges that young people are dealing with.

Now, I raise the name of Joseph Machado to say that as we look at this 13-year-old boy and the challenges that he has gone through, the idea that we will be thrusting on to his shoulders and his brother Robert and his sister Mercedes the responsibility of paying for such profligate spending that has been going on is just plain wrong.

We feel strongly about the need to ensure that we do not do that, that we do everything we can to decrease that. That is one of the reasons that we are going to urge our colleagues today to vote no on the previous question, and in voting no on the previous question we will allow the House to have a chance to vote on a proposal that our colleague from Peoria, Mr. SHOCK, has offered that is going to deal with training to rein in spending.

The people of this country have driven around, and I laugh, I mean sadly laugh, when I see the signs along the side of the road that credit the Reinvestment Act with the job creation that is supposedly going on in dealing with infrastructure issues. Millions and

millions of dollars are being expended putting up the signs along the side of the road. The burden of those is going to be passed on to Joseph Machado and other young people in this country, and we believe that that is an example that the American people can get so they don't have to see signs that they are paying for along the side of the road.

Every Member of this House, Madam Speaker, is going to have an opportunity to vote no, to say that we shouldn't be continuing to spend millions of dollars on road signs crediting the stimulus bill for the construction that is taking place on those roads.

So I am going to join in urging my colleagues under this YouCut proposal to vote ''no'' on the previous question, because that vote in and of itself will allow us the opportunity to consider this measure.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule, because this is a completely closed rule, having had this measure considered under suspension of the rules.

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

Let me remind my colleagues, Madam Speaker, that when President Obama came to office, he inherited an economy that was losing on average 750,000 jobs a month. That is what President Obama was left with.

My friends talk about the fact that the economy is still struggling. It is still struggling. But the June numbers, as much as we wish they were better, we were told that 83,000 private sector jobs were created and 9,000 manufacturing jobs. I would rather be creating jobs, again, I would like to create 100 times more jobs than we were able to do in June, but I would rather be creating jobs than going back to where we were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month.

My friend mentioned job fairs, all my colleagues are doing job fairs. What I find particularly ironic is that my colleagues are hosting job fairs touting stimulus money. The distinguished minority whip on the Republican side from Virginia has been one of the Recovery Act's most vocal critics, uniformly whipping the Republican Caucus into opposing the stimulus. But despite his withering attacks and despite the withering attacks of others on the other side, they continue to host job fairs filled with employers hiring directly because of stimulus grants and programs.

We are told that over half the GOP Caucus, 114 lawmakers who voted to kill the stimulus, then took credit for its success, hosting job fairs, touting the stimulus, doing press releases every time a stimulus award was announced.

So, I guess they want to have it both ways. They want to be out here criticizing the Recovery Act, but when they go home, they are standing and posing for pictures, handing checks to their constituents and small businesses with stimulus money.

So I would again urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to at least be consistent. If you are going to oppose the Stimulus Act, the American Recovery Act, don't go home and take credit for it. Don't go home and say ''I did this for you'' when you were here in Washington and you voted to deny your communities the very money that is helping to create some jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

□ 1230

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

I can assure my colleague across the aisle that I wasn't one of those people who went home to take credit for the Stimulus Act. So he needs to take that issue up with those who have done it and not paint us all with the same brush.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill proposes spending $30 million creating a variety of initiatives promoting telework opportunities to allow Federal employees to work at home. This bill would require each Federal agency to create a teleworking managing officer. But there are many people who wonder if creating this kind of a situation is going to improve efficiency among Federal employees, and it may even reduce the productivity of the Federal Government.

While the 3 million Americans who have lost their jobs since President Obama took office are asking, Where are the jobs we were promised, the Congress is pushing this initiative to make it easier for Federal employees who already have it much better than the rest of the country to avoid coming to work. So why is this bill so popular with the ruling liberal Democrats? Perhaps it has something to do with their longstanding subservience to labor unions.

New data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that a majority of American union members now work for the government. That's 52 percent of all union members now work for the Federal, State, or local government, representing a sharp increase from the 49 percent in 2008. A full 37.4 percent of government employees belonged to the unions in 2009, up six-tenths of a percent from 2008. This shift toward representing government employees has changed the union movement's priorities, as unions now campaign for higher taxes on Americans to fund more government spending.

These changes in union membership are certainly not surprising, as unionized companies do poorly in the marketplace and lose jobs relative to their nonunion competitors. Government employees, however, face no competition, as the government never goes out of business. The recession has left union bosses looking for new membership targets—and where better to look than in the government, which they see as having the deepest of all pockets and a host of sympathetic liberal Democratic politicians eager to please their political base. In fact, as reported by USA Today, overall, Federal workers earned an average salary of $67,691 in 2008 for occupations that exist both in government and the private sector, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. The average pay for the same mix of jobs in the private sector was $60,000. These salary figures don't include the value of health, pension, and other benefits, which average $40,785 per Federal employee in 2008 versus $9,882 per private worker, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. So the average Federal employee's benefits are worth four times what the average benefits are worth in the private sector.

A March 26, 2010, Wall Street Journal editorial entitled ''The Government Pay Boom'' reveals that ''the real windfall for government workers is in benefits.'' And it goes on to talk about how these benefits are growing, growing, growing. We know that the number of Federal employees making over $100,000 has increased by almost 5 percent since 2007, since the Democrats took over in Congress. Currently, there are more people in the Federal Government making in excess of $100,000 than those making $40,000.

Since the recession began in 2007, public worker pay has risen 7.8 percent, while private-sector wages remain stagnant. The 2010 pay increase for Federal civilian employees was 2 percent. In 2009, the average Federal employee received a pay raise of 3.9 percent, and an average pay increase of 3.5 percent in 2008. In 2007, the Department of Transportation had only one employee making over $170,000. At the end of last year, it had 1,690 employees making that amount.

Madam Speaker, we are growing the Federal Government while we have a 9.7 percent unemployment rate in the private sector. This is unacceptable to the American people. That's why we should vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on this bill, because we are not heeding what the American people want us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think the gentlelady from North Carolina kind of just summed it all up. The Republican message to workers all across the country is, We don't want you to have good wages; we don't want you to have good benefits; we don't want you to have good retirement. We want to go back to the days when you get paid less; when one job doesn't earn enough for you to be able to support your family. I've never heard anybody get up before and talk about and advocate lower wages for people. They're all upset that a researcher at NIH trying to find a cure for cancer or a cure to Alzheimer's disease or Parkinson's disease is somehow being overpaid. I've heard a lot of things on this floor, but I've never had anyone come out and

decry the fact that workers in this country should be paid less.

My friend from North Carolina always likes to talk about the fact that government should act more like a business. Well, I want to remind her that the bill that we are talking about here today, the telework bill—telework practices have been adopted by the private sector all throughout the country. I will give you an example. Teleworking allows IBM to reduce office space and save $56 million per year every year. Well, it works in the private sector. Why don't we take that example of where the private sector is able to save some money and bring it to the government sector where we may be able to save some money. If we can save tens of millions of dollars each year, that is a good thing. Maybe we can take that money and put it toward deficit reduction. But the idea to come out here and to be against this bill because of unions and all this other stuff, I think, is ridiculous.

This is a commonsense measure that's going to save the American taxpayer a lot of money. I urge all my colleagues, Democratic and Republican alike, to support this commonsense measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask Members to join me in voting ''no'' on the previous question. For the past couple of years, the American people have been forced to make some extremely difficult budgeting decisions. Because when times are tough and your back is up against the wall, you have no choice but to rein in your expenditures and pare down your debts.

This vote today on the previous question, the reason why we're standing in opposition, is because Republicans would like to see us include in this rule the opportunity to vote on this week's winning YouCut proposal. This proposal would prohibit funding for the droves of puzzling and flamboyant signs attributing various projects to last year's stimulus bill. Often visible along highways, these signs do not provide any meaningful information and do not create any jobs. They are the public face of an administration PR campaign that taxpayers are unwittingly financing. While the precise cost of these signs is unknown, press reports peg it in the tens of millions of dollars.

The painful sacrifice borne by families and small businesses are hugely disconnected from the status quo here in Washington. Inside this Chamber of Congress, the excessive, untargeted, and ineffective spending binge that gives us the failed stimulus is alive and kicking. But now, Madam Speaker, the American people are fed up. Across the country, from big cities to quiet suburbs to rural towns, Americans of all backgrounds are demanding that Washington stop the wasteful spending.

Today, here in this body we will hold the seventh YouCut vote—and the American people will once again be able to see which Member of Congress hears their plea and gets the message. This week's proposal, by Representative SCHOCK of Illinois, would require agencies to report on the amount already spent on the signs. And it would recapture those funds by reducing the agencies' administrative expenses by that same amount.

Madam Speaker, America is at a crossroads. The Federal Government needs to stop spending our country out of prosperity and into a quicksand of unsustainable debt. We need to change the culture in Washington and tip the balance in the direction of savings. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to bring this week's YouCut proposal to a vote before the full House.

□ 1240

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

Madam Speaker, this is laughable. If we're talking about trying to reduce the deficit and get the debt under control, this is the best that we can get, you know, not putting up signs? I mean, how about paying for the tax cuts for the rich that my friends on the other side of the aisle passed? Hundreds of billions of dollars in debt that you put on the backs of my kids and my grandkids so that the wealthiest of the wealthy in this country can get a tax break? Why don't you pay for that, if you want to get this deficit or this debt under control? Signs, that's the best we can do?

Again, with respect to the distinguished minority whip, who I heard again beat up on the stimulus package, it's funny that he beats up on the stimulus package here, but when he goes home, he holds a job fair that so everybody can take advantage of the of the stimulus package. Employer after employer after employer in the gentleman from Virginia's district has received money from the stimulus package so they can create more jobs, and the gentleman takes credit for it, and so do a great many people on the other side of the aisle.

I find it somewhat hypocritical that on one hand we're here saying, ''We don't like it,'' but when you go back home, you tell everybody, ''Oh, this is what I'm doing for you.''

But if you want to get serious about reducing our deficit, we have a bipartisan commission set up to try to make recommendations to this Congress. We need to do it holistically. It's going to be tough. We all want to do it. But to come up and say, ''Oh, you know, our suggestion is to eliminate the signs on projects that benefit from money from the Recovery and Reinvestment Act,'' I think that's just silly.

I would urge my colleagues again to remember the underlying bill that we're talking about, this telework bill, will save tens of millions of dollars for the taxpayers. Those tens of millions of dollars I would bet is a lot more than the signs and could be put toward deficit reduction or could be put toward what I think needs to happen right now, which is that we need to extend unemployment benefits to those who are struggling in this difficult economy. Unfortunately, my Republican friends don't agree to that, and they are blocking it in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I will invite my colleague from Massachusetts, when he speaks again, to give us the citation for the study that he's talking about that shows that this bill will save tens of millions of dollars. I have done a little research on it myself, and I will be talking about that study. But I would invite him to prove to the American people that this will save money.

And I want to point out to him that he's poking fun at Republicans on recommending that we save money on signs, but what he was really doing is poking fun at the American people. It wasn't the Republicans on this side of the aisle who came up with this. It's the American people who voted on this, and the American people understand the biblical admonition, If you are a good steward of small things, you will be a good steward of big things. We should start where we can save money. And I agree with the people. This is a good place to start.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank my good friend, Dr. FOXX, for the time here today.

Madam Speaker, at the President's first news conference after his first official Cabinet meeting, he addressed the Nation, and he said that he was asking his agency heads to come together and collectively come up with $100 million in savings that they could bring forward for this next budget year to eliminate over last year's spending. His quote was, ''We've got to earn their trust.'' The President said, ''They've got to feel confident that their dollars are being spent wisely.'' I couldn't agree with the President any more.

So that is really what today is about. We bring forward House Resolution 5679, which is really quite simple. It says we don't need to tell the American people with propaganda signs that we're spending their tax dollars wisely. More specifically, we don't need to put up road signs all over the country when we're doing paving projects at the tune of hundreds, sometimes thousands. We've found signs that cost over $10,000 apiece simply to say this is your tax dollars at work.

First of all, I would suggest to you that it's an insult to the intelligence of my taxpayers to suggest that they drive by a public works project and think that anyone other than they, as taxpayers, are paying for it. Second, I

would suggest to you that this is a dangerous precedent. Think if every unit of government, from your school board, your township officials, your State government, your Federal Government put a label on everything that they were using to spend your tax dollars on. The unnecessary bureaucratic expense, the unnecessary overhead that it creates.

We have found in 1 year since the stimulus bill was passed that we have spent over $20 million just on signs. The Illinois Department of Transportation, in my home State, has spent over $650,000 on signs. The State of Ohio reports they've spent over $1 million just on signs—not creating jobs, not the infrastructure that was promised, not to lower unemployment, but rather a bunch of sheet metal along the road.

This is not only the financially smart thing to do. I would argue it's the environmentally right thing to do. And then my friends on the other side of the aisle stand up and suggest, well, gee, you know, AARON, it's only $20 million. The estimates, if we don't stop doing this, are that by the time the stimulus program has run its course, we will spend $192 million on these signs. Now, I don't know about you, but whether you supported the stimulus program or you voted against the stimulus program, I hope we can come together and say, You know what? At the end of the day, this $192 million, this $20 million that's already been spent, would better be spent on road projects, on filling potholes, on fixing bridges, on something that we can show for that we're going to ask the next generation of Americans to pay for. And that's all we're doing. We're saying, from this day forward, you can't spend money on signs. Put it into the infrastructure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again, I am always interested in what my colleagues have to say today. But where were they when President Bush and the administration sent out a press release on the prescription drug bill that they didn't pay for that cost millions and millions of dollars to all the senior citizens of this country? There was silence. And if we want to have a serious discussion about deficit reduction, which I think we should, this is where we begin? Why don't we talk about paying for the Bush tax cuts for the rich? Why not offset those tax cuts? Why not pay for them? Why not have that discussion? My friends talk about the deficit, but they didn't have any problem adding hundreds of billions of dollars onto the credit card for the prescription drug bill. They didn't think it was important to pay for it.

Under the Democratic leadership, we're abiding by PAYGO. We're paying for things as we go forward. My friends on the other side of the aisle, when they were in charge, they didn't do that. That's one of the reasons why we're in such trouble right now. But if you really want to reduce the deficit in this country, if you really want to get at the debt, if you really want to do this right, then we need a serious discussion; and the President, I think, has taken the first step toward that discussion by putting together a bipartisan commission to figure out how we do this.

And you know what? The recommendations are going to be such that none of us are going to like them, and we are going to have to make some tough decisions, and hopefully we'll do it together. If not, we'll do it alone. But I think the fact of the matter is getting the deficit under control is a priority. But I'll tell you this: You're not going to get the deficit under control unless you get the economy back on track, unless you put people back to work.

And I really regret that my friends on the other side of the aisle, every chance they get, try to undercut this President's economic agenda to try to create and incentivize more jobs. Every chance, every single chance, they object or they try to obstruct. Again, I will go back to what I said earlier. They come on the floor and they decry the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but then they go back to their districts and they do press conferences and they do press releases and they take all kinds of bows for all the money that they voted against. A lot of that money, Madam Speaker, is creating jobs in their districts. And the reason why, I guess, they're taking bows is because they see that some of the help to some of the small businesses and to some of their manufacturers and to some of the States and cities and towns for building their infrastructure is important to job creation.

So, again, let's get back to what we're here to talk about, which is this telework bill, which I think will save the Federal Government a great deal of money. I'm not the only one who thinks that. There are others in the private sector and in the public sector that have made the argument that if we do this right, we could save not just tens of millions of dollars but maybe hundreds of millions of dollars, and I think that's a good step for us to take. If my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to take that step, fine. They can do what they usually do and obstruct everything. But this is good for the taxpayers of this country, and I hope that it passes with an overwhelming margin.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts that the Republicans can't obstruct the President's effort because we are in the minority. And we don't have to obstruct him anyway because they've all failed. Nothing has worked that the President and our friends across the aisle have tried, and so they're going to fail of their own weight.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts that we need to get this economy back on track, but you don't get it back on track by creating the great uncertainty that your side has created in the economy, raising health care costs, raising energy costs—potentially raising energy costs—raising taxes. Businesses aren't going to invest when there's this much uncertainty out there. And I hear it every single day from my colleagues from around the country, from businesses that I speak to.

But what we can do is start to find out ways to cut wasteful spending. And I support Mr. SCHOCK from Illinois's proposal today to cut the wasteful spending on these signs that are across this country. $20 million. They're not creating a single job. They're not improving safety in this country. In fact, as my colleague said, I find it silly that this administration is spending $20 million on signs.

In my State of Pennsylvania, which has more structurally deficient bridges than any other State in the Nation, we could take these $20 million and apply it to some of these bridges in Pennsylvania and across this country. And I'll just point out three of them in Pennsylvania, while I'm sure there are hundreds if not thousands across this country:

$1.1 million to replace the Bolden Ridge Bridge in Fayette County, a project that would create 33 jobs and improve safety for the traveling public;

$3 million to replace the Fair Grounds Bridge in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, a project that would create 92 jobs and, again, improve safety for our citizens;

And, finally, $5.5 million to repair a sinkhole that's occurring in Huntington County, Pennsylvania, that is going to pose a serious risk to the traveling public in Huntington County, Pennsylvania, and those people that cross that road. $5.5 million will create 167 jobs, and it will make our roadways safer.

These projects will create jobs. They will improve our infrastructure. And most importantly, they'll improve safety.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side to stand up with us today and say, let's stop this silliness. Let's stop spending $20 million on these signs that aren't creating jobs and are nothing more than propaganda. So I ask them to support my colleague's, Mr. SCHOCK, H.R. 5679.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I'm a little bit confused. I don't know whether the gentleman supports the stimulus package or opposes the stimulus package.

On one hand, you know, Pennsylvania was one of the top recipients of aid from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. A lot of bridges are

being repaired; a lot of highways are being fixed. Does the gentleman want to take that money back? Does he think that the people who worked on constructing those bridges and building those roads are somehow, those jobs aren't worth it?

The fact of the matter is, you know, it's another example of where, on one hand, my colleagues are saying we want more money for bridges and roads and infrastructure. And the very bill that delivered a lot more money for bridges and roads, they all voted against.

So I would again urge my colleagues to be consistent. And I would also urge them to support the underlying bill, this telework bill, which I think will save the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHUSTER. When we did the stimulus bill, we spent money on all different kinds of programs, many of which don't create jobs. Only 8 percent went to infrastructure in this country, 8 percent, which is a very small amount.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time. But the fact of the matter is a lot of infrastructure projects are going on in Pennsylvania right now. And the people who are working on those jobs are happy to have a job. And the people who run the State are happy that they are able to make some improvements because States have been suffering greatly as a result of this economy.

So, you know, I would also point out again that, for all the talk of jobs, when they were in charge, we were losing on average 750,000 jobs a month; 750,000 jobs a month we were losing when they were in charge.

We're now gaining jobs, not as many as we would like, but we're moving in a different direction. I don't want to go backwards. I don't want to go backwards to 22 consecutive months of job loss.

Barack Obama has created more jobs in 1 year than George Bush created in 8 years, and that is a fact. And so to all my colleagues who are talking about jobs, here's your choice: you can go backwards and experience once again historic job losses, or you can stick with this economic agenda, get through this difficult time, put people back to work, get this economy moving again and start paying down our debt.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleague again is very selectively using statistics. He knows that he cannot back up the data that says that in the first year of President Obama's administration he has created more jobs than in all the Bush administration.

I have this chart which shows the unemployment rate under President Obama, under President Bush; and, again, we had many more jobs created under President Bush than have been created under President Obama, because all we've done is lose jobs under President Obama and create government jobs.

That's the whole issue here, Madam Speaker. We've lost four million jobs since President Obama took office. That's it.

And, you know, my colleague across the aisle says we need to be consistent. Well, he should be consistent. This will bring savings immediately, what we're proposing. What he's talking about might bring savings 30 years down the road. In fact, the study that I asked him to talk about, there's no study, Madam Speaker. I asked for a copy of the study. You know what it is? An article that was in the newspaper last February when we shut the government down, or the Democrats shut the government down for a week. They were losing $100 million a day. But they found out 30 percent of the people were logging into their computers, so they call that a savings of $30 million per day.

Listen, the American people are tired of that kind of thing being passed off as a study. There is no study.

Madam Speaker, this bill does not need to be passed. This rule does not need to be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 20 seconds to finish her statement.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I won't take the full 8 minutes, but I again want to point out a couple of facts to my colleagues here. We are faced with a very difficult economy, and this is an economy that President Obama inherited. He is trying to dig this economy out of the ditch that my friends on the other side of the aisle dug us into. It is not easy, and it's not going to happen overnight.

But it is a fact that Barack Obama has created more jobs in 1 year than George Bush created in 8 years. We were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs on average each month when President Bush was in office. We are now gaining jobs; not as many as we would like, not as fast as we would like, but we are moving in a very different direction. We're moving in the direction where we are creating more jobs, and we're moving toward a healthier economy. That is just the fact.

And the question is, Do we try to work with this administration to get this economy back on a strong footing, or are we going to try to obstruct everything and root for failure?

I mean, my friends on the other side of the aisle, their whole kind of, their whole platform is based on this President failing, on this economy failing. How cynical can you get?

The fact is, we have a lot of work to do, and we need to focus on jobs. Jobs is the issue. We need to extend unemployment benefits to those who have lost their jobs, mostly through no fault of their own.

□ 1300

We need to help them get through this difficult time. I regret that my Republican friends in the Senate continue to obstruct the extension of unemployment benefits. I hope nobody goes home for an August recess until unemployment benefits are extended.

My friends say we can't afford to pay for it. Can't afford to pay to help people in our own country. Yet last week $33 billion in borrowed money for nation building that supports a corrupt government in Afghanistan. They all support it. No questions asked. All borrowed money. And I get it. You know, if you think it's important, fine. But if nation building in Afghanistan is important, a little bit more nation building here in the United States of America is important.

We have to take care of our people here who are experiencing very difficult times because of the troubled economy. We just can't sit here and bicker and bicker and bicker and let people lose their homes and let people not be able to pay their bills or put food on their table.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, this President has accomplished a great deal in a very short time. And my expectation is that if we continue to follow his economic agenda, that we will see this economy get on stronger footing. The bill that's before us, the telework bill, I think is a good bill. It will save the taxpayers lots of money. IBM, a private-sector company, says it saved them tens of millions of dollars each year. If it can save IBM tens of millions of dollars each year, it ought to save the Federal Government hundreds of millions. Let us take that money, put it toward deficit reduction or put it toward helping our people who are in deep trouble as this economy tries to recover.

Madam Speaker, I would close by urging my colleagues to support the rule. I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1509 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. 5679) to prevent funding from the American Recovery

and Reinvestment Act of 2009 from being used for physical signage indicating that a project is funded by such Act, and for other purposes. 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. 5679.

(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. Madam 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 adopting House Resolution 1509, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2864.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—232

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
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.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
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
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
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam

Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus
Capuano
Cummings
Delahunt
Deutch
Garamendi
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Marshall
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt
Whitfield

□ 1329

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. BARTON of Texas, CRENSHAW, LUETKEMEYER, and ISSA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 180, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—238

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
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
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachus
Deutch
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Kagen
Marshall
McKeon
McMahon
Olson
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Tiahrt
Whitfield

□ 1338

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. McMAHON. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 438, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AUTHORIZING HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES FOR LOSS OF ICE IN ARCTIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2864) to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring of coastal changes, as amended, 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 Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—420

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)