

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie Dahlkemper Johnson, E. B.
 Ackerman Davis (AL) Johnson, Sam
 Aderholt Davis (CA) Jones
 Adler (NJ) Davis (IL) Jordan (OH)
 Akin Davis (KY) Kagen
 Alexander Davis (TN) Kanjorski
 Altmire Deal (GA) Kaptur
 Andrews DeFazio Kennedy
 Arcuri DeGette Kildee
 Austria Delahunt Kilpatrick (MI)
 Baca DeLauro Kilroy
 Bachmann Dent
 Bachus Diaz-Balart, L. King (IA)
 Baird Diaz-Balart, M. King (NY)
 Baldwin Dicks Kirk
 Barrett (SC) Dingell Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Barrow Doggett Kissell
 Bartlett Donnelly (IN) Klein (FL)
 Barton (TX) Doyle Kline (MN)
 Bean Dreier Kosmas
 Becerra Driehaus Kratovil
 Berkley Duncan Kucinich
 Berman Edwards (MD) Lamborn
 Berry Edwards (TX) Lance
 Biggert Ehlers Langevin
 Bilbray Ellison Larsen (WA)
 Bilirakis Ellsworth Larson (CT)
 Bishop (GA) Emerson Latham
 Bishop (NY) Engel LaTourette
 Bishop (UT) Eshoo Latta
 Blumenauer Etheridge Lee (CA)
 Blunt Fallin Levin
 Boccieri Farr Lewis (CA)
 Boehner Fattah Lewis (GA)
 Bonner Filner Linder
 Bono Mack Fleming Lipinski
 Boozman Forbes LoBiondo
 Boren Fortenberry Loeb sack
 Boswell Foster Lofgren, Zoe
 Boucher Foxx Lowey
 Boustany Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer
 Boyd Franks (AZ) Lujan
 Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel
 Brady (TX) Fudge E.
 Braley (IA) Gallegly Lynch
 Bright Garrett (NJ) Mack
 Broun (GA) Gerlach Maffei
 Brown (SC) Giffords Maloney
 Brown, Corrine Gingrey (GA) Manzullo
 Brown-Waite, Ginny Gonzalez Marchant
 Buchanan Goodlatte Markey (CO)
 Burgess Gordon (TN) Markey (MA)
 Burton (IN) Granger Marshall
 Butterfield Graves Massa
 Buyer Grayson Matheson
 Calvert Green, Al Matsui
 Camp Green, Gene McCarthy (CA)
 Campbell Griffith McCarthy (NY)
 Cantor Grijalva McCaul
 Cao Guthrie McClintock
 Capito Gutierrez McCollum
 Capps Hall (NY) McCotter
 Capuano Hall (TX) McDermott
 Cardoza Halvorson McGovern
 Carnahan Hare McHenry
 Carney Harman McHugh
 Carson (IN) Harper McIntyre
 Carter Hastings (FL) McKeon
 Cassidy Hastings (WA) McMahan
 Castle Heinrich McMorris
 Castor (FL) Heller Rodgers
 Chaffetz Hensarling McNerney
 Chandler Herger Meek (FL)
 Childers Herseth Sandlin Meeks (NY)
 Chu Higgins Melancon
 Clarke Hill Mica
 Clay Himes Michaud
 Cleaver Hinchey Miller (FL)
 Clyburn Hinojosa Miller (MI)
 Coble Hirono Miller (NC)
 Coffman (CO) Hodes Miller, Gary
 Cohen Hoekstra Miller, George
 Cole Holden Minnick
 Conaway Holt Mitchell
 Connolly (VA) Honda Mollohan
 Conyers Hoyer Moore (KS)
 Cooper Hunter Moore (WI)
 Costa Inglis Moran (KS)
 Costello Inslee Moran (VA)
 Courtney Israel Murphy (CT)
 Crenshaw Jackson (IL) Murphy (NY)
 Crowley Jackson-Lee
 Cuellar (TX) Murphy, Patrick
 Culberson Jenkins Murphy, Tim
 Cummings Johnson (GA) Murtha
 Johnson (IL) Myrick
 Nadler (NY)

Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Kissell
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Putnam
 Quigley
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross

Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak

Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Teague
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NAYS—9

Blackburn Lee (NY) Rooney
 Flake Lummis Sensenbrenner
 Kingston Paul Shadegg

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gohmert Issa Poe (TX)

NOT VOTING—5

Lucas Rangel Young (FL)
 Pence Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1314

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we just voted on H. Res. 543. I voted present because I was confused. This indicates that we are designating June as Home Safety Month. By designating the month that just passed as Home Safety Month, would this be an ex post facto law that would be prohibited by the Constitution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot construe the measure.

Mr. GOHMERT. I understand it is confusing to you as well. But were we designating the month just passed as Home Safety Month?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I thought the question mark on the end might have helped it become one. But anyway, I understand it is confusing to the Chair, so I guess no answer is an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 3170.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1315

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 644 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3170.

□ 1316

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

I am pleased to rise in support of the Financial Services and General Government 2010 appropriations bill, which includes total funding of \$24.150 billion.

This is a bill that we worked on cooperatively with our ranking member, JO ANN EMERSON, and I want to thank her for her work that she has put into this bill, for her friendship and her all around goodwill. We had helpful input from our subcommittee members and a productive full committee markup where all members had an opportunity to offer amendments and to have them debated and considered.

This is a bill that we, as a Congress, can be proud of. The agencies that this

bill funds touch the lives of all of us, and the funding is directed to those programs where we believe the American people will derive the most benefit.

You have had a chance to look at the bill and report and to see the specifics of how the money for the 2010 fiscal year have been allocated so, in the interest of time, I'm not going to present a lot of detail regarding each program and agency. Instead, I would like to briefly highlight the five important themes that were addressed throughout this bill.

The first of these is rebuilding the regulatory agencies designed to protect investors, consumers and taxpayers. A significant increase of \$76 million above 2009 is provided for the Securities and Exchange Commission. This is the agency that combats financial manipulation, fraud and deceptive practices. It has not been vigilant enough in executing these duties in the past few years. The increase provided will allow the SEC to hire approximately 140 new employees to strengthen their oversight capacity.

In addition, the Federal Trade Commission, which protects consumers in financial matters, will receive \$33 million more than in 2009.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission, which plays an important safety role in our product decisions, will also receive increased funding.

Funding is strengthened for several of the Inspector General offices included in our bill that are charged with making sure that regulatory and financial agencies are doing what they're supposed to do.

With regard to the Troubled Assets Relief Program, TARP, the bill requires the Treasury Department to provide reports so that we know how Treasury is addressing those parts of the financial crisis over which it has been given oversight responsibilities.

A second major theme of the bill is to make sure capital and other assistance gets to small businesses and low-income communities, not just to large businesses and the wealthy. Funding increases are directed to the two key agencies which play important roles in this area. The Small Business Administration receives \$236 million more than last year, and the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund receives \$137 million more than in 2009.

Our third priority of supporting equitable and efficient administration of justice in the Federal courts is met by well-directed funding increases that allow our courts to keep up with the costs and growing workloads.

The fourth theme is to provide for fair and effective collection of taxes. Full funding is provided for the President's request for the IRS, which includes a substantial increase for tax enforcement to close the gap between taxes owed and taxes paid. We also help our taxpayers meet their responsibility by including resources for the IRS to provide assistance in person, over the phone, and on the IRS Web site.

Our final priority is to meet our obligations to the Nation's Capital City, Washington, D.C., by including payments to address high-priority needs. We reduce undue interference in local affairs by dropping numerous restrictions on the District that do not apply to other parts of the Nation. For example, we dropped the prohibition on use of local D.C. tax funds for abortion, thereby putting the District in the same position as the 50 States by leaving that decision up to the elected government of the District of Columbia.

Beyond these five priority areas, our bill touches the lives of Americans in other ways as well. For example, we assist American farmers by clarifying language from last year's bill regarding trade with Cuba and the requirement for payment of "cash in advance." We also provide increased funding for Drug-Free Communities coalitions who work to reduce problems of youth drug abuse in their neighborhoods and communities.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank staff on both sides of the aisle who have made tremendous contributions to this process. All the staff, both majority and minority, have worked long hours with dedication, and I would like to extend my personal thanks.

So let me end by saying that I believe this is a good bill that merits your support. It directs funding to improve the services that our government agencies provide to our constituents as they invest their savings, purchase products, start small businesses and pay taxes. It addresses the needs of our courts and our Nation's Capital City. I would ask for your vote in favor of its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since this is the first bill I'm managing on the floor as ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee, I'd like to say for the record how honored I am to have this position.

The economic challenges facing our Nation demand that the contents of the Financial Services Appropriations bill be deliberately laid out and carefully structured. The subcommittee has jurisdiction over a diverse group of agencies which regulate the financial and telecommunications industries, collect taxes and provide taxpayer assistance, support the operations of the White House, the Federal Judiciary, and the District of Columbia, manage Federal buildings and provide oversight of the Federal workforce.

I want to commend Chairman SERRANO for his efforts in crafting the bill. It has been a real privilege and pleasure to work with him. And while we don't always agree, he has been very open to concerns and issues raised by Members on our side of the aisle. I thank the chairman for his commitment to bipartisanship and for listening to the minority views.

I also want to thank the majority staff who worked on this bill, including

the Clerk, David Reich, Bob Bonner, Karyn Kendall, Lee Price, Andria Oliver, Ed O'Kane, Alex Jobal and Nadine Berg. I also have to commend the members of the minority staff. John Martens, Alice Hogans, Dena Baron, and my staff, Justin Rone and Jeffrey Connor, who have all been extremely dedicated to putting the best possible product forward from the subcommittee. On both sides, these staff members worked very hard for the committee and the American people, and I appreciate their efforts.

While I've been pleased to have a wonderful working relationship this year with Chairman SERRANO, I am disappointed by the fact that we're not doing what our constituents have asked us to do, and that is to work together in a totally bipartisan way at the full committee level to make the lives of our constituents better.

For example, the rule for consideration of the bill limits debate to 17 amendments, and I believe that 97 were submitted to the Rules Committee. This rule, then, doesn't, the rule governing the debate here, did not display bipartisanship or regular order because we had colleagues who want today offer amendments about which they felt very strongly, saving taxpayer money by taking extra returned TARP money and putting it toward the deficit, people who felt very strongly about the D.C. public school systems, and the like. But it's troubling that they weren't able to offer their very substantive amendments, amendments which our constituents feel very strongly about.

I do urge my colleagues to support a process where every Member has the opportunity to have his or her voice heard on the floor of the House.

Now, let me turn to the bill before us today. The \$24.15 billion allocation provided to the subcommittee is much too large. It's a 7 percent, or \$1.6 billion increase above the current year, excluding stimulus funding. This allocation allows most agencies in the bill to be funded at or above the rate of inflation. I believe the resource requirements of the agencies funded in the bill can be met with a smaller allocation. Especially at a time when every household in America faces difficult budgetary choices, Congress must be diligent when spending the taxpayers' money. The Federal Government, in this bill, is growing at an incredible rate at a time when employers who I represent in the district have cut jobs, and when people are really hurting. They're making the tough choices, and we really should too, as an example to them.

The Congressional Budget Office concedes that, "Under current law the Federal budget is on an unsustainable path—meaning that the Federal debt will continue to grow much faster than the economy over the long run."

This bill primarily funds government agency operating accounts. It doesn't support programs or grants, and doesn't represent a commitment to fiscal sustainability. In short, this bill

provides a 7-percent increase which goes straight to the bureaucracy's bottom line. We're not making the tough decisions the American people feel we should consider at a crucial time for our Nation's economy.

The administration's own budget documents state that the Federal debt held by the public will be 68.5 percent of gross domestic product by 2014. This is the highest percentage of Federal debt to GDP since 1950, the year that I was born.

That said, using the allocation provided to him, Chairman SERRANO has done an outstanding job of crafting this bill. I'm grateful that the bill provides increases to critical programs such as the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Treasury Terrorism and Financial Intelligence Programs, and Tax Preparation Assistance Grants.

I also support the proposed reduction in the ONDCP's media campaign in order to provide additional resources to the Drug-Free Communities program and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program.

I'm pleased the bill provides \$74 million for D.C. education programs, including \$42 million to D.C. public schools. My stepdaughter currently teaches in a District public school, and her reports, along with the Adequate Yearly Progress measurements, indicate dramatic improvements need to be made before every D.C. school is offering the opportunity that children in D.C. deserve.

In the meantime, this bill does not eliminate the Opportunity Scholarships program, but it does restrict the program to students already enrolled in it.

How can we limit educational opportunities for low-income students when we know the public school system is underperforming?

Regarding the General Services Administration, I am grateful that the chairman has included language directing a review of the GSA supply schedule. In just one example of the need for this review, the Department of Homeland Security has identified \$42 million of savings over 5 years by no longer using the GSA to purchase office supplies. We want to try to improve the GSA supply procurement process so that this savings can be replicated throughout all government departments and agencies.

□ 1330

I also support the GSA construction and alteration projects funded in the bill. I don't usually have positive things to say about GSA construction and alteration accounts, but I will say that the chairman has done an excellent job in crafting the bill that funds justifiable projects.

I also want to thank the chairman for including language clarifying the congressional intent regarding the cash-in-advance policy in the sale of agricultural and medical supplies to

Cuba. This clarification will help American producers expand their markets in a significant neighboring export market.

One area of the bill that I believe has received an excessive level of funding is payments under the Help America Vote Act. There is no question that we are obligated to provide for free and fair elections. It's a hallmark of our democracy, and we must always work to safeguard the electoral process. However, the administration justifiably proposed to cut this particular program to \$50 million because the States aren't spending the funds that have been provided in the past years. The account contains a surplus of \$186 million today. This bill needlessly adds \$100 million to this underused account.

The Election Assistance Commission is waiting for the States to claim the 2008 and 2009 grant funds. Of the \$115 million provided in fiscal year 2008, only \$25 million has been claimed by the States. Of the fiscal year 2009 funds, \$100 million, only \$3 million has been paid to two States.

Another area of the bill that deeply concerns me is controversial changes to longstanding general provisions regarding the District of Columbia. I strongly oppose these changes. I do not believe that increasing the availability of abortions or medical marijuana will improve the quality of life in the District of Columbia.

As you see, Mr. Chairman, this bill is very controversial. Not only does the proposed bill spend more than \$24 billion, but it proposed to change longstanding policies on which Members on both sides of the aisle have long agreed. This is why the bill should be considered in regular order.

We recognize that operating under an open rule is grueling, long, hard work, and we've done it that way for years and years, at least as long as I have been on this committee. At the same time, we believe that the responsible regular functioning of this institution is important, especially on spending measures that demand the full attention of the Congress because they have the full attention of the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, while I have some reservations regarding this bill and I'm disappointed that it's not being debated so that all Members could be heard, I would again like to thank Chairman SERRANO for his openness and his friendship.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the full committee and the most famous Chicago Cubs fan in the Nation, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I think George will dispute that fact.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a key part of efforts to restore the stability of, and public confidence in, America's financial institutions. For example, with the Securities and Exchange Commis-

sion, this bill strengthens its ability to enforce rules that govern investments and financial markets and detect and prosecute fraudulent schemes. Under the Federal Trade Commission allocation, it strengthens the FTC's capacity to protect consumers and combat anti-competitive behavior and prosecute unfair and deceptive practices in areas such as foreclosure and credit repair services.

With respect to the Treasury Inspector General, it provides \$30 million to help the Inspector General perform mandated reviews in cases where bank failures or other circumstances caused losses for the deposit insurance fund. It also provides a substantial amount of funding, \$387 million more than 2009, to target wealthy individuals and businesses who avoid U.S. taxes by parking money in overseas tax havens.

I think those are four good reasons to vote for the bill.

I also want to speak just for a moment to the LaTourette amendment. That amendment simply is an effort to try to find a way to give auto dealers across the country an opportunity to have a decent review process, a decent appeals process, given the fact that GM and Chrysler have set up their own arbitrary process to shut them down.

I would point out the majority of Members of this House are sponsors of similar legislation, and I would also suggest this. This Congress has provided \$60 billion in funding to the auto industry. I think to suggest that somehow they have been abused because the Congress is trying to provide some efforts to help local auto dealers get a better understanding of what is happening to them is, in my view, off the point.

In addition to the \$60 billion we provided those auto companies, we've also provided increased Federal purchases of automobiles to try to get rid of their backlog. We've provided the Cash for Clunkers provision which they wanted to see passed, and we provided \$2 billion in research funding to help the auto industry develop new technology. I hardly think that they have been underprivileged in terms of their treatment by this Congress.

So I would simply say before people get too exercised about the LaTourette amendment, I don't think anybody expects that language to survive intact. What we do want is to see that language used as an opportunity to get the auto dealers and the auto companies to sit down and work out a better appeals process so that you don't have some significantly profitable auto dealers at the local level being unnecessarily put out of business. That means job losses in virtually every county in this district, and I don't think we have an obligation to support that.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 3 minutes to a fellow subcommittee member and a very hardworking member from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentle-

A wise friend, a local historian pointed out to me the city council makes decisions that can affect you for the next month, the next week, State legislatures make decisions that may affect you the next year, but the United States Congress makes decisions that will affect the next generation and for many years to come. And so we, all of us, take very seriously our obligation here to work together to find solutions to the problems that face the Nation, to protect what is great about America. And this committee has done so, all of us on the committee, regardless of our core principles, the districts we work for, represent, trying to find areas we can work together.

And I want to thank Chairman SERRANO, our full committee chairman, Mr. OBEY, for example, finding areas to work together with our superb ranking member, Mrs. EMERSON, to find common ground on important areas. I want to thank the chairman for accepting the amendment that Mr. LATOURETTE offered that we all support to protect car dealers from being arbitrarily shut down and enforcing State franchise laws, for accepting the amendment to get information from the White House on whether or not foreign combatants captured on foreign battlefields are actually being read Miranda rights.

I want to thank the committee chairman for agreeing as we work together to try to get the Supreme Court to open up their oral arguments to disclosure on the Internet.

But when it comes to the financial solvency and security of the Nation, there are profound differences of opinion between those of us who are fiscally conservative and the fiscally liberal majority. We, this week, saw the deficit exceed a trillion dollars for the first time on the same day that the majority laid out a government takeover of the health care industry, what would be the largest tax increase in the history of America, the week after the liberal majority passed the largest tax increase in the history of the country on energy. The energy tax that this majority passed will affect everyone in America and hammer the private sector unless you're Amish. I think the Amish are the only people that come out okay under that energy tax.

And don't forget this liberal majority is going to allow the Bush tax cuts to expire 12 months from this coming January 1. When you combine all of those things together, the New York Post points out today that in New York City the tax rate would get to about 58 percent.

So there is a profound difference in us as fiscal conservatives and the direction that the liberal, fiscally liberal majority is taking us.

I offered an amendment in committee, which the majority denied, that all money refunded by TARP recipients had to go to pay down the deficit. That amendment was rejected. We keep searching, as fiscally conservative

Members in the minority, we keep searching for ways to keep money. Is there any cut that this liberal majority would accept? We haven't seen it yet. We've offered every cut we can imagine, from little ones to big ones. Nothing is accepted.

This Congress is spending more money in less time than any Congress in history. It's irresponsible. It's dangerous. This endangers the national security of the country, and there should be no more spending, no more debt, no new taxes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I begin by thanking my good friend from New York and the distinguished chairman of the full committee for their kindness and their graciousness in making this time available.

I have rarely voted against the rule and rarely voted against the previous question. I am very much troubled by what we see happening here today. I recognize the goodwill of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I would observe that we are playing with fire here.

My friend from Wisconsin mentioned billions of dollars we've made available to the auto industry. He's correct. We have. Now the question is do we, by what we are doing here with regard to the auto dealers, jeopardize those expenditures and jeopardize the well-being of our auto industry? That is what is at stake here.

This is a serious matter. If the auto industry goes down because we have taken sides in a quarrel between the auto industry and the dealers, we will have destroyed not only the dealers that complain but all of the other dealers and all of the people who work for the auto industry, who are associated with it, all of the suppliers. Frankly, we are playing with fire here.

I recognize that there is the intention to use this as a lever to help the dealers, and I applaud that. But I think that this is the wrong lever, the wrong time, and the wrong way to use this kind of lever.

The result of this playing with fire can be a serious disaster which we visit upon ourselves, upon the auto industry, upon all of those who are dependent upon it. And I would urge my colleagues in dealing with this to be exquisitely careful with this kind of exercise because it imposes upon all of us and upon the Nation an incredible level of danger which I hope will be avoided, and we are now putting ourselves in a position where all of the good that has been done to try and preserve this important auto industry is being put at risk.

Mr. Chair, it is with sadness and great dismay that I rise in opposition to H.R. 3170, the

"Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2010." The bill's legislative language, which would force auto manufacturers that have received federal funding to reinstate terminated dealer franchises, has the grave potential to do significant harm to the already suffering national economy. Thanks to the timely intervention of the Administration and extraordinarily speedy bankruptcies, Chrysler and General Motors (GM) are once again on the path toward viability. Nevertheless, section 745 of this bill threatens to undo the delicately wrought restructurings achieved in bankruptcy court for both companies and could very well bring about their collapse. Should section 745 become law, I fear far more dealers, not to mention auto suppliers and other ancillary businesses, would be forced to close than would have otherwise under Chrysler's and GM's original dealer termination plans. Although I recognize that both companies, particularly Chrysler, did a poor job in achieving dealer rationalization, it remains my strong preference to resolve this matter outside of statute. I urge my colleagues to take heed of this warning.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE)

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but the highest regard for the dean of the House. As a matter of fact, when I was elected in 1994, my mentor, Ralph Regula, said, When you grow up, you need to be like JOHN DINGELL.

And in this particular instance, however, I thought I was going to disagree with his remarks, but I couldn't agree with him more. And I would assure him, as the author of the amendment in this bill and also from observing Mr. MAFFEI and the majority leader as they move legislation in a different path, that everybody understands the gravity of this situation. But without exerting this lever, we're going to have a crisis in this country, and an economic recovery will not be possible if we continue to throw people out of work.

The use of expedited bankruptcy proceedings by the automotive task force in connection with the two car companies has caused the extinguishment of State franchise laws and rights that have affected all of the dealers that are listed on this chart: 789 for Chrysler, 2,600 for General Motors. About 60 people work at each dealership. This stroke of the pen, this saying that this is the way we're going to go to get General Motors and Chrysler out of trouble on top of the \$60 billion that Mr. OBEY talked about is going to throw over 200,000 people out of work.

I am grateful to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SERRANO, for accepting this amendment and also going to the Rules Committee and protecting it from potential point of order.

And the proof is in the pudding on the car companies. The car companies

submitted reorganization plans on February 17 that didn't contemplate the closing of as many plants, the firing of as many people, nor the closing of the dealerships. The auto task force, according to testimony by Mr. Bloom, the new head of the task force, before the Senate said they pushed back. The task force said to the car companies, you're not being aggressive enough because you haven't closed enough plants, you're not being aggressive enough because you haven't fired enough people, you're not being aggressive enough because you haven't closed enough dealerships, and so now we're left with what we're left with.

As a result, if the crocodile tears that we now hear from Detroit are to be believed, if they really thought this was the way to go, to close down people that are making money for them and don't cost them any money, they would have, on February 17, said, This is our plan. They didn't do it until May, and as a result, 200,000 people are going to lose their job.

□ 1345

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank the chairman for his leadership, Chairman Serrano, on this bill, for giving me the opportunity to speak on an important issue impacting my district.

The District of Columbia operates a juvenile detention facility named New Beginnings in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, which is in my district. Since its opening this May, there have been two separate instances of escapes by juveniles housed at the facility. In the last instance, six juveniles escaped without any notification to the county in which the facility is located. From all accounts, these escapes occurred through easily breached doors and windows. Both of these episodes have raised troubling questions about the level of oversight and security at the facility.

Applicable District of Columbia law requires: "Developing and maintaining a system with other governmental and private agencies to identify, locate, and retrieve youth who are under the care, custody, or supervision of the department, who have absconded." Unfortunately, these and other standards relating to the security at the facility have not received adequate attention from District of Columbia authorities.

I'd like to yield to the majority leader who I know has a perspective on this.

Mr. HOYER. I would like to echo the remarks of my colleague, Mr. SARBANES.

Prior to opening New Beginnings, the District of Columbia operated another juvenile detention facility, Oak Hill, at the same location. I represented that area of our State for some period of time. This facility was plagued with a history of escapes, and Oak Hill offi-

cially routinely, in my opinion, failed to notify area officials and local law enforcement when that occurred. In 2002, I facilitated an agreement signed by the D.C. Human Services Department obligating them to contact local police and communities in the vicinity about Oak Hill escapees.

Although that facility has now been replaced, I am dismayed that the District has failed to comply with the spirit of that agreement and, as Mr. SARBANES points out, applicable D.C. law. I join with my colleague in urging the subcommittee to continue to work with the District of Columbia to ensure, first, that every effort to prevent future escape is undertaken and, second, that the local community, including law enforcement, be notified should an escape occur.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank Chairman Serrano for the opportunity to speak about this important issue; and as we move forward with this legislation, I hope we can work together with the District of Columbia to make sure that we can protect the surrounding community.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. I can certainly appreciate the gentleman from Maryland's frustrations, and he raises an important issue. I will work with the gentleman to ensure that the District of Columbia reviews security procedures at the New Beginning youth facility and works cooperatively with local leaders in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 3 minutes to a member of our subcommittee, Mr. CRENSHAW from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Let me just say, as we stand here debating this bill, there are a lot of people in our country that are hurting because of some particular acts that have taken place, and one of the things this subcommittee is tasked with doing is to make sure the regulatory agencies that could prevent situations like this actually have the proper amount of funding and the oversight to protect American lives in the future.

A lot of you all have heard me say from time to time that the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and usually when I say that I am talking about national security. I'm talking about funding for our men and women in uniform.

But today, I rise to talk about two agencies under this bill which are aimed to protect American lives by protecting their health and their financial security: the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

During the housing boom in Florida, a lot of American drywall producers couldn't keep up with the pace and the demand for drywall for the new homes. So they began to import drywall from overseas locations, including China. However, unbeknownst to the contrac-

tors and to the families who were buying their dream homes, this drywall was contaminated. Some say the Chinese used byproducts from coal plants. Some say it was from overseas shipments.

The end result has been catastrophic. Families have had to flee their homes that smell like rotten eggs, and worst of all, these homes have put their families' health at risk. These contaminants have caused nose bleeds, headaches, asthma attacks, among other things. American families soon realized that their American Dream had turned into an American nightmare.

So how could this have been prevented? Well, my colleagues and I on the subcommittee have asked that since the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission is charged with protecting the public from products like this, how did it go undetected? All I know is this legislation is aimed to end an episode like that and make sure it doesn't happen again. There's more money, more regulation, more oversight to end this.

The other tragedy that's taken place this year has devastated the financial security of a lot of our citizens. Last year, a guy named Bernie Madoff admitted that he had created an elaborate Ponzi scheme from the legitimate investments of hardworking Americans. Instead of investing the funds, he would simply deposit the money in his own bank account, and cover this up by masking foreign transfers and filing false SEC reports. Again, how did this happen? How did the SEC not catch this tremendous and egregious highway robbery? Well, the good news is this bill contains additional funds for the SEC to try to help them do a better job of making sure this doesn't happen again.

Now, I would have written this bill differently had I been in charge. I think there are a lot of flaws in the bill, but I think as members of this subcommittee we do have a responsibility to try to protect the health and the financial security of our American citizens.

Mr. SERRANO. I'd like to yield 2 minutes now to a gentlewoman who, notwithstanding some of the things you see happening on this House floor, is really the only Representative from Washington, D.C., Ms. NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman, the ranking member and the committee for bringing this bill forward, especially Chairman SERRANO for consistently showing respect for our citizenship as American citizens by not interfering with local governance and trying to keep others from doing so.

Mr. Chairman, it's very painful for a Member to have to come to the Congress to ask that you vote for her local budget. It's particularly painful when that Member doesn't even have a vote herself on her own local budget. Yet some Members are quick to step up with amendments of their own on a

budget they had nothing to do with raising, as if District of Columbia were just another Federal appropriation.

One Member, I regret to say, came forward with some misinformation which the Rules Committee and I had to correct this morning that somehow we wanted Federal funds to be used for abortion. Nonsense. We have never asked for Federal funds for abortion services in the District of Columbia, only for use of local funds. We have never asked for anything except equality with other jurisdictions and other American citizens.

All residents ask is that you respect the Home Rule Act. Congress had no intention that our local budget would be treated any differently. These are our funds, local funds, not Federal funds. It is very difficult for Congress, and Congress does not, in fact, change the local budget because Congress doesn't know anything about it. The presence of the D.C. budget here becomes a basis for a small minority to use us for their own purposes, to try to impose on us their own choices.

You can't endorse local control as a founding principle for everybody except the residents of your Nation's Capital. The Founders never made exceptions. I ask you to vote for this appropriation and in doing so, to remember, we demand not to be relegated to second-class citizenship because of our treatment in this process and on this floor.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for all you have done for this appropriation.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. The bill before us today will open up the funding spigot for abortions in the District of Columbia. The Dornan amendment has, for years, helped to reduce abortions in D.C. Recently, there has been a lot of talk about abortion reduction, and the one thing that everyone seems to agree on is that public funding for abortion increases the number of lives lost to abortion. Even the Guttmacher Institute has found that significantly more women choose abortion when the government subsidizes it. Unfortunately, the bill before us today will only serve to increase abortion.

The District of Columbia has a sordid history with abortion funding. In 1994, when the funding ban was lifted, D.C. took \$1 million away from the Medical Charities Fund which was created to help AIDS patients to instead pay for abortions. And the District had to request additional funds to make up for the funds used on abortion. Then, when the funding ban was reinstated, the city disregarded the law and continued to fund abortion for two additional years.

The bill will again open the door for D.C. to abuse taxpayer dollars to expand abortion, and it completely disregards the views of the majority of Americans who do not support public funding for abortion.

The bill thrusts upon hardworking taxpayers the values of the Washington elite. Nearly 180 Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, made a simple and reasonable request: maintain existing pro-life policies in appropriations bills; and if you don't, allow us the opportunity to vote up or down.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee unilaterally acted to deny Members and, consequently, the constituents they represent, the opportunity even to vote on whether this bill should be used to expand public funding for abortion. Such actions are an offense to the democratic process, to the American taxpayers, and to the sanctity of human life.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. SERRANO. I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) who by the way was the strongest leading voice in having us put language in this bill that says that any TARP money has to be explained to the Congress on its use and all kinds of reports come back to Congress.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank Chairman SERRANO for his kind comments and for his leadership for including two key provisions in this bill I strongly supported.

First, this bill holds the U.S. Treasury Department accountable for how it invests taxpayer funds under the TARP program. Language included in the bill at my request mirrors my bill, H.R. 2832, which directs the Treasury Secretary to report back to Congress by December of this year on their plans to repay taxpayers the money they have invested in the TARP program. The language also requires the Treasury to submit to Congress the estimates, the likely gains and losses, from those investments.

Our efforts to shore up the financial system must be accompanied by greater accountability and strict oversight to ensure taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely and effectively. The American taxpayers have a right to know how their tax dollars are being invested and when they will be repaid.

Second, the bill adds \$92 million to the budget of the SEC and for the first time specifies that \$4.4 million of SEC funding should be used by the Office of Inspector General, increasing their staff by 140 investigators, lawyers and analysts to investigate and prosecute corporate crime. The Americans want greedy Wall Street criminals who helped cause this recession investigated and punished for their crimes. By increasing enforcement at the SEC, we will send a strong message that if you rob innocent investors of their retirement and college savings you will spend the rest of your life sharing a prison cell with criminals like Bernie Madoff.

I thank Chairman SERRANO for including these two important provisions in this legislation and urge the bill's passage.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and also wish her, on behalf of the House, a happy birthday.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me thank the chairman for his well wishes. They come every 6 months now I think, but thank you so much.

Let me rise in strong support of H.R. 3170 and just say to the chairman, this is my first year on this subcommittee, but it's an honor to serve with you and such great leaders.

□ 1400

I want to thank Chairman SERRANO and Ranking Member EMERSON for their very hard work on this bill in a bipartisan fashion. You've worked together during very difficult times for our economy and, of course, for this appropriation.

This bill begins the work of rebuilding the regulatory and oversight framework of the Federal Government, restoring home rule to the District of Columbia, and safeguarding consumers by reinvigorating the Consumer Products Safety Commission.

By investing in the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Consumer Products Safety Commission, the IRS, and other vital agencies, we can bring back a fair and honest marketplace that is safe for consumers and investors alike.

We need strong regulators to enforce our Nation's financial regulations. This will ensure the stable operation of our capital markets, help stabilize the economy, and bring an end to this unregulated financial environment during the Bush administration, which has created havoc in the lives of millions.

The chairman has also taken great strides in restoring home rule to the residents of the District of Columbia. As Chairman SERRANO has said, we were elected to represent our home districts, not elected to represent the District of Columbia, nor are we members of the D.C. City Council.

The people of the District of Columbia should have the ability to make the same decisions as other communities and cities which make these decisions for themselves. They should not be subject to the ideological whims of Members who wish to advance personal agendas on the back of D.C. residents.

These are Americans. They deserve to be treated fairly—just like we'd want our constituents to be treated.

I also want to thank the chairman for clarifying the definition of cash in advance for agricultural and medical equipment payments from Cuba.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just say that United States companies should be able to benefit from profits

and create jobs, which is the bottom line, during this recession as a result of these business opportunities. So this provision is very important for our economic recovery.

So I look forward to working with the chairman and the subcommittee to ensure that the Treasury Department prioritizes real terrorist threats to our national security and does not waste vital agency resources—our tax dollars—on Americans who want to travel to the Caribbean.

Mrs. EMERSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 1 minute to my friend and leader, the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding and I congratulate him on his leadership of this committee and say how pleased I am that my good friend, JO ANN EMERSON, is the ranking Republican on this committee. I thank her for her leadership—one of the very constructive Members of this body.

This subcommittee is a special subcommittee to me because I had the great honor of serving on this subcommittee for 23 years. I chaired this subcommittee for 2 years and then served as the ranking member when we had the hostile takeover of the institution by the other side, and they became the chair and I became the ranking member. So I have served on this committee for some time.

I rise today because I normally would have weighed in with the chairman and with the ranking member on the issue of pay for civilian employees. As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity to discuss with the chairman the provisions for pay in this bill.

The administration and I had a discussion some months ago with reference to their recommendation on civilian and military pay. I indicated to him that we are in a very unique situation in America today. We've lost millions of jobs, millions of people are concerned about losing their jobs, and I therefore perceived it as a relatively unique situation where Federal employees understood that there would be constraints that were not necessarily present in other years.

Federal employees are already constrained by the ECI, the Economic Cost Index, wage index, in the country. If people across the country don't get raises, they don't get raises.

However, for the 28 years that I have served in this body, there have only been 4 years where there has not been pay parity between the military pay cost-of-living adjustment and the civilian cost-of-living adjustment.

In 1985, the military received half a point more than the civilians. In 1994 and 1995, the civilians received in 1994, 1.7 percent more than the military and, in 1995, fourth-tenths of a point more than the military. In 2002, the military received 2.2 more.

Both the military and the civilian employees obviously perform great

services for our country. I think there was a sense by the military and civilians that parity between the two made sense, and in fact the Congress, as you see in 24 of those 28 years, has followed that policy.

The chairman, in consultation with me, because I don't want the burden to be on him or the committee, and in discussion with those of us who represent a large number of Federal employees, concluded because of the uniqueness of our economic situation that agreeing to this lack of parity—not supporting it, but agreeing to it—that may be, for some, a distinction without a difference, but it is, I think, a distinction.

However, because of my concern and my discussions with Mr. Orszag in February or March, I went back to Mr. Orszag—and I want to read into and submit for the RECORD a letter dated July 9, 2009.

It says, "Thank you for your June 24, 2009, letter regarding pay parity for Federal civilian employees and non-military in noncombat zones."

Now, the reason he references non-combat zones is because I think there is an appropriateness in the hazardous duty pay, whether they be military or civilian. We put people in harm's way and we put them at risk, and giving them greater compensation makes a lot of sense. I suggested this to the Armed Services Committee. That's not what we did here, but I will go on.

"Given the exceptional circumstances surrounding the economic downturn, the administration did not include equal pay increases for civilian and military pay personnel in its fiscal year 2010 budget submissions. Nonetheless, the administration shares your commitment"—and, really, the commitment of all of us in this Congress who, for 24 out of 28 years, has fought for and affected pay parity as the policy of this Congress—"nonetheless, the administration shares your commitment to a strong civil service that can attract the talent we need to deliver the high level of performance the American people deserve from their government."

This is the important sentence. I made it known to Mr. SERRANO. I did not go over this with Mrs. EMERSON. But, it says this, "The administration is therefore committed in future years to the principle of pay parity between the annual pay increase for the Federal civilian workforce and members of the Armed Service serving in nonhazardous locations." Again, this is not about hazardous duty pay for people in harm's way. "Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Federal employees," et cetera.

I rise simply to note that on behalf of the Federal employees I represent, the Federal employee representatives with whom I have had extended discussions, the Senate has taken action in their subcommittee. They did not effect pay parity either, although they effected a greater increase than is included in this bill.

Between now and the conference committee, I intend to be working with Mr. SERRANO and Mrs. EMERSON on what policy we believe to be appropriate, given the economic circumstances that confront all Americans.

Federal employees have the benefit of having stable, secure jobs. They very much appreciate that. They understand that they don't want their fellow citizens to be in distress and without them being cognizant of that distress and appreciation for the economic situation it puts us in.

So I thank the chairman, I thank the ranking member for their concern and their focus, and I look forward to working with him on this issue as they proceed through the process and we go to conference.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: Thank you for your June 24, 2009, letter regarding pay parity for Federal civilian employees and military personnel serving in non-combat zones.

Given the exceptional circumstances surrounding the economic downturn, the Administration did not include equal pay increases for civilian and military personnel in its Fiscal Year 2010 budget submission. Nonetheless, the Administration shares your commitment to a strong civil service that can attract the talent we need to deliver the high level of performance the American people deserve from their government. The Administration is therefore committed in future years to the principle of pay parity between the annual pay increase for the Federal civilian workforce and members of the armed services serving in non-hazardous locations.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Federal employees. We look forward to continue working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I come to the floor and I rise in opposition to this bill. I do so for a number of reasons, but the reason I take this opportunity to express that is, the longstanding policy that blocked the compulsion that was delivered to American taxpayers to fund abortions through the District of Columbia has been dropped from this bill, and it was refused to be allowed as an amendment here to the floor. So the constituents of America will not know how their Member would vote and where their Member stands on compelling public funds to be used for abortions in the District of Columbia.

We've gone through this debate here before. This debate has gone on back and forth, but it was established back in the early nineties. The process of funding public abortions in D.C. were established in the early nineties, and

that was rolled back, and still the District of Columbia violated Federal law for 2 years and continued to fund abortions.

Now, here's the image that I have in my mind. Two of them. One of them is to compel anyone who has a moral objection to funding abortions is wrong. The second thing is the memory of the vote on the Mexico City Policy. When we lost that as a pro-life coalition here in Congress, I saw people over on that side of the aisle jumping up and down, hugging, clapping, and cheering. And why? Because we were going to compel taxpayers to fund abortions in foreign lands.

How could anyone be that delighted about such a policy? But I think it was because those who were cheering and clapping and hugging believe they had landed a blow against the convictions of the people who they could just consider be wearing a different jersey on the other side of the aisle.

It is bigger than this, it's deeper than this. This is life. This is unborn, innocent human life that doesn't have a voice here on this floor. If we could hear their scream for mercy, we would at least hear the Tiahrt amendment and have a real debate here on the floor, as we would have had in any of the two previous centuries this United States Congress has operated under open rules.

I oppose the bill and I advocate for open rules.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the chairman and my friend. Mr. Chairman, why Tuesday? Why do we have Federal elections on Tuesday? My guess is that most Members of this House of Representatives don't know the answer to that question, and the answer is: There is no good answer for our voting on Tuesday.

There is good reason to change voting from Tuesday to weekends. One out of four people say they don't vote in Federal elections because the weekday is too busy for them. They're balancing their jobs and their schedules and their kids.

I've introduced the Weekend Voting Act, which would move Federal elections from Tuesdays to weekends. And I want to thank the chairman of this subcommittee for including language that I had proposed in this bill directing the GAO to conduct a study on the cost-benefit analysis of weekend voting.

That study is going to answer the question: Why Tuesday? But, more importantly, it's going to answer the question: Why not weekends, and lead to the empowerment of the American people.

We ought to make it easier for people to vote, not harder.

Mrs. EMERSON. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for almost two decades, Congress has banned the use of taxpayer funds for abortion in the District of Columbia except in the exceedingly rare and tragic cases of rape, incest, or the life of the mother.

President Obama tells us he wants to reduce abortion. Well, one of the most effective and proven ways to reduce abortion is not to fund it. The evidence is compelling. And, frankly, it's logical.

The research arm of Planned Parenthood, an organization that itself every year performs over 305,000 abortions in its own clinics—a staggering loss of children's lives—their research arm, the Guttmacher Institute, has made it absolutely clear that when taxpayer funding is not available, between 20 and 35 percent of Medicaid abortions that would have been procured simply don't occur and that these children go on to be born.

Today, there are thousands of children in the District of Columbia and millions throughout the country who live, attend schools, have boyfriends and girlfriends, get married and have their own kids—dream and hope because taxpayer subsidies didn't effectuate their demise.

Pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the authority and, I would respectfully submit, the obligation and duty, especially from a human rights perspective, to set policy as it relates to how funds are used in either protecting or destroying children. We should not be subsidizing the killing of unborn children.

By definition, abortion is infant mortality. Ultrasound technology, the rise of prenatal medicine has shattered the myth that unborn children are somehow not human, nor alive.

Dr. Alveda King, Mr. Chairman, niece of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, had two abortions. She now leads an organization known as the Silent No More Campaign, made up exclusively of women who have had abortions.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

□ 1415

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. She has made it very clear that, after every abortion, one baby dies—two if they're twins—and the woman is wounded.

The intermediate and long-term psychological damage and physical damage to women is underreported and underappreciated, but as she and so many others have pointed out, it is real and frightening. Dr. King has said, How can the dream survive? She was talking about her late uncle, the late Dr. Martin Luther King. How can the dream survive—these are her words—if we murder children?

Abortion methods, Mr. Chairman, are gruesome. The cheap sophistry of choice, the euphemisms that are cynically employed to cloak it, can't mask a dismemberment abortion that hacks

a child to death and can't mask poison shots that chemically burn and kill an unborn child. Abortion is infant mortality. We should not be funding it. There will be children who will die if this legislation becomes law simply because the subsidies are there to effectuate their deaths.

I hope Members will vote "no" on the bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Could I inquire as to how much time is available?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 8½ minutes available, and the gentleman from Missouri has 5½ minutes available.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes for a colloquy to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Chair of this subcommittee for producing a good bill, and I seek to enter into a colloquy with him about the importance of making voting systems auditable and about conducting audits of electronic election results.

Voting is the foundation of our democracy. It is the right through which we preserve all other rights. Anything of value should be auditable, especially our votes. That's why it is so important that States using paperless systems have all of the funding they need to convert to paper ballot voting systems before the next general election and that all States have the funding they need to conduct audits of the electronic tallies.

I would yield at this moment back to the chairman.

Mr. SERRANO. I agree with the gentleman about the importance of protecting the integrity of the vote count. I was pleased to incorporate HAVA funding in the bill and language in the committee report stressing the importance of gathering information on voting system malfunctions, of making official paper ballots more accessible, and of verifying election results. I hope jurisdictions will use these funds to deploy the most accessible paper ballot voting systems and will audit their election results to ensure the integrity of our democracy.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman very much.

We have a recent compelling example of how important this is. We have the resolution of the Senate race in Minnesota. If the only information available were an electronic tally, one candidate would have been presumed the winner without recourse, but because a bipartisan canvassing board was able to inspect and recount actual voter-marked ballots, they were able to determine that the other candidate actually won. Software electronic counts alone cannot be relied upon to ensure that the intent of the voters will be honored.

In 2010, seven entire States and counties in a dozen others will not be able to verify independently the electronic tallies in their elections unless they use their HAVA funds to deploy accessible paper ballot voting systems. We

have not succeeded yet in establishing a national standard.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. However, I urge every jurisdiction in the country that has changed their voting system in the last several years to move to an accessible paper ballot system.

I thank the gentleman very much for his support.

Mr. SERRANO. The gentleman is most welcome, and I look forward to working with him to make sure all States have the funding they need to implement these critical election protection measures.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

Mrs. EMERSON. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentlelady for recognizing me again during the course of this debate.

Mr. Chairman, one of the sad consequences of bringing appropriations bills to the floor under a closed rule or under a structured rule is that you leave so many Members on both sides of the aisle between the devil and the deep blue sea. Sadly, we have that in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, you would have seen during the rule vote that it was a close vote, and thanks to some great work by orthopaedic surgeons in its last 30 seconds, the provision was able to survive.

I would suggest that it is not a mystery to those of us in this House that the people who voted “no” on the rule, many of them—both Republicans and Democrats, and I think the last time I saw the scoreboard it was 33 Democrats—weren’t voting “no” against their leadership and the rule that they’d brought forward. They were voting “no” because the rule did not permit a discussion on an amendment by Mr. TRAHRT or by anybody else relative to the use of taxpayer funds for abortions in the District of Columbia. That’s why they voted “no.”

Likewise, we have discussed—Mr. OBEY has discussed, Mr. DINGELL has discussed, and I have discussed—the fact that Mr. SERRANO and Mr. OBEY were very gracious to accept an amendment that I offered that deals with the 200,000 people in this country who are about to lose their jobs, who work at auto dealerships across the country.

You know, for 14 years—just as an aside, Mr. Chairman—I chafed at the fact that appropriators were legislating on authorization bills, but now that I’m one of them, I love it. I think it’s a wonderful process, and I hope it continues.

Having said that, as for the vote that Members are going to take in a couple of hours, nobody is going to know where they stand on the car dealers, and nobody is going to know where they stand on the issue of abortion. If

you vote “yes” on the bill, you can call up and say, Hey, I was with you auto dealers. Yet the people who don’t think that taxpayer funds should be used for abortion are going to be concerned about that vote. If you vote “no” on the bill, you are not going to have any difficulty with the people who don’t think taxpayers’ funds should be used for abortions, but your auto dealers would be right to be mad at you. These need to be open ruled.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LATOURETTE. The fact of the matter is we have to have some clarity. The people who send us here to Washington deserve to know where we stand on these issues. For every year that these appropriations bills had come to the floor when we were in the majority, we hadn’t liked some of the amendments. I can remember being where the Chair is today. I sat in that chair for 3 days on an Interior Appropriations bill, and I let every Democrat and every Republican who wanted to say something come down and strike the last word or offer an amendment. At the end of the day, the will of the House prevailed. This rule and the way this debate is being conducted, the rule of the House is not being adhered to.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a member of the subcommittee and one of our great leaders.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this is a strong bill, a bill that aims to bring much needed stability and confidence to our financial system and assistance to our small businesses.

The bill provides critical funding to the Securities and Exchange Commission to help it strengthen the regulation of our financial markets and to the Federal Trade Commission to enhance its ability to protect consumers. It ensures further oversight of TARP. It requires Treasury reports that will notify Congress of steps taken to implement oversight recommendations. To help small businesses weather the current economic storm, the bill supports \$848 million for the SBA, including \$25 million in new microlending and \$10 million in microloan technical assistance.

In 2008 alone, SBA’s intermediary microlenders made more than 5,000 loans, totaling more than \$60 million, to entrepreneurs who were unable to secure the credit that they needed from conventional lenders. This bill also includes significant funding for IRS tax enforcement to support the administration’s efforts to combat tax haven abuse.

I have worked to ensure that the bill includes a provision which prevents Federal contracts from going to domestic corporations that incorporate in tax havens to avoid meeting their tax obligations.

The bill also eliminates Bush-era restrictions that hamper the ability of U.S. companies to export agriculture goods to Cuba. In this economic climate, we should be opening and not irrationally closing markets for American products.

In recent years, many of our regulatory agencies have neglected their responsibilities to protect consumers, taxpayers and investors. This bill takes strong steps to reverse that disregard while making critical investments in programs that help small businesses, the lifeblood of our economy, succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important piece of legislation.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer an amendment to provide funding for the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation in the amount of \$660,000. I decided not to offer that amendment today, but I wish to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the importance of this foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is in the best interest of our Nation to ensure that the leaders of tomorrow have access to the best educational opportunities available. For that reason, I have long been associated with the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, which awards scholarships for college students to attend graduate school in preparation for careers in government or elsewhere in public service.

The Truman Scholarship Foundation was established by Congress in 1975 as the Federal memorial to our 33rd President, Harry S. Truman. The foundation has been operating from the original appropriation and the interest from that amount since 1977; but as the cost of college has increased over the years, the foundation’s assets have not grown accordingly to meet the needs of the students it serves.

So, Mr. Chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SERRANO, I ask your assurance that you will seek to include funding for the Truman Foundation in conference with the other body.

Mr. SERRANO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to my attention, and I will assure him that I will do my best to work with my Senate colleagues in conference.

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly thank the gentleman, and I thank you for this opportunity to raise the issue on the floor.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman again for his graciousness and for his openness in working with me and with

the rest of the subcommittee on the minority side, and I look forward to continuing that relationship.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman, and I want to thank all of the speakers who have participated today, but I think there is a clarification that needs to be made.

Many speakers have come to the House floor and have spoken about the abortion issue and have said that the American taxpayer is being asked in this bill to foot the bill for abortions. That is not correct, and that has to be made clear.

First of all, to me, the issue is whether or not the District of Columbia should be given the opportunity to govern its own affairs or whether Congress will continue to impose on D.C. its will. So, for many years, the folks in the District of Columbia have had to accept Congress' wishes for many text items and issues throughout the country. I believe that, in some cases—and with all due respect to my colleagues—they have imposed these provisions on the District of Columbia in many areas of gay marriage, of needle exchange programs, of abortion, and of gun issues so that they could go back home and say they had done something on that issue. Yes, they did, to the people of the District of Columbia—not to the people in their districts but to the people of the District of Columbia.

What this bill simply says is that local funds raised locally by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia can be used to provide abortion services. The ban on the use of Federal funds for abortion remains in place.

□ 1430

Let me repeat that. Federal funds going to the District of Columbia cannot be used to supply abortion services. What we've done is to say, local funds that you raise on your own from your own American citizen taxpayers can be used for those purposes. That should be clarified, and people should know the truth.

This bill is a good bill; and I hope that at the end of the day, people will vote for it. It covers many areas. I thank all my colleagues.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chair, since I was elected to serve in Congress, I have supported the pro-life position. I am strongly committed to protecting the rights of the unborn. Accordingly, I think it is wrong for Americans' tax dollars to be used to pay for abortion.

Mr. Chair, I voted against the rule for consideration of this bill because it did not afford Members an opportunity to express their clear position on the issue of taxpayer-funded abortion. Fortunately, we will have a chance to vote again on a conference report between the House and the Senate, which I hope will strip these abortion provisions from the bill before any bill is signed into law.

Mr. Chair, let the record reflect that I oppose lifting the restrictions on government-funded abortions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the District of Columbia Opportunity Scholarship Program.

We, as Members of Congress, have one notion that binds us all together—every one of us understands that the key to the future of our great nation is the quality of the education we provide our children.

We all know the story of many failing District of Columbia public schools: Low graduation rates. High drop out rates. Low math and reading scores, reflected in a city-wide adult literacy rate of 37%! And, we can all agree that the children in the District deserve a first class education!

A few years back, I had the honor to Chair the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee. In that capacity, I worked to create a program to give a 'hand-up' to children in DC—the District of Columbia Opportunity Scholarship Program.

We built a 'three-sector' approach, endorsed by former Mayor Anthony Williams and then councilman and current Mayor Adrian Fenty, and others: public schools, charter schools, and the latter, and the Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides families with funds to send their children to private or parochial schools.

Since 2005, some 3,000 students have been provided with Opportunity Scholarships (over 7,000 applied). Today, there is a long waiting list, but over 1,700 D.C. scholarship students are attending 49 non-public schools. The average annual income for these families is around \$23,000.

In April, the U.S. Department of Education released its own report—finding that students in the scholarship program are performing at higher academic levels than their peers who are not in the program, and are better off by virtually every important measure in their chosen schools.

So this is a good news story, right?

Well, not any more.

During the markup of this bill in Committee, I offered an amendment to make all DC children eligible for the Opportunity Scholarship Program.

And an amendment to allow the younger brothers and sisters of Opportunity Scholars to be allowed to participate alongside their older siblings. Both were defeated.

And likewise, I tried on behalf of Minority Leader Boehner and others before the Rules Committee, unsuccessfully, to make all children eligible.

But the Rules Committee said "no" to the Boehner amendment and in doing so, slammed the 'door of opportunity,' inexcusably, on thousands of low-income Washington families.

Anticipating that there may well be a wellspring of indignation that Congress is again interfering with DC governance, may I ask where the District would be today if the Federal Government had not assumed most of the costs of the city's judicial system, and numerous city employee pension obligations—which we still pay.

And, I never heard protests about intervention when I inserted funding in the D.C. Appropriations bill to rebuild many dilapidated and dangerous DC school playgrounds or money to protect the Anacostia riverfront.

So why not continue to support a program that really is important: one that helps children!! by providing \$14 million to give these children a better school and their parents a chance to fulfill their dreams?

And may I add, the dollars that now rescue some children in failing District public schools do not come at the expense of the public system—the program offers parents a choice without hurting public schools.

We need to heed the call of many city parents who want school choices for their children—a future as bright as ones in many of our states.

While the theoretical debate on such scholarships may have some value in the political sphere, District children should not be the pawns in some ideological battle. Rather, we need to protect their future and keep the scholarship program alive and expand it.

Finally, Mr. Chair, as the Washington Post recently wrote, and I quote: "Political ideology and partisan gamesmanship should not be allowed to blow apart the educational hopes of hundreds of DC children." I could not agree more!

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chair, it is morally wrong to take the taxpayer dollars of hundreds of thousands of Washington, D.C. residents who cherish the right to life and use them to fund abortions. I am deeply disturbed that this Congress is set to vote on a Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act that lacks traditional protections against using tax dollars to fund the destruction of human life.

Every year since 1996, this annual funding bill has included language that prevented the use of federal and local funds to pay for abortions in the District of Columbia. Not only was the language prohibiting the use of local funds stripped from the Financial Services Appropriations bill, but a bipartisan amendment to restore this ban on taxpayer-funded abortion offered by Congressman TODD TIAHRT (R-KS) and Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS (D-TN) was blocked by the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee from even receiving an up-or-down vote on the House floor, violating a much older tradition of this storied institution.

Earlier this year I joined nearly 180 of my colleagues in writing a letter to Speaker PELOSI to urge the retention of important pro-life provisions that have historically been included in government spending bills. Despite our bipartisan plea, the Democrat leadership has chosen to remove these provisions and deny the people's representatives a vote in this House, shutting out the voices of the millions of pro-life American taxpayers they represent.

The District of Columbia now has the unlimited ability to use local taxpayer funds to provide abortions. This is a dark moment for the cause of life in America and I hope that this Congress will rededicate itself not only to protecting the taxpayer, but the unborn.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Financial and Governmental Services Appropriation Act of 2010.

The bill appropriates a total of \$46.2 billion to fund the important operations and functions of the U.S. government. This support will help fund federal government salaries, including a 2% pay raise for all federal civilian employees, the U.S. postal service, and it will help to rebuild the regulatory, enforcement and oversight structure of the federal government.

This bill supports our efforts to protect consumers and investors by strengthening the oversight of Wall Street and large financial institutions. Enhancing the regulatory authorities and oversight functions of government agencies will be a major focus of these efforts. This legislation contributes to this process by increasing the flow of government resources to the agencies that will be on the frontlines. The bill appropriates \$1 billion for the Securities and Exchange Commission, \$149 million to fund the operations of the Treasury Department Inspectors General; \$292 million for Federal Trade Commission; \$113 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and \$38 million for the FDIC Inspector General.

The bill also acknowledges the key role the nation's small businesses will play in the recovery by providing resources for the government programs that are helping small businesses weather current economic conditions. Small businesses drive economic growth and job creation in the U.S. Protecting the health of existing small businesses and fostering the growth of new ones is a congressional priority. In addition to providing \$847 million for the Small Business Administration, the bill further illustrates Congress' commitment to supporting healthy small businesses by reinstating agreements with auto dealerships that were dropped as part of the recent General Motors or Chrysler bankruptcy proceedings.

This bill funds the important functions and operations of the federal government, while also supporting the financial reform, enforcement and oversight priorities of Congress. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3170, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations for FY 2010. The gentleman from New York, Mr. SERRANO, has done a wonderful job of shepherding this complicated and bipartisan bill to the floor today.

I rise today to speak on one specific provision in this bill. The bill requires automakers that have taken government funding, such as General Motors (GM) and Chrysler, to reinstate agreements with dealerships they have dropped as part of their recent bankruptcy proceedings.

Automobile dealers are the backbone of all of our communities. They are an economic engine employing dozens and sometimes hundreds of hardworking, taxpaying members of the community.

Auto dealers are on the frontlines of the U.S. automotive industry. They take the chances with the new cars being developed in laboratories in Detroit and around the world. They are the face of our cities, the sponsor of many little league teams and the lead in many charitable events.

When the Auto Task Force and the bankruptcy judges took the ability of our auto dealers to earn a living, they took away a portion of our communities.

The bill gives these men and women the opportunity to reclaim their lives and their businesses, and plug a hole that has been torn in each and every one of our districts.

Support this bill, support our communities and support our automobile dealers.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Chair, there is an amendment to this bill that should have been made in order, but was not.

The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill before us today in-

cludes a modest investment of \$12 million to provide an educational lifeline to a few lucky disadvantaged students living in our nation's capital.

We are all too painfully aware of the challenges facing the public school system in the District of Columbia, where less than half of elementary students are proficient in reading and math. Mayor Adrian Fenty and Chancellor Michelle Rhee are working hard to turn this around, and I applaud their efforts.

But change can't happen fast enough for the District's children. That's why Congress created a three-sector plan to improve education for all students. Students could choose to attend their traditional neighborhood public school, a charter school, or a private school—if they were lucky enough to win a scholarship lottery.

Sadly, this Democratic majority and the Obama Administration have backed away from this bipartisan, fair approach that lets District parents decide what school is best for their child. This majority has cut off the scholarship option for any student who is not already in the program.

Earlier this spring, the Department of Education actually rescinded more than 200 scholarships from new students who had been told they would be able to attend the private school their parents had chosen for them this fall.

Instead, these students will now be forced to attend a D.C. public school—one they did not choose, and one that may be failing academically or expose their child to physical danger. Adding insult to injury, some of these children are being separated from older siblings who were lucky enough to receive a scholarship in the past.

This matter is best illustrated by The Washington Post, which featured the plight of one mother, Latasha Bennett, in a July 10 editorial.

The Post reports that Ms. Bennett is "in an understandable panic over where her daughter will go to kindergarten next month. She had planned on the private school where her son (already a scholarship recipient) excels, but, without the voucher she was promised, she can't afford the tuition."

What the amendment that was rejected by this Democratic majority would have done is help Ms. Bennett and the thousands of District parents who are trying to give their children the opportunities they never had. It's that simple.

The parents who are fortunate enough to participate in the program are grateful for the opportunity these scholarships provide their children, and students are taking advantage of the benefits. After three years of study we know parents remain highly satisfied with their children's schools, and participating students are ahead of their counterparts in D.C. public schools in reading.

In fact, the lead independent researcher, Dr. Patrick J. Wolf, has called this program a success. In written testimony to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Reform, he stated the "D.C. OSP has met a tough standard of efficacy in serving low income inner city students." Further, in responding to a question from the Chair of the Committee, Mr. Wolf agreed the D.C. OSP is one of the most effective national programs he has studied.

This type of success should translate into an expansion of the program. Instead, this Ad-

ministration's Statement of Administration Policy on this bill actually praises the Democratic majority for taking away families' choices, stating, "The Administration also appreciates the Committee's support for continuing the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship program for only those students currently enrolled in the program."

The reaction from D.C. residents is telling: More than 7,000 D.C. residents have signed a petition imploring Congress to keep the program alive.

Further, seven members of the D.C. Council also have petitioned Education Secretary Arne Duncan to reverse his decision. In their letter, the members say "we believe we simply cannot turn our backs on these families because doing so will deny their children the quality education they deserve."

The D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program has helped thousands of low-income students in Washington go to the school of their choice—including the exclusive Sidwell Friends School attended by the President's own children.

The President obviously chose the school he thought was best for his daughters. Why shouldn't every parent have that opportunity? I am ashamed this majority will not even allow Congress to debate whether or not to continue the program and the benefits it provides to families in the District of Columbia. What a travesty.

This Administration has spoken about "green shoots" when it discusses hopeful signs in our weakened economy.

The D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program is a "green shoot" in the weakened school system of this nation's capital city—and we are letting it die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, first, because it provides much-needed funding, and second because it will correct a grave injustice affecting people in all of our districts.

Auto manufacturers operating on taxpayer money are shutting down dealerships without any justification and without adequate compensation to the dealers.

These closures are difficult for all communities but their effects are especially pronounced in minority communities.

The closure of minority-owned dealerships cost 150,000 jobs in 2008 and will cost another quarter of a million jobs in 2009.

Members of this body have worked for decades to support small business and minority-owned business. We should do everything we can to help them now.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OBEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 651

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—
Ms. Chu.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 644 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3170.

□ 1431

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and the bill shall be considered read through page 145, line 11.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex; hire of passenger motor vehicles;

maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business, \$303,388,000, of which not to exceed \$21,983,000 is for executive direction program activities; not to exceed \$46,249,000 is for economic policies and programs activities; not to exceed \$48,080,000 is for financial policies and programs activities; not to exceed \$64,611,000 is for terrorism and financial intelligence activities; not to exceed \$22,679,000 is for Treasury-wide management policies and programs activities; and not to exceed \$99,786,000 is for administration programs activities: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any program activity of the Departmental Offices to any other program activity of the Departmental Offices upon notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any program activity shall be increased or decreased by more than 4 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That any change in funding greater than 4 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, is for information technology modernization requirements; not to exceed \$200,000 is for official reception and representation expenses; and not to exceed \$258,000 is for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$6,787,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, is for the Treasury-wide Financial Statement Audit and Internal Control Program, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred to accounts of the Department's offices and bureaus to conduct audits: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, is for secure space requirements: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$3,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012, is to develop and implement programs within the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Compliance Policy, including entering into cooperative agreements: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012, is for modernizing the Office of Debt Management's information technology.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services for the Department of the Treasury, \$9,544,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That \$4,544,000 is for repairs to the Treasury Annex Building: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to support or supplement "Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support" or "Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization".

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for official travel expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$100,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury, \$29,700,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, including purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only for police-type use) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; \$149,000,000, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available for official travel expenses; of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration; and of which not to exceed \$1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and training expenses, including for course development, of non-Federal and foreign government personnel to attend meetings and training concerned with domestic and foreign financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; not to exceed \$14,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$102,760,000, of which not to exceed \$26,085,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012; and of which \$9,316,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this account may be used to procure personal services contracts.

TREASURY FORFEITURE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$50,000,000 is permanently rescinded and returned to the general fund.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Management Service, \$244,132,000, of which not to exceed \$9,220,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2012, for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX AND TRADE BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of carrying out section 1111 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$99,500,000; of which not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$50,000 for cooperative research and development programs for laboratory services; and provision of laboratory