I support H.R. 1059 and again thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for having sponsored it. I also thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for having served as cosponsors.

H.R. 1059 promotes an important goal—providing security for Federal judges. Under the Ethics in Government Act, judges and other high-level judicial branch officials must file annual financial disclosure reports. This requirement increases public confidence in government officials and better enables the public to judge the performance of those officials.

However, recognizing the nature of the judicial function and the increased security risks it entails, Congress also enacted legislation that allowed the Judicial Conference to redact statutorily required information in a financial disclosure report where release of such information could possibly endanger the filer or his or her family.

Those seeking to harm or intimidate Federal judges might use a disclosure form to identify where someone's spouse or child works or goes to school on a regular basis. However, individuals targeting judges for harassment have also been known to file false liens on properties owned by judges and their families. Harassers could use judicial financial disclosure reports to more easily identify such property.

The Judicial Conference delegated to its Committee on Financial Disclosure the responsibility for implementing the financial disclosure requirements for judges and judicial employees under the Ethics in Government Act. The committee monitors the release of financial disclosure reports to ensure compliance with the statute. In consultation with the U.S. Marshals Service, the committee also reviews and approves or disapproves any request for the redaction of statutorily mandated information where the filer believes the release of the information could endanger the filer or his or her family.

Under the Judicial Conference's regulations, no redaction will be granted without a clear nexus between a security risk and the information for which a redaction is sought. The law has worked well through the years and has been reauthorized twice since 2001. But it expires at the end of this calendar year if we fail to act—an outcome that is unacceptable. Last year, the Marshals Service investigated and analyzed almost 1,400 threats and inappropriate communications to judicial officials—nearly three times as many threats recorded in 2003. There were more than 3,900 ''incidents'' and arrests at U.S. court facilities in 2010.

Financial disclosures are an important part of maintaining an open and transparent government, Mr. Speaker. But government transparency should not come at the cost of personal security for government officials. Judges and other judicial employees perform important work that is integral to our democratic system of government. In order to preserve the integrity of our democracy, we must protect the integrity of our courts. And that means ensuring the security of judges and other judicial employees from intimidation and threats.

In conclusion, there's no evidence that the law is being abused. I support H.R. 1059 and urge my colleagues to extend the redaction authority permanently.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of Judiciary, LAMAR SMITH, as well as the subcommittee chair, Mr. COBLE, for swiftly moving this through the Judiciary Committee. I think it has been explained that the redaction of sensitive information for the benefit of members of the judiciary is obvious and important. I am hoping that with my consultation with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee we would be able to make the permanent feature that HOWARD COBLE has discussed a permanent one and a part of the law as it now exists.

H.R. 1059 gives the Judicial Conference of the United States permanent authority to redact certain sensitive information from public financial disclosures required by the Ethics in Government Act.

This important legislation, which was ordered reported from the Judiciary Committee by voice vote, deserves the support of the entire House for a number of reasons.

First, H.R. 1059 properly balances the purposes of the Ethics in Government Act with the need to ensure the security of judges, judicial employees, and their families.

The Ethics in Government Act serves to promote ethics and openness in the federal government by reducing the risk of corruption or preventing the appearance of impropriety.

The Act accomplishes this objective by requiring the public disclosure of certain information, including identification of personal financial information, non-governmental sources of income, gifts, property interests, and liabilities.

Unfortunately, the required disclosures can also include critical information about the filer's residence, a spouse's workplace, a child's workplace, or a vacation home. This information has the potential to place individual judges, employees, and their families at risk. The bill's redaction authority is critical to ensuring that this information does not get into the wrong hands.

Second, the risk to the personal safety of federal judges and court employees from disclosure of personal location information is real.

But, without further action, this important protection for judicial security will expire at the end of this year.

And, finally, making this redaction authority permanent will not lead to abuse of such authority.

The federal judiciary has utilized such authority very sparingly.

For instance, there were 17,658 financial disclosure filings between 2007 and 2010. Of those, there were 750 instances where filers requested redaction. Of that number, 645 redaction requests were granted in full, while 70 requests were granted in part, and 35 requests were denied.

Thus, in only 4.2 percent of filings was redaction even requested, and not all of those were granted.

It's clear, based on these statistics, that the federal judiciary exercises considerable restraint in applying its redaction authority in recognition of the need for public disclosure.

The Government Accountability Office similarly reported in 2004 that the judiciary's exercise of its redaction authority provided a measure of security to at-risk individuals, while not substantially interfering with dissemination of information to the public.

Congress first recognized the value of granting redaction authority to the judiciary back in 1998. It has repeatedly reauthorized redaction authority on a temporary basis since then, except for a two-year lapse in 2006 and 2007.

In order to avoid future lapses, this redaction authority should be made permanent.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Subcommittee Chair HOWARD COBLE for moving this important legislation through the committee and swiftly to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1059.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–53)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Education and

the Workforce; Energy and Commerce; Financial Services; House Administration; the Judiciary; Oversight and Government Reform; Rules; Science, Space, and Technology; Small Business; Transportation and Infrastructure; and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

This message and accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

To the Congress of the United States:

Today, I am pleased to submit to the Congress the enclosed legislative proposal, the ''American Jobs Act of 2011,'' together with a section-by-section analysis of the legislation.

The American people understand that the economic crisis and the deep recession were not created overnight and will not be solved overnight. The economic security of the middle class has been under attack for decades. That is why I believe we need to do more than just recover from this economic crisis—we need to rebuild the economy the American way, based on balance, fairness, and the same set of rules for everyone from Wall Street to Main Street. We can work together to create the jobs of the future by helping small business entrepreneurs, by investing in education, and by making things the world buys.

To create jobs, I am submitting the American Jobs Act of 2011—nearly all of which is made up of the kinds of proposals supported by both Republicans and Democrats, and that the Congress should pass right away to get the economy moving now. The purpose of the American Jobs Act of 2011 is simple: put more people back to work and put more money in the pockets of working Americans. And it will do so without adding a dime to the deficit.

First, the American Jobs Act of 2011 provides a tax cut for small businesses, to help them hire and expand now, and an additional tax cut to any business that hires or increases wages. In addition, the American Jobs Act of 2011 puts more money in the pockets of working and middle class Americans by cutting in half the payroll tax that comes out of the paycheck of every worker, saving typical families an average of $1,500 a year.

Second, the American Jobs Act of 2011 puts more people back to work, including teachers laid off by State budget cuts, first responders and veterans coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan, and construction workers repairing crumbling bridges, roads and more than 35,000 schools, with projects chosen by need and impact, not earmarks and politics. It will repair and refurbish hundreds of thousands of foreclosed homes and businesses in communities across the country.

Third, the American Jobs Act of 2011 helps out-of-work Americans by extending unemployment benefits to help them support their families while looking for work, and by reforming the system with training programs that build real skills, connect to real jobs, and help the long-term unemployed. It bans employers from discriminating against the unemployed when hiring, and provides a new tax credit to employers hiring workers who have been out of a job for over 6 months. And, it expands job opportunities for hundreds of thousands of low-income youth and adults through a new Pathways Back to Work Fund that supports summer and year round jobs for youth; innovative new job training programs to connect low-income workers to jobs quickly; and successful programs to encourage employers to bring on disadvantaged workers.

Lastly, this legislation is fully paid for. The legislation includes specific offsets to close corporate tax loopholes and asks the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share that more than cover the cost of the jobs measures. The legislation also increases the deficit reduction target for the Joint Committee by the amount of the cost of the jobs package and specifies that, if the Committee reaches that higher target, then their measures would replace and turn off the specific offsets in this legislation.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this proposal.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 12, 2011*.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2076, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2633, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1059, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

INVESTIGATIVE ASSISTANCE FOR VIOLENT CRIMES ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2076) to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the statutory authority for the longstanding practice of the Department of Justice of providing investigatory assistance on request of State and local authorities with respect to certain serious violent crimes, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 9, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

YEAS—358

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson