

Taylor	Velázquez	Weiner
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Welch (VT)
Thompson (MS)	Walz (MN)	Wexler
Tierney	Wasserman	Wilson (OH)
Towns	Schultz	Woolsey
Udall (CO)	Waters	Wu
Udall (NM)	Watson	Wynn
Van Hollen	Watt	Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Akin	Gilchrest	Pearce
Alexander	Gillmor	Pence
Bachmann	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Gohmert	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Pitts
Biggert	Granger	Platts
Billbray	Graves	Poe
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hayes	Putnam
Blunt	Heller	Ramstad
Boehner	Hensarling	Regula
Bono	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hobson	Reichert
Boustany	Hoekstra	Renzi
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Reynolds
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Royce
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Sali
Capito	King (NY)	Saxton
Castle	Kingston	Schmidt
Chabot	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Conaway	Kuhl (NY)	Shays
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Shimkus
Culberson	Latham	Shuster
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Simpson
Davis, David	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Deal (GA)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Dent	LoBiondo	Souder
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Drake	E.	Thornberry
Dreier	Mack	Tiahrt
Duncan	Manzullo	Tiberi
Ehlers	Marchant	Turner
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
English (PA)	McCauley (TX)	Walberg
Fallin	McCotter	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McCreery	Walsh (NY)
Ferguson	McHenry	Wamp
Flake	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	McKeon	Weller
Fortenberry	Mica	Westmoreland
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Foxx	Miller (MI)	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)
Gallegly	Musgrave	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Baker	Doolittle	Moran (KS)
Barton (TX)	Everett	Napolitano
Bonner	Hastert	Nunes
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Paul
Brown-Waite,	Johnson (GA)	Radanovich
Ginny	LaHood	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter	McGovern	Sullivan
Cramer	McMorris	Tancredo
Cubin	Rodgers	Waxman
Davis, Jo Ann	Miller, George	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1045

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

The resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2771, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 502 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. 2771.

□ 1046

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. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Ms. BALDWIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I am pleased to present the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch appropriations legislation for the fiscal year 2008.

The Legislative Branch bill is unique in that it appropriates funding for the entire Capitol Building and Grounds as well as nine legislative branch agencies and the 435 Members of this body and their offices. As a new member of the Appropriations Committee serving as a subcommittee Chair, I recognize the tremendous responsibility that comes along with being steward of this great institution, and I am honored by the confidence and trust that Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and my colleagues have placed in me.

Historically, the Legislative Branch bill has enjoyed the bipartisan spirit that has come to define the Appropriations Committee and my experiences in working with the ranking member have been consistent with that spirit. Over the past several months, I have worked with Ranking Member WAMP, the gentleman from Tennessee, and other members of the committee from both parties to shape and determine the appropriations for the people’s

House. We held 14 oversight hearings prior to developing this bill, and I am very proud of our accomplishments.

I want to thank the members of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for their help and input, Vice Chair LEE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. GOODE. The vast majority of our committee is new to the full committee, and we approached our task with zeal and with dedication.

I would particularly like to thank Ranking Member WAMP for his work on this bill. He has been a good partner, and I appreciate his cooperation and friendship. While we have not agreed on every issue, we worked in partnership to address our differences; and notwithstanding a few issues, they were resolved. I would also like to thank Chairman OBEY for his guidance during this process and Ranking Member LEWIS for his efforts as well.

Madam Chair, the bill provides \$3.1 billion for the legislative branch, not including Senate items. That’s an increase of \$122 million, or just 4 percent, over the actual spending level in fiscal year 2007. This reflects a \$276 million reduction in the total amended budget request, and I think that’s an important point that Members should note. We are bringing this bill in under the original request.

We used three guiding principles to develop this bill: fiscal responsibility, security and life safety, and accountability.

In terms of fiscal responsibility, we’ve emphasized that we need to keep this bill tight with a view towards the long term. We’ve funded the must-haves over the nice-to-haves and have focused on critical investments. We’ve held the actual spending increase in this bill to only 4 percent, \$122 million, compared to the 13 percent, or \$398 million, which was the increase that was requested.

In terms of security and life safety, we’ve made sure this bill makes the Capitol complex as secure and safe as possible. To this end, the bill includes \$50 million worth of critical security and life safety projects, including, at the suggestion and urging of my good friend from Tennessee, interoperable radios for the Capitol Police. It also provides substantial increases to agencies with a direct role in the health/safety of the complex. The Capitol Police receive an 8 percent increase, while the Office of Compliance, which ensures that we protect our visitors and our employees in a safe environment, receives a 23 percent increase.

Finally, in terms of accountability, we’ve crafted this bill to provide Congress with the resources it needs to perform its constitutional oversight role and hold agencies accountable. We’ve fully funded House committees and included resources to bulk up GAO to better support our congressional oversight efforts. We’ve also beefed up

the Capitol Police IG office and established a statutory IG office at the Architect of the Capitol to improve oversight within those two organizations.

In closing, we've kept this bill tight so that we're fiscally responsible. We've done so by prioritizing investments for critical life safety and security needs while providing Congress with the tools it needs to hold the government accountable to the American taxpayer.

Madam Chair, we have a wonderful staff. I'd like to thank my committee

staff, my personal staff, and Mr. WAMP's staff: Ms. Tracie Pough and Ian Rayder on my personal staff; Mr. Tom Forhan, our clerk; Rob Nabors, the full Appropriations Committee clerk; Chuck Turner; David Marroni; and Mr. WAMP's staff, Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson, for their assistance. They have assisted both myself and Mr. WAMP as a new Chair and ranking member with our learning curve and worked countless hours to help produce this product.

Finally, I want to thank, Madam Chair, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their guidance, patience, understanding and encouragement as we endeavored to craft a bill that was fiscally responsible with an eye toward ensuring that our employees and visitors have a safe and secure environment in which to function, as well as make sure that Congress has adequate resources to engage in our oversight responsibilities.

Madam Chair, it is an honor to serve in this role.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, I want to start by saying that it's an awesome feeling being in my 11th year as a member of the House Appropriations Committee to be standing here as the ranking member offering our first bill and to congratulate our chairwoman from Florida on her first product. It is a joyous occasion for each of us, and I am grateful for this opportunity.

Let me also say that while I do not support and we do not support the overall spending that the Appropriations Committee is recommending for the year, we certainly do support this bill. This bill is a fiscally responsible product. We did work in a bipartisan way. We kind of went through waves where we could do better at times, but towards the end we really came together, and especially on the critical issues, in a bipartisan way. I commend the gentlelady from Florida on that cooperative spirit. I think we both learned a lot along the way about how to work with each other and how to reach out to our members and we do have a good subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

I too want to thank this outstanding staff: Jeff Shockey and Liz Dawson on the minority side; Tom Forhan, Chuck Turner and David Marroni on the majority; particularly Melissa Chapman and Amanda Schoch on my personal staff for all the work that they've done. We're new, we're learning, but we are working together and we're grateful for that.

I want to point out a few things in this bill that I think are very noteworthy. As the chairwoman said, the Inspector General of the Architect of the Capitol is a very important move. Former chairman and now ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, began this initiative in the '07 bill. For the chairwoman to go forward with it I think is incredibly important. We've learned a lot. Unfortunately, a lot of lessons learned from the CVC, but clearly they need the oversight of the Inspector General.

I also want to commend her on responding to the needs of the Capitol Police. If we are not state-of-the-art in communication on Capitol Hill, then in the whole country we've got a problem with security. They need the money for interoperable communications. It is now in this bill and we're grateful for that.

One caution, and we talked about it some during the rules debate, is this FDA building, the swing space, the whole issue of are we in the wake or behind the CVC going to go into another major capital improvement project and is that necessary or even wise at this time to go forward with that. We're going to talk more about that, but my view is we need sweeping procurement reforms in the way the AOC operates. I know that this is not necessarily an AOC directly driven project, but the whole supervision of how we procure capital improvements, renovations and do it is not efficient.

Frankly, we saw the Botanical Gardens a few years ago, we didn't learn enough lessons from that. We went into the CVC. It's gotten out of hand. We need reforms before we go forward. I look forward to discussing that more as the morning goes.

The Green the Capitol Initiative falls under the category of the prerogative of the majority but the responsibility of the minority to question, is this real substantive. I think there's widespread bipartisan support for environmental improvements on Capitol Hill and across the country. I'm the cochairman of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus. The gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, will speak in a few minutes with concerns about the Green the Capitol Initiative. He's one of the leaders, as am I, on renewable energy and energy-efficiency technologies, but does this end up being somewhat window dressing, not as much substance as we would like. It's not a large budget issue, but we have the obligation to ask these questions.

One of the questions would be, we have an E-85 pump coming but we don't yet have these fleet vehicles or leased vehicles running off of E-85. So we've got to connect the dots and make this work, but we're respectfully asking these questions with the same desire as the majority, to green the Capitol and frankly be as environmentally responsible across the board as we can.

Let me also say another disappointing aspect is that we're still in my view not doing enough for the blind and physically handicapped. The digital talking books program does still receive a reduction even though we made some improvements at the full committee. I want to advocate for doing all we can along the way.

And then let me just say a word about something that's in this bill that thankfully the Rules Committee allowed to stay in this bill and it's the naming of the hall which some say that this subcommittee or even the full committee should not take action on, but I disagree. Because time is of the essence. This new Capitol Visitors Center is the 600-pound gorilla that we've been trying to get our arms around and frankly we've both taken a lot of ownership in this. We inherited this problem, as did the Acting Architect, Mr. Ayers, inherit the cost overruns in this very large project, which is unprecedented. We haven't done it in the history of the Capitol, something this large, 580,000 square feet, \$592 million, over twice the original cost; but frankly the planning overlapped September 11. \$170 million in cost overruns are for enhanced security improvements in the wake of September 11. But there is a 20,000 square foot space in the middle of this new Capitol Visitors Center, and it's going to be the largest congregate space in the Capitol. Unfortunately, through, I think bad communication, this hall was called the Great Hall,

which is exactly the same name as the main hall in the Library of Congress for over 100 years. The Great Hall is this beautiful, ornate room at the Library of Congress. Early on, there was bipartisan agreement at our subcommittee that both of these halls on each end of a tunnel should not be called the Great Hall.

So we took action and I think carefully thought through and felt through some of the options, and the most glaring omission in the history of the Capitol is the irony that the people that built the Capitol were, in large part, slaves who never were honored in any way, shape or form for the work that they did building this Capitol. There were even periods of time where the people working on the dome were Union soldiers and slaves, at the same time, building the dome during the Civil War. What an unbelievably awesome thought that the people who were fighting for their freedom were working side by side with these slaves.

Listen, this is our opportunity to truly honor them in a way that transcends our service, our existence, individuals. And so the naming of this 20,000 square foot hall Emancipation Hall is something that is ripe with life and tradition and time-honored work for all of us. I'm pleased that it was left in the bill, and I'm pleased that our Senate counterparts took action on this yesterday by introducing legislation.

The power to convene is greater than the power to legislate. Sometimes we forget that things like this may seem to be symbolic, but it means so much more. I've taken 1,700 groups through the Capitol over the last 13 years. I give these tours and it inspires young people to a life of service. What greater way to honor freedom than to walk people through this new 20,000 square foot hall and say, this is Emancipation Hall, a great lesson of history.

□ 1100

We gained our national character by the mistakes that we learned from, never to repeat again. That's where we get our character. That's why this is so important.

Some people say we shouldn't spend the money to change the name of the signs. We should never have printed the signs. Let's not make another mistake by not rectifying this first mistake.

I really appreciate the bipartisan spirit in which we have worked on this particular issue.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I wanted rise not to speak on the issue that gentleman just spoke so passionately about, but just to say a word about the two new leaders of this committee.

I have had opportunity of serving in this House for some period of time.

When I first came here, shortly thereafter, Vic Fazio, Congressman Fazio and Congressman LEWIS, who is now the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, handled this responsibility that DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP are now handling. For almost at least a decade, Liz, I think they handled that responsibility. And they handled it in an absolutely bipartisan way to reflect the fact that 435 Members representing the 300 million people in this country care about this institution working well to their benefit, and to the benefit of our country.

I want to congratulate certainly DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who, in her third year, has become a cardinal, in large part because of her energy and her focus and her talent and her experience in the State Senate in Florida and the House in Florida, and what she brings to this institution. She is an institutionalist.

We are also fortunate with ZACH WAMP from Tennessee, with whom I disagree from time to time and maybe a lot of times when we vote on substantive legislation, but who is a good friend of mine. We are blessed that the two of them are working on this bill.

I mentioned Liz Dawson, who has been, really, mothering this bill, I was going to say husbanding this bill, but for a very significant period of time, since she was a very young girl, and who cares a great deal about this institution. I want to thank her as well for her leadership.

But I think we ought to all feel fortunate that we have two people like DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP trying to make the accommodations for this institution to work well to represent our people. This is the people's House. To the extent that we have the resources to represent our people in a way that will reflect credit on this House and a positive result for our people, our country will be better. So I wanted to say that and congratulate Mr. WAMP and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, first let me also thank our chair for your leadership, for your very focused work, and for your commitment not only as chair and to this bill, but to this entire institution.

I also want to thank our Ranking Member WAMP for your leadership and your expertise and, really, your ability to work together in a bipartisan way to make the committee truly a bipartisan committee, which is what all of our committees are striving for.

So it's a pleasure to serve as vice chair on this committee. I am very proud of the product which we are presenting today.

I rise in strong support of this legislative branch appropriations bill, and

really want to just take a moment to thank all of the staff who really, as a result of their vigilance and their expertise and their hard work, they were the ones who really helped us put this all together. I want to especially acknowledge Chris Lee on my staff, because this is one of his very first legislative initiatives, and he did a phenomenal job in keeping me pointed on looking at the goals of what we were trying to accomplish in this legislation.

This bill also seeks to improve the working conditions of dedicated staff who are a vital and integral part of this legislative process. This bill also commits the House of Representatives to set an example to the Nation on how to reduce the environmental impact of the workplace by beginning the greening of the Capitol complex. How exciting this is.

This bill also begins to address the pattern which, unfortunately it is, but it's a pattern of exclusion that has gone on for too long in contracting and procurement in the House of Representatives. For too long businesses owned by women, minorities and the disabled have not had a seat at the table. It was appalling, with what we learned at the hearings about the exclusion of such a large segment of our qualified business community. For too long we have operated without written formal policies and reliable reporting on compliance without the crucial data that the committee cannot know if real progress is being made or if additional action should be required.

Well, naming the great hall Emancipation Hall in recognition that the great Capitol had been built by the expertise, the blood, sweat and tears of slaves is appropriate and timely as we also now go beyond the name to include the descendants of slaves in the economic vitality and opportunity of this Capitol. So we have included in this bill language that requires specific contracting with minorities, with women and the disabled.

We required contractor and vending opportunities and access to equal opportunities for our disadvantaged businesses and for promoting their hiring and development as well.

We also include language that requires GAO to adopt a formal affirmative action plan. They may be doing the right thing, but we don't know that. We know that they do need an affirmative action plan, so we would require that in this bill.

We also make sure that there is accountability in this bill, but let me just say I am very proud of the fact that for the first time we will have requirements now, with our own Capitol contracting opportunities, as well as with the Visitors Center, to not exclude minorities and women and the disabled, but to include them in the economic opportunities that this bill provides.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may

consume to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairman, to ZACH WAMP, I want to express my feelings about your work on this bill in a couple of ways.

First, those of us on the committee who have watched this process go together, Chairwoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ZACH WAMP working together, frankly, seeing people develop a relationship in a job that involves the real business of the House. It is the bill that funds our appropriations process. While it's not the largest bill, it's very important to the fundamentals here.

But I have never been quite so impressed as I watched them working with our very fine professional staff, to see them also bring along Members of the Appropriations Committee addressing this bill in a very special way. I wish the entire House could have observed the Appropriations Committee as we discussed Emancipation Hall the other day.

JESSE JACKSON was magnificent. The interplay between he and the chairwoman and ZACH WAMP was worthy of the Appropriations Committee, but very much a reflection of the very best of this House. I couldn't have been prouder than I was observing that conversation within appropriators.

With that I want to congratulate you very much for this product. It's a tremendous reflection of our work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairwoman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairwoman.

Madam Chairwoman, thank you for your leadership on this bill; In particular, for your support and leadership of the Green the Capitol Initiative, which accounts for the House's global impact on global warming.

Also, I want to thank the ranking member Mr. WAMP, Speaker PELOSI and Chairman BRADY as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to congratulate Mr. WELCH for his initiative in moving this issue forward.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. By making my office carbon-neutral earlier this year, my hope was to be able to take a small, but meaningful, step towards addressing the impact of my own congressional activity on global warming.

May I clarify my understanding that the committee report on the bill directs the Chief Administrative Officer to purchase carbon financial instruments to offset carbon produced by all House operations, and that these offsets will be fully transparent, verified, American, project-based offset credits?

I yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, that's correct. As written in the report, the committee believes it is important to offset the greenhouse gases generated by the House, which is why we have directed the CAO of the House to purchase carbon offsets at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and credits to successfully offset carbon produced by all House operations.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. It's my understanding through conversations with Dan Beard, the CAO, that he has agreed to develop a plan to deliver a report to your committee in a timely fashion for accounting the balance of congressional offices' carbon footprints. This plan would expand the Green the Capitol Initiative to be inclusive of all Member official travel in district office operations.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is the intent of the subcommittee to eventually encompass all House operations, including travel and district operations. I would welcome this report from Mr. Beard and encourage his recommendations on how we will offset the remaining carbon footprint of the House.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Madam Chair; thank you, Ranking Member WAMP. We all really appreciate the way you have worked on this bill together. You make us all proud.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

I look forward to working together on this important issue.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, let me just underscore what Mr. LEWIS said about the work of JESSE JACKSON, Jr., on the work on Emancipation Hall, but also the support from JOHN LEWIS, JIM CLYBURN and Ms. NORTON, who is in the Chamber this morning, and all the people who have any jurisdiction or involvement in this particular issue.

Ms. KILPATRICK and the Congressional Black Caucus support his bill, in large part because of JESSE JACKSON, Jr.'s, leadership. He is extraordinarily bright. He was so articulate and passionate about this issue. Frankly, it wouldn't have been done to this point. We are not complete without him. I just want to underscore that recognition.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman of Pennsylvania, a member of the full committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their bonding of bipartisanship. We could use a lot more of that around here. I think it has been great.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting my

amendment in full committee that was a GAO study on the implications of changing our fuel source from coal to natural gas. That's a symbol for America to listen to our carbon imprint, so we will go to the clean, green fuel, natural gas.

I see universities doing it. I see State governments doing it already. As our symbol, if that happens in all agencies, State, local, education, we will have a huge impact on the need of affordable, clean natural gas in this country.

My concern is we have a body here who is very much opposed to the production of clean, green natural gas.

One point, on Green the Capitol, I have not been able to find a window that was Energy Star. I have not been able to find a window that was not a single-pane glass that is a great transfer of heat out and cold in. It seems like we ought to be using fuel-efficient first. Maybe that's our next objective.

We're going to be accepting an amendment in a few minutes, and I am not going to protest it, I will not debate it, on light bulbs. It's going to mandate energy-efficient Star-rated light bulbs.

I have them in my home. I have a large home. We have a lot of lights going, and I try to put them where I burn them all the time. But they are not very bright. They are not good for reading. My wife has replaced the one in her reading chair. They buzz sometimes, they just buzz like a transformer, so they are not exactly what we are used to.

Oh, by the way, next year at this time, every light bulb in the Capitol will be made in Communist China, will have mercury in it, and the incandescent light bulb industry that's left in this industry, and I have two plants, those good union jobs will be leaving quicker, not later.

I am not saying Americans shouldn't switch, but we need to know what we're doing.

□ 1115

I believe we need to have a much more thoughtful approach and look at where the jobs are in America in that we are transferring jobs to China. We're putting mercury into the workplace, and we're eliminating some of the best jobs that we have back in our districts. We need to think about that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the subcommittee chairwoman, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, in a colloquy to express my concerns regarding the Comptroller General's implementation of the Human Capital Reform Act of 2004 and the resulting unionization effort at the Government Accountability Office.

For the past 18 months, the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia, which I chair, has been inves-

tigating certain personnel actions taken by the Comptroller General.

Our investigation culminated in a joint House and Senate hearing on May 22, where CRS's legal division and the General Counsel for the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board testified that, based on current statute, GAO did not have the authority to deny over 300 employees who met and, in some cases, exceeded expectations, their 2006 and 2007 annual across-the-board increase.

GAO says that it took this action based upon a compensation-based study conducted by Watson Wyatt. However, when the subcommittee's staff, working with experts in market-based pay, reviewed the documentation, they were unable to validate that the employees who did not receive their across-the-board increase were overpaid, as asserted by GAO.

In addition to meeting their performance expectations, these employees were among the most experienced, with over 25 years of service to GAO.

The workforce at GAO has been severely disrupted by these personnel actions. In reaction to them, a majority of GAO's 1,500 analysts filed a petition with the GAO's Personnel Appeals Board to be represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers.

Unfortunately, GAO has responded by hiring the law firm Venable, LLC, to represent it before the PAB. It is uncommon for a Federal agency to use taxpayers' dollars to hire private sector counsel for such purposes. In addition, GAO is asserting that one-third of the petitioners are supervisors and, therefore, cannot unionize.

Furthermore, GAO has indicated that if its challenge is successful, and it can show that the alleged supervisors were involved in the solicitation of authorization cards for the remaining eligible employees, it will not commit to recognize and bargain with the employee group.

I yield to the chairwoman to ask what steps has the Appropriations Committee taken to address Member and employee concerns about the situation at the GAO.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you for yielding, Chairman DAVIS. Like you, I am very concerned about the Comptroller General's actions and have personally spoken to him to express my concerns.

I am committed to doing all we can to ensure that the Comptroller General does not put up obstacles to workers' rights to organize. In particular, I am dismayed the GAO, as a legislative branch agency, has retained outside counsel, rather than use its own attorneys to represent it before the Personnel Appeals Board. This action is unnecessarily costly and will likely delay the process of determining the outcome of the petition.

The committee has reiterated these points in report language in this bill. We will be closely monitoring the progress of the Comptroller's review of

eligibility, and we are requiring weekly reports on progress in these areas.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Chairman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. My committee will continue to closely monitor this situation as well. I look forward to working with your subcommittee on this matter in the future.

Representatives WYNN, VAN HOLLEN, and Majority Leader HOYER regret that they could not be here to speak on this issue. However, I have statements from them, and will submit them for the RECORD, along with a letter dated June

21, 2007, from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers to Comptroller General David Walker alleging unfair labor practices.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Silver Spring, MD, June 21, 2007.

Hon. DAVID M. WALKER,

Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WALKER: Enclosed is an unfair labor practice charge against you. Accept this letter and enclosure as your 30 day advance copy of the charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). We request that you re-

view the allegations, and to prevent any future violations we urge you to cease any activity related to those described herein. Further, we trust that you will instruct all other Agency officials that such improper conduct will not be permitted.

We anticipate an informal resolution of this charge pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1§15(b). However, if this matter cannot be resolved informally within the next 30 days, the charge will be filed with the GAO Personnel Appeals Board Office of General Counsel and further action will result.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,

President.

Personnel Appeals Board/Office of General Counsel
U.S. Government Accountability Office

**UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE
AGAINST THE
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**

FOR PAB/OGC USE ONLY

Case No.

Date filed

See instructions on the back of this form and the PAB regulations governing unfair labor practices at 4 CFR §28.120 *et seq.* Attach additional sheets if needed, numbered according to the item to which they pertain.

1. Charging Party (Individual or Labor Organization)

<i>Name/Contact</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Phone and Fax</i>	<i>Email</i>
Julia Akins Clark International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers	8630 Fenton St, Suite 400 Silver Spring, MD 20910	Phone: (301) 565-9016 Fax: (301) 565-0018	<i>jclark@ifpte.org</i>

2. Charged GAO Component or Agent

<i>Name/Contact</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Phone and Fax</i>	<i>Email</i>
Hon. David M. Walker Comptroller General of the United States	Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, NW Washington, DC 20548-0001	Phone: (202) 512-5500 Fax: (202) 512-5507	

3. Identify any subsection(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you believe that GAO and/or its agent(s) has violated.

GAO Order 2711.1 § 12(a)(1) and (8)

4. Describe precisely the actions taken by GAO and/or its agent(s) that you believe violated the provisions identified in #3. Identify the date, location and individuals (with titles) involved in the alleged unfair labor practice.

See Attachment 1

5. Have you or anyone else raised this matter in any other procedure? No Yes If yes, explain in detail how, when and where this matter was raised.

6. I DECLARE THAT I HAVE READ THIS CHARGE AND THAT THE STATEMENTS IN IT ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I UNDERSTAND THAT WILLFULLY MAKING FALSE STATEMENTS CAN BE PUNISHED BY FINE AND IMPRISONMENT PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §1001.

Julia Akins Clark
Type or print your name

[Signature]
Your signature

6/20/07
Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING AN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Use this form if you are charging that the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) or its agents committed an unfair labor practice under GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a). File an original signed copy of the charge with the Personnel Appeals Board, Office of General Counsel (PAB/OGC) at 820 1st St. NE, Suite 580, Washington, D.C. 20002. If filing a charge by fax (202.512.7522), you must promptly submit the signed original to the PAB/OGC. You may, but are not required to, submit evidence or documents supporting the charge. If you choose to do so, these materials must be delivered, not faxed, to the PAB/OGC.

LINE BY LINE INSTRUCTIONS

1. Give the full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers, as well as email address, of the Charging Party. If a union, give both national affiliation (if any) and local designation. If an employee, identify the component of GAO at which you are employed.

2. Identify the GAO official alleged to have committed the unfair labor practice(s) by full name, mailing address, phone and fax numbers as well as email address (if known). Provide the name of a contact person if the charged party is GAO or a component of GAO.

3. Identify which of the following provisions of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) that you allege was violated:

(a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for the GAO to

(1) interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right under GAO Order 2711.1;

(2) encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by discrimination in connection with hiring, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment;

(3) sponsor, control, or otherwise assist any labor organization, other than to furnish, upon request, customary and routine services and facilities if the services and facilities are also furnished on an impartial basis to other labor organizations having equivalent status;

(4) discipline or otherwise discriminate against an employee because the employee has filed a charge, complaint, affidavit, or petition, or has given any information or testimony under GAO Order 2711.1;

(5) refuse to negotiate in good faith with a labor organization as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(6) fail or refuse to cooperate in impasse procedures and decisions as required by GAO Order 2711.1;

(7) enforce any rule or order, other than a rule or order implementing 31 U.S.C. 732(h)(2), which is in conflict with any applicable collective bargaining agreement if the agreement was in effect before the date the rule or order was prescribed; or

(8) otherwise fail or refuse to comply with any provision of GAO Order 2711.1.

4. Be concise, complete and factual. Tell what happened in chronological order.

5. State whether this same matter has already been raised as all or part of a claim brought elsewhere, e.g., the GAO Office of Opportunity and Inclusiveness or grievance procedure.

6. Type or print your name. Date and sign the statement attesting to the truth of the statements contained therein.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE
ATTACHMENT 1

Item (4):

Comptroller General David M. Walker has made remarks regarding the International

Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers ("IFPTE") and its efforts to assist employees of the Government Accountability Office ("GAO") in their organizing activities, which violate the requirement that management, especially the Comptroller General as head of the Agency, maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign. GAO Order 2711.1 (defining a management action which interferes with protected Union activities as an Unfair Labor Practice). See GAO Order 2711.1 12(a) (requiring management not to "interfere with, restrain, or coerce any employee in the exercise by the employee of any right").

It is well established pursuant to Federal Labor Relations Authority ("FLRA") precedent that the prohibition on interference with protected Union activities means that an Agency must remain neutral during a Union organizing campaign. See also 5 U.S.C. §7116(e) (providing that management can only make expressions of personal view, argument, opinion or statements relating to representation elections that: (1) publicize the fact of a representational election and encourage employees to vote; (2) correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement made by any person; or (3) inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do not contain threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions).

The objectionable remarks are summarized below:

In a January 23, 2007 article on www.govexec.com. (See Rutzick, Karen, "GAO Employees Move Toward Vote on Union Representation") Comptroller General Walker: (1) Characterized the union movement as coming from a "handful" of employees; (2) Stated that, "a few employees are trying to do something"; and (3) Stated that, "there are pros and cons" of the organizing effort that "[he] would have to present to [his] employees".

During the May 9, 2007 quarterly Health Care Team meeting at GAO, held the day after the representation petition was filed Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that having a union can seriously impact the decision-making process within an agency, and could "dramatically" slow things down; (2) Stated that he wanted employees to "have all the information" before deciding on whether or not to bring such a change to GAO; and (3) Stated that some employees are concerned that the workplace is "not fair" and "those that think it is not fair do not understand the situation."

Similarly during the June 6, 2007 IT Team staff meeting at GAO, Comptroller General Walker: (1) Stated that, "[t]he people who want a union are the vocal minority in GAO"; and (2) Stated that "[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts".

Comptroller General Walker's above-referenced statements to the media and in his addresses to GAO staff meetings are a breach of his obligation to remain neutral regarding the employees' union organizing effort, and constitute a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

On June 19, 2007 the agency circulated a memorandum to GAO employees. The document: (1) Is titled "Union Update." The title of the document is confusing and implies that it is from the Union rather than the Agency; (2) Stated that IFPTE filed the representation petition when in fact the name of the petitioner is GAO Employees Organization, IFPTE; (3) Withholds the fact that in its May 16, 2007 letter to the PAB the em-

ployer agreed to the exclusion of PDP employees, and changed its stance during the meeting between the parties on June 13, 2007; (4) Withholds the fact that GAO's offer required the union to waive the right of Band IIB employees to be union represented, in consideration for GAO's agreement to hold the union election in July. Further, GAO withheld the fact that the union offered to hold the election during the summer, and resolve GAO's IIB supervisory challenge post-election, in order to expedite the election; and; (5) States that a hearing will be held this summer. The agency has no basis for that assertion, since no hearing date has been set.

These statements contained within the memorandum are inaccurate and misleading. As noted above, the June 19, 2007, "Union Update" contains numerous factual errors and omissions which, in and of themselves constitute violations of Section 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8). In addition, however, section 2711.1 §12(e) specifies the conditions in which the Agency may provide information about the organizing/election process. The information in the Agency's "Union Update" goes well beyond the matters specified. The Agency is not permitted to provide periodic self-serving, spinning of facts related to the ongoing procedures of the union organizing process, and then send these to a captive audience via intranet. Accordingly, the contents of the "Union Update" itself constitute a ULP in violation of 2711.1 (a)(1) and (8). Moreover, the inaccuracies in the document interfere with employees' free choice and are impermissible pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1 §12(e) and inconsistent with 5 U.S.C. §7116(e). Thus, the document constitutes a violation of GAO Order 2711.1 §12(a)(1) and (8).

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD/OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL, U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,

Washington, DC., June 21, 2007.

REQUEST TO PROCEED

The undersigned requests the Personnel Appeals Board to proceed with the above-captioned representation case notwithstanding the alleged violation(s) of GAO Order 2711.1, §12(a) filed directly with the charged party pursuant to GAO Order 2711.1, §15(b) on June 21, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA AKINS CLARK.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Madam Chair, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP, Madam Chair, before recognizing the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, Mr. EHLERS of Michigan, I want to just point out that the Comptroller General of the GAO, David Walker, has stated that he "supports the right of GAO employees to organize if they so choose." And I also recognize the presence on the floor today of the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. BRADY, a friend of mine.

But to speak eloquently on this bill is a man who knows as much about the House as anyone here, a person who I work with very well. I yield 9 minutes to Mr. EHLERS of Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS, Madam Chair, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me to speak on this legislation.

First of all I'd like to respond to his comments earlier about greening and also the comments of the subcommittee Chair. I have been involved

in environmental issues even before the first Earth Day. And I also, with all the discussion about fluorescent lights, it's more than 15 years ago that we installed fluorescent lights in the most heavily used parts of our house. We have saved immense amounts of energy and, above all, have avoided having to change light bulbs very often. It's certainly a good thing to do, and we should do it here.

Also, in connection with the comments made about the carbon footprint of the House, let's recognize the most important thing to do is to start by conserving energy, and that is key. You can gain more energy and greater results by increasing efficiency of the use of energy than any other single thing you can do, not just in the Capitol but, frankly, anywhere. And every reduction in a kilowatt of energy is a reduction in carbon emissions. So you can do two things at once.

And I applaud the emphasis on the carbon issue, but that's part of it. Include energy too, that's a very important part. So I encourage the full view. Simply buying credits from someone, if we ever do, and I don't think we should, is not really the answer. We have to reduce the amount we use, and there are many, many ways we can reduce the use of energy in this complex. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for the compliment on that issue.

The main reason I rise today is to express my concerns with many of the administrative provisions in this bill that infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. These could hamper our ability to provide meaningful and effective oversight of the offices and operations within our purview.

I recognize full well I am no longer the chairman of the committee, but I am the ranking Republican. And Mr. BRADY, whom I think very highly of, is in total agreement on these issues.

Initially, when I saw these, I thought of taking the route of moving points of order against these issues, but I'd prefer to work this out with the Chair and ranking member of the subcommittee.

Let me share just a few of the matters that have raised concern among members of the Committee on House Administration. I have also shared these with Mr. BRADY and with Mr. WAMP, and I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern.

In the section titled "Legislative Branch-wide Matters," the report language states in regard to policies governing contracts with women and minority-owned businesses that "all agencies shall provide a copy of policies to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate within 60 days of enactment of this act."

It goes on to say that "the committee further directs all agencies provide an annual report of their compliance with this policy." One of the key reforms in the last decade or so has been giving the Committee on House

Administration authority governing use of accounts within the House. The oversight provided by the House Administration Committee was designed to prevent financial abuses and also extended to the creation of procurement guidelines, since procurements are made from House accounts.

Those reforms were put in place to guarantee open competition in the procurement process and to ensure that the House would get the best value for the taxpayers' dollars.

This bill essentially creates a reporting relationship to the Appropriations Committee that circumvents the Committee on House Administration and damages our committee's ability to perform the vital oversight function that is within our jurisdiction.

And I would appreciate it if I could have the attention of the Chair because I'm going to ask a question about this in a few minutes.

In the section titled "Culinary School Students," the Appropriations Committee requests that the Chief Administrative Officer contact culinary schools and explore the possibility for culinary school students to enhance their skills and make appropriate arrangements for the students to participate on a rotational basis among the participants in an on-the-job training or similar program.

While I certainly appreciate the interest of the Appropriations Committee in training students and creating a more enjoyable dining experience for Members and staff, the House Administration Committee has already tried to do this in the past and found that no culinary schools were interested because of the unpredictable hours of operation. Again, by circumventing our committee's authority, the Appropriations Committee has added another layer of bureaucracy, created a duplication of work for the CIO, and created a conflict of oversight authority.

Similarly, in the section titled "Disability Access," the language includes a directive to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, with the assistance of the Architect of the Capitol, Government Accountability Office, and the Office of Compliance, where necessary to do a comprehensive assessment of the Capitol complex regarding disability access.

In fact, as required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, the Office of Compliance conducts biennial ADA inspections of the legislative branch. Most, if not all, of the corrective actions to be taken are under the purview of the Architect of the Capitol. The AOC works closely with the OOC to develop abatement plans and includes cost estimates for that abatement in their annual budget submissions. The CAO is not equipped to conduct this type of study and does not have authority to examine the entire Capitol complex.

Just to conclude, while each of these issues are troubling on their own, to-

gether with the other concerns I have addressed with Chairman BRADY, they carry even greater significance as a symbol of an emerging pattern whereby report language is being used to establish administrative policy that was never intended to be a matter before the Appropriations Committee. If continued, this creates a duplicative oversight function, threatens to severely hamper the oversight ability of the House Administration Committee.

We've often heard the term "the power of the purse strings," but in this case the power's being used to grant oversight authority to the Appropriations Committee in a manner that will create additional bureaucracy and cause undue harm, particularly to the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

I would like to yield time to the Chair of the subcommittee to respond to this. I hope that we can resolve this amicably, and that's why I did not make an issue offering points of order to strike language, et cetera. I don't want to make a do-or-die issue of this, but I would appreciate assurances from the Chair of the subcommittee that we can amicably resolve these jurisdiction issues between ourselves and perhaps with the help of the Parliamentarian.

And I know that Mr. BRADY shares my concern. I believe he's had some conversations with you as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the hard work of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

□ 1130

I appreciated as a freshman his assistance during the orientation process and want to assure the gentleman, as I have in conversations with Chairman BRADY, that the language in our report, specifically as it relates to the culinary language, is simply a request for the GAO to take a look at that issue so that we can incorporate culinary students in an instructional way in the preparation and delivery of food in the Members dining room. In addition, the disability language, while it is a directive, it was intended to make sure that we could keep the safety and security focus of our legislation.

I do look forward to working very closely with the chairman and the ranking member of the House Administration Committee so that we can make sure that we cover those needs that we have in the House of Representatives and the legislative branch agencies.

And I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for the assurance.

I just want to state I have been on that committee virtually since I came to the Congress. I have worked very, very hard on this committee to establish a good working administrative system. We have clarified jurisdiction

over the years, and even though I am no longer chairman but the ranking member at this point, I just want to ensure that the committee continues to enjoy a good relationship with the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chair of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I just want to say a few quick things.

We had a problem in House Administration when Chairwoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD passed away. There was a void. But taking over as chairman, I have a great working relationship with my ranking minority member, Mr. EHLERS. I have a great working relationship with the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, ZACH WAMP. I also have tremendous respect for and a great working relationship with the chairwoman.

We have had some conversations that we did not need to discuss here. I have been assured and am extremely comfortable with the fact that we will be together working out our jurisdictional problems. I thank the gentlewoman for stepping in at a time when it was needed. Again, with my ranking minority member, we have a great relationship. We probably have the best committee in that we get along all the time. We are going to continue to do that. I thank, again, the ranking member.

I look forward to working with you, and I have your assurance that we will be doing that.

Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the work of the gentlelady from Florida to craft the FY08 appropriations bill for the Legislative Branch. As we are well aware in the Committee on House Administration, working on this bill may not be very glamorous, but it is essential to keeping the House running.

The Committee on Appropriations has done a good job of balancing the many needs of the House—paying our employees, keeping the physical plant running, and operating the various agencies that serve Capitol Hill.

I am particularly pleased to see in this bill an additional \$5 million toward upgrading the radio systems of the Capitol Police. Estab-

lishing a secure communications system for our police force is essential to the security of the Hill.

I also appreciate the Committee's commitment of funds for the "Green the Capitol" initiative. According to the House Chief Administrative Officer's calculations, we can eventually recoup these costs from savings on our utility bills when we make the House more energy-efficient.

I look forward to continuing our strong working relationship in the future.

Finally, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I urge the Members to reject the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE]. It is essential that the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation be funded at least at the level recommended by the Appropriations Committee. The Government Printing Office must have enough resources to provide Congress with the printing and digital services fundamental to our legislative process.

The congressional printing account has been flat-funded since 2005. As a result, in order to deliver what we require to do our jobs in Congress, GPO has had to reach into its own working capital. When GPO depletes its working capital, it consumes funds otherwise available to keep pace with technology, train employees, even to maintain plant and equipment.

GPO receives no salaries-and-expenses appropriation for its printing operations. GPO runs just like a business, and the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation is Congress' prepayment for its own orders. As a GPO customer, like many other Federal agencies, Congress has to pay its way and cannot expect GPO to underwrite printing needs, especially as we increase congressional activity in this 110th Congress. If Congress continues to underfund its own printing, GPO will eventually face a financial crisis that we caused, threatening its ability to operate for any of its agency customers. Let's reject the Flake amendment to keep that from happening.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I thank her for her excellent work on her maiden voyage as chair.

I have come to say a few words that I think need saying about the performance of GAO with respect to the grand experiment that our committee allowed on pay for performance. We allowed it. We have not tried to interfere with it. But the actions taken by the Comptroller General where you would at least have expected it has produced nothing short of a revolution within, of all places, the GAO workforce.

They were chosen for this grand experiment because they were a fairly upscale part of the Federal workforce. And what have we got? How would you feel if you had worked at or above performance, and yet you were among 300 employees of, what is it, 2 million Fed-

eral employees who did not receive the across-the-board pay increase that everybody else receives? Well, some of you might have sued or filed a claim with the Personnel Appeals Board within the GAO. And those employees, all 12 of them, have received their COLA, have been promoted, and have had their retirement fixed.

But there are 300 employees from 2006, 130 from 2007 who have been punished as to their pensions and pay because the Comptroller did not keep his promise with the Congress, which was that nobody's across-the-board pay would be affected. In fact, what he did was to insert a market-based study without informing the subcommittee, an unvalidated study, and now he has a whole racial claim on top of it because the African Americans have been disproportionately affected by his action.

If the Comptroller wanted some help, he could have gone to the OPM. Instead, he used a market-based study from a consultant. If he wanted to know how to deal with unionization which is now upon him, he could have gone to the OPM. He could have gone to the Federal Labor Relations Authority. Instead, he is spending taxpayer funds in order to try to beat a union within the Federal sector, the first time ever. If we allow taxpayer funds to be used that way, then it seems to me we ought to be called to account.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the legislative branch appropriations bill. I want to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ranking Member WAMP, and the appropriations staff for their hard work in crafting this fiscally responsible bill.

The bill on the floor today is "lean and mean," providing just the resources that we need to serve the people in an honest, transparent manner.

I strongly believe that as our Nation's elected leaders, we have a responsibility here in the people's House to lead the Nation in creating an environmentally friendly workplace. This is why I crafted two amendments for today's bill that would have directed the Architect of the Capitol to take small but significant steps toward "greening" the Capitol complex.

I am pleased that Subcommittee Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ shares my support for the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiative. Since she has enthusiastically agreed to consider them during conference, I won't be offering them today.

But I would like to draw the House's attention to these two initiatives because they demonstrate how small investments can reap large rewards.

Both initiatives were drawn from the Greening of the Capital report recently

completed by the Architect of the Capitol, and both are endorsed by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The first initiative would study the feasibility of constructing a "green roof" on the Ford House Office Building. A green roof is a rooftop that is carefully planted with vegetation. It can be anything from a simple plot of grass to a park-like setting.

Green roofs have proved to be tremendous economic and environmental benefits. They are great insulators, reducing heating and cooling costs often by as much as 25 percent. And they save on maintenance costs as well since they are more protective than traditional roofs. Green roofs cool the surrounding neighborhood by reducing the amount of heat that is reflected back into the surrounding atmosphere, the so-called urban heat island effect. Vegetation on green roofs celebrates our natural heritage and also absorbs rainwater, reducing contaminated runoff.

Even with all these benefits, green roofs have not caught on. They are not very popular yet in the United States. And as Members of Congress, we now have the opportunity to lead by example. A successful demonstration of the economic benefits of green roofs right here in the Capitol Complex can help promote green roofs across the Nation.

My second proposal concerns the planting of more trees around parking lots in the Capitol Complex. My colleagues who closely follow environmental issues already know that trees have a remarkable ability to reduce the air temperature in our urban areas. Trees remove carbon from our atmosphere, shade our buildings and cars, and even reduce asthma by filtering out air pollutants. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, this proposal would even save the taxpayers money.

Without action this year, many of the Speaker's Greening of the Capitol Initiatives, including the two I have just discussed, won't get funding until 2009 or 2010. These proposals would get us started modestly but promptly and don't require additional funds.

I look forward to working with Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to incorporate these projects into the legislative branch's plans for 2008.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on environmental issues and look forward to working with her on continuing the Speaker's leadership on the Green the Capitol Initiative, both in terms of planting of the trees and the greening of roofs, and I look forward and appreciate her input.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, this place, this House is always at its best when Members of the United States Congress work together. And I want to congratulate the chairwoman of this committee and the ranking member of this committee for working together.

Most people don't understand that the legislative branch creates an atmosphere of hospitality in this place. As I look and see the number of visitors that we have, your responsibility is to secure them and to welcome them. Let me thank you personally for the task that you have undertaken.

I want to thank you for the increase in the House Child Care Center, and I hope that our community does not criticize the fact that we are family friendly so that employees have the opportunity to have child care.

I want to thank you for supporting the Speaker's Green Initiative because we, too, must do what we ask Americans to do.

And, of course, the brave men and women that serve us, I welcome the increase in the Capitol Police, and I also look forward to their continuing to address the questions of discrimination and equality as they increase the numbers of police.

Let me join in the words of Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and hope that we will challenge, if you will, the GAO to be responsible in its dealings with its employees and unionization.

But I came today to be able to offer to the American public the sense of pride and the sense of humbleness that I am now experiencing because of your grand leadership and that of the Appropriations Committee. And my good friend Congressman JESSE JACKSON and, of course, members of the Congressional Black Caucus signed a letter, which I was proud to sign, because this picture reflects something that is near and dear to Texas.

My good friend comes from Tennessee. He knows that we have a lot of continuity or connection between Tennessee and Texas and the good State of Florida.

But we celebrated this week the Emancipation Proclamation. We celebrated, in particular, Juneteenth. Those of us in the South remember Major General Gordon Granger coming 2 years late to indicate that we might be free. Isn't it wonderful that now we will name the Visitors Center, and we hope for our good friends in the other body to be as reasonable, the Emancipation Hall.

I went through the hall just outside this door before I came to the floor, and I saw the name of William Jennings Bryan. I saw the name Wheeler of Alabama, Huey Pierce Long, Lew Wallace, Sequoyah, Sam Houston.

□ 1145

I met a woman who told me about her grandfather, Levi Coffin, who had helped slaves in the Underground Rail-

road. Her name was Ms. Holt. She was just standing there talking to me.

That's what naming the Emancipation Hall means to America. It reflects the wholeness of America, the wonderment of our history, the dignity of our history. Yes, slaves built this place, but all Americans will be able to go into Emancipation Hall, and it will symbolize the freedom of this Nation. I am so grateful that we have come to this place at this time.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, Emancipation Hall.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2771, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2008 and to commend Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process. This legislation funds the House, Senate and various entities in the legislative branch, including the Library of Congress, the Capitol Police, the Government Accountability Office, and the Government Printing Office.

But it does more than that, Madam Chairman. The bill provides funding for "Greening the Capitol" to reduce carbon emissions from the operations of House buildings and the Capitol. It makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health hazards and safety requirements in law. In short, this legislation demonstrates a commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

H.R. 2771 appropriates \$3.1 billion for legislative branch entities, including \$1.2 billion for House operations and \$1.9 billion for legislative branch agencies and other offices. The total provided is \$275.7 million (8 percent) less than requested by legislative offices and agencies and only \$122.2 million (4 percent) more than comparable FY 2007 funding. Nearly 25 percent of this increased funding is directly attributable to costs associated with the 2008 presidential election and subsequent inauguration.

Following the long-established practice that each house of Congress determines its own housekeeping requirements without interference from the other body, the bill contains no funding for Senate operations. The bill appropriates \$1.2 billion for operations of the House of Representatives, which is \$36.5 million (3 percent) less than requested, but \$54.1 million (5 percent) more than current funding.

The total for the House includes \$581 million for members' offices, also known as MRA's, 5 percent more than current funding, but 5 percent less than requested and \$162.8 million for House committees, 8 percent more than current funding and 4 percent more than requested. The bill also provides \$169.4 million for the various House officers and employees, including the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), 8 percent more than current funding, but 3 percent less than requested.

H.R. 2771 provides \$21.1 million for joint House-Senate items, 13 percent less than current funding and 23 percent less than requested, when the recent June 8 supplemental request for the Capitol guides is taken into account. The appropriated amount includes \$9.4 million for the Joint Committee on Taxation, 7 percent more than current funding.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2771 provides a total of \$1.9 billion for other offices and legislative branch agencies that directly or indirectly support congressional operations. This funding is \$71.2 million (4 percent) more than current levels but \$232.8 million (11 percent) less than requested. Among the agencies this bill funds are the Architect of the Capitol; the Capitol Police; the Library of Congress; the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Government Accountability Office.

For the Architect of the Capitol, the bill provides \$348.4 million, 9 percent less than current funding and 12 percent less than requested. Included in the bill is \$27.5 million for the Capital Visitors Center. I cite with particular approval that the bill renames the center's Great Hall as "Emancipation Hall" in remembrance of the slave labor that created this mighty edifice.

Earlier this week, the House passed H. Con. Res. 155, which recognized the historical significance of June 19, 1865, or "Juneteenth," the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. On June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, TX, with news that the war had ended and that all slaves were now free. But this was 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation—which had become official January 1, 1863.

Madam Chairman, I suppose it may just be another irony of life that the U.S. Capitol was rebuilt during the Civil War and completed around the time of Juneteenth. This magnificent symbol of democracy, freedom, and equality could not have been brought in to being without the blood and sweat and unrequited toil of slave labor. For much of our history the contributions to our country by slaves and their descendants has not been fully acknowledged. But in renaming the Great Hall to the Capitol Visitor Center as "Emancipation Hall," we begin to rectify this error. It is a wonderful thing we are doing.

The bill also provides \$3.9 million to implement the "Green the Capitol" initiative, including \$2.7 for shifting from coal to natural gas for heating in the Capitol power plant, and the report requires the House CAO to purchase carbon credits. The bill also requires the hiring of an inspector general.

The bill provides the Capitol Police \$286 million, which is \$13.1 million (4 percent) less than requested, but \$20.3 million (8 percent) more than current funding. The Library of Congress is slated to receive \$572.5 million, \$63.8 million (13 percent) more than the current level, but \$89.1 million (13 percent) less than requested. There is \$125.8 million for the Government Printing Office; \$37.8 million for the Congressional Budget Office (CBO); and \$503.3 million in net funding for the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The bill does not contain any earmarks as defined under House rules.

To conclude, Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2771 because it makes the necessary investments for critical health and safety needs by funding security upgrades and addressing health and safety hazards. I support this legislation because it reflects the commitment by the new Democratic majority to increased oversight, accountability and fiscal responsibility.

I thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her fine work in bringing this exceptional

legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, with the understanding that the distinguished Chair from Florida will close, I would like to yield myself 1 minute before yielding the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

I congratulate our chairwoman for just working really hard, having a lot of hearings, digging in, learning a lot, and then finding a way to work together through the process, and I'm grateful.

Also, I want to say, with regard to the GAO issue and outside counsel, using outside counsel is actually commonplace; even the House itself has used it, the legislative branch agencies have used that. And then also to say about the greening of the Capitol issue, what we've heard today should remind us to use great caution because we are all for greening and environmental efficiency, but we need to be careful that the Congress itself is not a guinea pig to try a whole lot of things just to see how they work.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, the former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. WAMP. And I thank the Chair and congratulate both of you on your work for this bill.

I want to say, however, I do not support it. I am very disappointed that after the bill left the Appropriations Committee and went to the Rules Committee, a funny thing happened. All this transparency and all this promise of open government and open rules seemed to fade away in a dark corner room up on the third floor of this building, because there were 23 amendments offered, and yet only three of them were accepted.

We talk about bipartisanship and we talk about sunshine in the process, and yet this is the very bill that basically funds and perhaps even governs our own body, our own congressional branch, and yet it has the closed rule. And 20 amendments won't get the sunshine, will not get the debate because of the Rules Committee under Democrat leadership. I would say you need to go back to your campaign brochures and look at all the promises that you made before you pass another rule like this.

One of the casualties of this closed process was an amendment that I offered that deals with contractors who deal with the Federal Government, who work for the Federal Government. I'll give you some examples. December 2005, 22 Mexican nationals were found illegally working in Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico. January 27, 2001, illegal aliens were found working at Fort Benning, Georgia.

March 2007, the Golden State Fence Company was actually fined because, in building a border security fence, they had hired 10 illegal aliens.

It doesn't stop there. In Louisiana, December 2005, a local company was busted working on a Veterans Administration hospital because they had illegal aliens. This is absurd. Now, I've heard from many people the theme of "leading by example." Perhaps one thing we could do and absolutely should do is require that if you are contracting for the Federal Government, that you have a Social Security verification process going in your business, more than the sham, more than the, Yeah, but we have an I-9 kind of approach that we're seeing. And this would actually say you need to be in the ICE, which is the Customs and Immigration Enforcement Service, you need to be in the ICE Basic Pilot Program, which is a way to know that your employees have correct and legal Social Security numbers. That's all the amendment would have done.

I would predict that this amendment would get lots of bipartisan support because we see that the biggest issue facing America, besides Iraq and perhaps energy, is the issue of illegal immigration. And here was an opportunity for us to make a definitive statement, to have a significant amendment added to the bill, and the Democrats said no.

I hope they'll reconsider on future legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I think it's unfortunate that the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished former chairman of this committee, has chosen this opportunity as a message opportunity, as opposed to working together in a bipartisan way, like the ranking member and I have done, to make sure that we can provide for the safety and security of the facilities of this institution.

He knows full well that the Capitol Visitors Center and the employees of the subcontractors that have been engaged to build that facility, while moving entirely too slowly, and we certainly have decried the cost overruns, are required to hire people who legally may work in this country and are required to ensure that a background check and a security check has been done on them. So his remarks are unfortunate, but everybody makes their own choices.

In conclusion, Madam Chair, I am really proud of the work that the subcommittee and I have engaged in. We offer this legislation to the House and ask for their support. We have endeavored to make sure that this bill is fiscally responsible, provides for the life, safety and security of the needs of the people who work here as well as the people who visit us here, and make sure that we can engage in Congress's oversight role and provide for accountability for the American people.

I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. WAMP from Tennessee on making sure that we can consistently

provide those initiatives for the American people.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express concerns about GAO's response to GAO employees' petition for a union election, which was filed on May 8 of this year. As a legislative branch agency it is imperative that GAO conduct its labor relations in a manner that is a model for all Federal agencies.

I am particularly concerned by GAO's decision to challenge the eligibility of one-third of the employees covered by the union petition. GAO is asserting that these employees are not eligible for representation because they perform a supervisory role.

The facts of their employment status at GAO strongly suggests otherwise. If these employees are in fact determined to be supervisors, then they are supervisors in name only because they are prohibited from performing supervisory functions. Moreover, GAO would have a 1:3 ratio of supervisors to nonsupervisors. That would be one of the smallest ratios in any public or private organization.

I am deeply concerned that GAO's challenge is an attempt to delay balloting until the end of the year, one that will entail a considerable expenditure of resources that will only distract the agency from carrying out critical investigatory and oversight work for the U.S. Congress.

I strongly urge GAO to reconsider its challenge, which will be costly, undermine agency morale, and distract it from its mission.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Chairman, today I rise to express my concerns with Government Accountability Office, GAO, management's response to the GAO employees' petition seeking a union election.

It should be noted that applicable law strictly prohibits the GAO management from expressing any personal view, argument, opinion, or statements relating to a union election except to: publicize election and encourage employees to vote; correct the record with respect to any false or misleading statement; or inform employees of the Government's policy relating to labor-management relations and representation as long as these statements do not contain a threat or reprisal or promise of benefit and are not made under coercive conditions.

Despite these restrictions, Comptroller General Walker was quoted in a January 23, 2007 publication as stating that he "will present to the employees [his] views on the advantages and disadvantages of unionization."

Shortly after this statement was published, attorneys for the union sent a letter advising Comptroller General Walker of his obligation to remain "neutral" during the employees' deliberations regarding unionization.

The GAO's General Counsel responded acknowledging GAO management's legal obligation to maintain strict neutrality during a union organizing campaign.

Further, the Comptroller General met with me shortly before I sent a letter to him regarding his response to the union organizing activities.

In that meeting, the Comptroller General tried to discourage me from sending the letter, and promised not to interfere with the unionization effort. I informed Mr. Walker that I appreciated his assurances but that would be sending the letter all the same.

I have the letter dated February 23rd of this year, and signed by a bipartisan group of 19 House Members and 3 Senators with me and wish to submit it for the RECORD.

I am sorry to say that despite these assurances, and since the union filed the election petition on May 8, 2007, the Comptroller General has made additional statements that are at odds with his obligation to remain neutral.

I am very concerned that I have received reports from GAO employees that Mr. Walker has used his staff meetings to make statements that are seen by employees as a breach of GAO management's neutrality obligation.

For example, they report that Mr. Walker has urged employees to "get all the facts", that a union could "make things different . . . seriously impact agency decision-making", and "slow things down."

He refers to the GAO employees who seek to form a union as a "vocal minority in GAO" and that "[d]ue to union organizing efforts, labor law prevents [him] from helping employees unilaterally. Both of [my] hands are tied due to the union organizing efforts. . ."

By implication, Mr. Walker asserts that if employees reject union-representation, Mr. Walker will "help" them.

Mr. Walker's statements are not neutral. I find it hard to believe that GAO analysts need to be reminded to "get all the facts" and the very purpose of a union is to "impact" the employer's decision-making.

Further, it cannot be clearer that the reference to potentially "slowing things down" is intended as a negative reference about unionization.

I rise today not only to call on Mr. Walker to stop interfering with GAO employees' right to organize and petition for a union election, but to call on my colleagues to stand together with these GAO employees who serve Congress and the public.

Let us do all we can to help these dedicated public servants get a vote on their union election petition this summer.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to add my voice of support to our valued public servants at the Government Accountability Office, GAO. Just as Congress relies on the GAO for the gold standard of fair and even-handed analysis, so too must we ensure that our GAO workforce receives that same standard of fairness and even-handedness when it comes to matters of their own employment.

The issues that gave rise to the language in today's underlying Legislative Branch Appropriations bill are not new to the Government Oversight Committee on which I sit, or to the Federal employee community I am privileged to serve. Like many of my colleagues on the committee, I have received reports expressing concern about the process surrounding the recent Band II Restructuring Project, as well as the methodology used in the 2004 Watson Wyatt Worldwide, WWW, compensation study. In that regard, I am particularly troubled that the WWW study is being cited as the reason over 300 hard-working GAO employees who met or exceeded their performance expectations have been denied annual cost of living adjustments, notwithstanding public commitments to the contrary.

As a majority of GAO analysts have now exercised their employment rights to organize a union, it is critical that the requisite election process go forward expeditiously and without interference. I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to voice my support for the GAO workforce and the rest of our valued Federal employee community.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I want to begin by taking the time to congratulate Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her excellent work on this bill as well as in the subcommittee the past couple of months. It has been a pleasure to work with you and I look forward to working with all other Members as we continue to address the concerns of all people working in and visiting the Nation's Capitol.

I would also like to commend Ranking Member WAMP for his work. Together the chairwoman and ranking member have fostered a collegial bipartisan atmosphere.

The bill before us is a good bill, a bill that brings us necessary security upgrades, that shows a commitment to increased oversight, and does it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Among the bill's many important provisions is funding for the Greening the Capitol Initiative. This initiative will enable us to start switching from coal to cleaner burning natural gas for the running of the Capitol powerplant. Pages live in the shadow of the Capitol powerplant. It will allow us to purchase energy efficient light bulbs, and will allow us to begin other energy savings operations throughout the Capitol Complex.

The bill includes necessary funding for the Office of Compliance, which will allow that office to conduct oversight of the utility tunnel improvement efforts and health and safety issues. During hearings in the subcommittee, I have raised concerns, along with several of my colleagues, about the utility tunnels and workers and I am pleased to see that the Office of Compliance will receive the resources it needs to oversee the ongoing situation.

This bill also includes funding for the Library of Congress and several of its extremely important programs, such as the Books for the Blind Program, which provides services to blind and physically handicapped patrons including the production and distribution of books and magazines in Braille and electronic media.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ranking Member WAMP for the efforts they have put in to the subcommittee this year to ensure that the Capitol Complex and various agencies around us are run well and efficiently.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2771

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 Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$1,198,560,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$23,648,000, including: Office of the