

Whereas the 2010 National Book Festival will be held on the National Mall on September 25, 2010, and will be sponsored and organized by the Library of Congress and supported by Honorary Co-chairs President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the commitment and efforts made by the Library of Congress to promote the joy of reading through the sponsorship of the National Book Festival;

(2) recognizes and emphasizes the important historic and ongoing role of the Library of Congress in organizing and running the National Book Festival; and

(3) encourages all Americans to celebrate the 10th National Book Festival, “A Decade of Words and Wonder”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the National Book Festival. The Library of Congress’ commitment to the spread of knowledge is well-known and so is their unbridled joy of books and reading.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution, along with all the members of the Committee on House Administration, and would like to congratulate the Library of Congress on another highly successful National Book Festival and laud their continued efforts to spread the joy and wonder of reading.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1646. I was privileged to be the main sponsor of this, but this is one of those unique bills where every single member of the committee, Democrat and Republican, sponsored it. That is not unusual in the sense that the goal of this bill is to celebrate one of the greatest gifts we can give to our children; that is, the gift of reading.

The first Library of Congress National Book Festival was held on September 8, 2001, so this year it celebrates its 10th anniversary with another highly attended, all-day event and remarkable panoply of authors. The National Book Festival has only grown in popularity over this last decade, and this year’s estimate is that over 150,000 individuals attended the 2010 festival this past Saturday.

The festival highlights and demonstrates the importance of literacy, creativity, and imagination in our schools, our young people, and throughout our society. The festival vividly brings to life the richness of books and fosters a lifelong love of reading.

So we congratulate the Library of Congress for its achievements in hosting the festival and wish them continued success. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the actions of the House of Representatives in recognizing the commitment and efforts made by the Library of Congress to promote the joy of reading through the National Book Festival. I support the Library of Congress in its efforts to promote and foster the joy of reading.

On September 25, 2010, the Library of Congress held its tenth National Book Festival on the National Mall. President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama served as the honorary chairs for this event. The National Book Festival invites readers from around the nation to celebrate books, reading, and creativity. It gives attendees from across the country the opportunity to visit with more than 70 award-winning authors who will talk about and sign their books. Over the past ten years, the National Book Festival has grown in popularity. Last year, it brought more than 130,000 book lovers, including those from my home state of Georgia, to the National Mall.

As the resolution states, the National Book Festival is a national treasure that fosters the joy of reading. Even in this modern digital age, reading has a host of benefits. Reading develops our creativity, broadens our interests, and introduces us to new things and different parts of the world. I am proud that Georgia was represented at the National Book Festival, along with all 50 states and the District of Columbia, at the Pavilion of the States where representatives were able to discuss and distribute materials about Georgia’s reading and literacy programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I’m pleased to join with my colleague in recognizing the successful annual book festival. It did set a new attendance record, and we’re delighted and we look forward to next year.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1646.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 2010

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 512) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 512

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Election Integrity Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) chief State election administration officials have served on political campaigns for Federal candidates whose elections those officials will supervise;

(2) such partisan activity by the chief State election administration official, an individual charged with certifying the validity of an election, represents a fundamental conflict of interest that may prevent the official from ensuring a fair and accurate election;

(3) this conflict impedes the legal duty of chief State election administration officials to supervise Federal elections, undermines the integrity of Federal elections, and diminishes the people’s confidence in our electoral system by casting doubt on the results of Federal elections;

(4) the Supreme Court has long recognized that Congress’s power to regulate Congressional elections under Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Constitution is both plenary and powerful; and

(5) the Supreme Court and numerous appellate courts have recognized that the broad power given to Congress over Congressional elections extends to Presidential elections.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319 the following new section:

“CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

“SEC. 319A. (a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a chief State election administration official to take an active part in political management or in a political campaign with respect to any election for Federal office over which such official has supervisory authority.

“(b) CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL.—The term ‘chief State election administration official’ means the highest State official with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections under State law.

“(c) ACTIVE PART IN POLITICAL MANAGEMENT OR IN A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.—The term ‘active part in political management or in a political campaign’ means—

“(1) serving as a member of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office;

“(2) the use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election for Federal office;

“(3) the solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of a contribution from any person on behalf of a candidate for Federal office; and

“(4) any other act which would be prohibited under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 7323(b) of title 5, United States Code, if taken by an individual to whom such paragraph applies (other than any prohibition on running for public office).

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR CAMPAIGNS OF OFFICIAL OR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section does not apply to a chief State election administration official with respect to an election for Federal office in which the official or an immediate family member of the official is a candidate.

“(2) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate, a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held after December 2010.

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2010.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 512 offers each Member of this body the opportunity to help Americans feel confident that their electoral process is fair and their interests are protected. This legislation that we’re considering today would take the long overdue step of prohibiting chief election officials from playing a leadership role in the political campaigns of Federal candidates and elections over which they have supervisory authority, and that includes using their name, serving on a campaign committee, fundraising, or using their official office to interfere or affect the results of an election.

When I introduced this in the last Congress, they gave us the number H.R. 101. Well, I thought that was pretty fitting because this bill is so basic you could call it Election Officiating 101, and as any novice knows, when the outcome of a contest is determined by judges, steps are taken to ensure that the judging is impartial so that everyone involved knows that the contest is fair, that they have confidence in the results, and that they want to participate. To actively support one side and to be a judge is unthinkable in every kind of competition I can think of, except, Mr. Speaker, one, our elections, the most important contest in our country.

It’s right. Under current law—people probably are surprised by this. Under current law, the chief election official, the person who actually is certifying the final validity of the results, can be actively backing a side by giving a candidate money or other support. It is the equivalent of a person being a player and referee at the same time. In sports, everyone knows who the refs are because they wear the stripes. In elections, the officials can actually run plays on the field and blow the whistle, all while wearing team jerseys and being head of the booster club.

□ 2020

The election official may be and probably is—I would suspect mostly is making the right calls. But it doesn’t look unbiased, and it certainly doesn’t inspire confidence in the system and in the results.

As a former president of the League of Women Voters in San Diego and a proud American voter myself, I know that election officials are entrusted with a crucial responsibility for our democracy. Their only allegiance must be to the will of the voters, not to partisan political agendas or special interests.

Americans are craving good government solutions to problems facing our country, and this legislation is just that. Congress should not wait for another Florida or Ohio before passing a bill that should not be a partisan fight. In fact, this isn’t a partisan issue. It’s an issue of preserving the American people’s faith and the integrity of our democracy. This bill will finally close the door on inherent conflict of interest. It certainly won’t solve everything, but it will help prevent future controversies.

Those who want to oppose this bill can come up with all kinds of excuses for their position. But let’s be clear: A vote against this bill is a vote for allowing those who certify our elections to fund-raise and rally for candidates of their choice. If you want our elections to appear tainted, then go ahead and vote against this bill. But if you think election officials should join Federal judges in restraining from political activity, then I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this bill.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I’m sorry that after the wonderful bipartisanship on the last vote today I have to rise in opposition to H.R. 512.

When I heard the gentlelady talking about the analogy to a football referee having a conflict with a team playing, I was reminded of the game I saw this last weekend where unfortunately my alma mater, Notre Dame, didn’t do too well against a Pac-10 team with Pac-10 referees. As a matter of fact, there was one case where it was clear that the

fallback for Stanford didn’t even come close to making a first down, and yet with some myopic vision, they were given a first down. But I would not suggest there was a conflict there. The way we played, we would have lost anyway.

I would just say that we should proceed with great caution before depriving any individual State official or non-State official of their full rights as citizens to participate in the electoral process. Unfortunately, I feel the majority has preceded with H.R. 512 without adequate justification. The bill does prohibit the chief State election administrator from taking an active role in a political campaign of any Federal office.

And while this bill places significant restrictions on the ability of secretaries of State to participate in the political process, it does so, in my judgment, without producing any justification why such a drastic action is warranted. Restricting secretaries of State from their First Amendment right to speak without any history of abuse is a dangerous precedent this House should not undertake.

I notice that in the bill before us, we have exceptions. That is, if the secretary of State is himself or herself running for Federal office, they continue to be the secretary of State and the chief election officer. The analogy that was drawn between this situation and a Federal judge is an inept analogy because, I believe, under the canons of ethics a Federal judge cannot run for another Federal office while still occupying the position of Federal judge. Also, if an immediate family member is running for Federal office, the election officer of the State is not prohibited.

It would seem to me that if you are going to argue for this bill on the basis of a conflict of interest, why do you exempt the greatest conflict of interest that there would be? That is, if the election officer is running for a Federal office, she is allowed to do so and continue to be the chief election officer. If one of her immediate family members is running, she—or he—is allowed to continue to participate fully in all of that election process.

Now, if, in fact, the concern of the majority is that there is a conflict of interest, it is interesting that what most people would consider to be the greatest example of a conflict of interest is not covered here. Now I will listen to the majority as they tell us why that happens. Perhaps it is what we call that difficult truth. The Constitution might come into play here. But I would just wonder why, if they are going to say this is absolutely necessary and that any of us vote against it must want conflicts of interest, must wish that we have this cloud over our elections to exist, why those situations which would seem to be the greatest opportunity for that concern are specifically exempted under the terms of this bill.

We can all agree that if someone is breaking the law and abusing their power to try to skew elections, they should be prosecuted accordingly. If, for instance, someone is standing outside a polling place with a billy club in his hand and is making threatening gestures to people as they come before him, have to pass by him to vote, and this person has had a record of saying that “crackers’ babies ought to be killed” and stands on the street corner condemning racially mixed couples, but yet we have a Justice Department which says that that doesn’t violate any laws.

Maybe I would be a little more concerned about the bill before us if I found any evidence whatsoever of the other side being concerned about the New Black Panther Party standing there all dressed in black with a billy club as people come forward, and one of the two individuals is known as someone who has made those kinds of threats against somebody else merely because they are of another race.

Now if we want to bring that forward, I think we could get a strong vote of support here. But we can’t even get a hearing on that. We haven’t heard a thing from our Judiciary Committee. It’s more important to bring Steve Colbert to testify before our committee, for him to remain in character. Maybe we ought to bring one of those New Black Panthers to our committee and have him in character, as he was on the day of election. Maybe then we would be getting down to our concern for equal treatment of each and every voter in America.

But when you have a Justice Department which decides they are not going to treat people equally based on their race, as was testified to last week, last Friday at the same time on the same day as Mr. Colbert was gracing us with his presence in our Judiciary Committee, and where we had this rush, this tremendous rush of cameras to cover him, yet we have very little coverage of the amazingly cogent testimony about terrible decisions that were made in the Justice Department in the voting rights section of the Civil Rights Division. That ought to be what we take our time discussing here.

I’m not trying to denigrate the gentlelady’s efforts here. I understand her sincerity in this bill. We have a dispute over whether this bill is the proper response to the situation she sees. But I find it very, very interesting that we can find time to bring comedians to Washington, D.C., to testify before committees, but we can’t find the time with the committees of jurisdiction to investigate what appears to be an absolute disgrace with respect to the protection of individuals.

I would just ask this question: If instead of the New Black Panther Party

you had had there, you had had the New Klux Klan party dressed in white robes with billy clubs, standing in front of a voting place with both blacks and whites coming in, whether we would not have raised our voices in protest against that and demanded that the full extent of the law be brought against those people.

□ 2030

But, no, we find ourselves too busy doing other things, too busy doing other things, bringing comedians to Washington, DC and forgetting about something taking place at that exact moment, where a career attorney in the Justice Department, who has been banished to some hinterland—I don’t mean to say that. That might be someone’s State that someone here represents. I apologize—who has been sent a way from main Justice and the basic responsibility he has had for protecting the rights of citizens and their votes, where he has testified, and yet we couldn’t spend the time to pay attention to him, nor have we scheduled any hearings whatsoever in this Congress. Something is wrong.

So I don’t in any way suggest the gentlelady had anything to do with that or that this bill interferes with it. I am trying to show the contrast of what I happen to think is an immediate problem, as opposed to the potential problem that the gentlelady here has spoken about.

It is an immediate problem when you have a situation with people with billy clubs standing in front of a voting poll with a reputation for having talked about the fact that people need to kill babies for the very reason that they happen to be of another race. That ought to outrage Americans. It ought to outrage every one of us here, and it ought to outrage everybody at the Justice Department, but thus far it has not.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is really interesting to me because one of the first things I think my colleague said was that this was somehow drastic legislation. And yet he went on to go out and think about how he might expand it.

Well, I appreciate the issues that he is referring to. Those are issues that, in fact, the Justice Department is looking at, a number of allegations that they are looking at.

But that is not part of this bill. And I go back and I ask my colleague, please read the bill. The bill talks about an active part that a chief State election official might take in political management or in a political campaign, which means serving as a member of an authorized committee of a

candidate for Federal office, or the use of official authority, official authority to influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election for Federal office.

That is a very different situation than what my colleague is referring to. And he seems to be concerned about the Secretaries of State. I respect them greatly. A lot of them support this bill. Some of them don’t. I am not sure I understand why they don’t, because what we are doing here is talking about not them so much as the voters. It is about the voters. And the most important thing is that voters trust that elections are fair.

And my colleague would suggest that maybe there shouldn’t be any rules; but I think we do have some rules, and it is important that we have them. We have them for judges as well.

So I think we need to understand what is in this bill. It is not solving all the problems that have been raised, but it is solving a very important one for voters. And they do need to feel, and we saw it happen in our history, in our pretty recent history, that it is an issue for people. It should be.

Why shouldn’t people be concerned that their State official person who is overseeing, who is supervising elections doesn’t have a bias that is quite clear?

Mr. Speaker, many years ago I was very active with the League of Women Voters. And one of the rules is, if you are a key official, a vice president overseeing the election process for that organization, for the community, or a president, that you don’t get involved in political activity. That is one of the rules. I thought it was a great rule, and I was very happy to adhere to it.

This gets to be serious business because we have people out in the streets and we know that because they were concerned about this issue. So I think this is important. It is very narrowly drawn, of course, and it should be. And I would certainly hope that my colleagues would really take a serious look at this because we need to ensure that voters trust the election. That is what this is about. And I believe that they have every right, and we have every right to make certain that that judgment is there, and that there is nothing that gets in the way between the voters and the political process.

Remember, these are Federal elections. And article I, section 4 of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, the place and the manner of holding Federal elections. This is in our purview. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 512, as amended.

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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NOTICE
Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 512, the Federal Election Integrity Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 512, THE FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 2010, AS PROVIDED TO CBO BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—													
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2015	2010-2020	
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT														
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

^aH.R. 512 would amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit any chief state election administration official from taking part in the political management or campaign for any federal office, except under specified circumstances. Enacting the legislation could affect federal revenues by increasing the collections of fines for violations of the law. Such collections are recorded in the budget as revenues and in certain cases, may be spent without further appropriation. CBO estimates that any additional revenues and direct spending would be insignificant because of the small number of anticipated violations.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 3421, the Medical Debt Relief Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3421, THE MEDICAL DEBT RELIEF ACT OF 2010, AS TRANSMITTED TO CBO ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2015	2010-2020
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

^aH.R. 3421 would prohibit credit reporting agencies from listing certain medical debts in consumer credit reports. Enacting the bill could increase the collection of civil penalties and this could affect federal revenues; CBO estimates that those amounts would not be significant.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, after consultation with the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, and on behalf of both of us, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR A DRAFT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONCURRENCE BY THE HOUSE IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3619, THE COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010, WITH AMENDMENTS, AS PROVIDED TO CBO BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2015	2010-2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

^aTitle VI of H.R. 3619 would authorize the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) to extend certain expiring marine licenses, certificates of registry, and merchant mariners' documents. Because the extension could delay the collection of fees charged for renewal of such documents, enacting this provision could reduce offsetting receipts over the next year or two. Some of those receipts may be spent without further appropriation, however, to cover collection costs. CBO estimates that the net effect on direct spending from enacting this provision would be insignificant. Title X of the legislation would establish new criminal and civil penalties. CBO estimates that any new revenues resulting from those penalties or related direct spending (of criminal penalties from the Crime Victims Fund) would be less than \$500,000 a year. Other provisions of H.R. 3619 would direct the USCG to donate certain real and personal property to local governments or other nonfederal entities. CBO expects that, under current law, nearly all of that property would either be retained by the USCG or eventually given to other federal or nonfederal entities; therefore, donating those assets under the legislation would result in no significant loss of offsetting receipts.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 4168, the Algae-based Renewable Fuel Promotion Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 4168, THE ALGAE-BASED RENEWABLE FUEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2010, AS TRANSMITTED TO CBO ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2015	2010-2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

^aH.R. 4168 would allow certain algae-based renewable fuels to qualify for the cellululosic biofuel tax credit, and would make the production facilities of those fuels eligible for the bonus depreciation allowed to cellululosic fuel facilities. The staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the effect of these changes on federal revenues would be insignificant in any year and over the 2010-2020 period.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 4337, the Regulated Investment Company Modernization Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.