United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2009 No. 30

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 13, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

To open the Bible, Lord, and just read a few lines offers such consolation. The message may not be advice or command an action. It is just rewarding to know You are not silent. You have words to speak. I simply need to take the time, open the Book, and listen.

If I open my heart and listen intently, I can hear Your love behind every word. I sense Your presence, and it is enough for me. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KUCINICH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

VOTE FOR THE STIMULUS

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, we learned today that more Americans are applying for jobless benefits. We also learned that, according to Moody's Economy.com, that the measure that is before us may not create as many jobs as we had hoped, perhaps only 2.2 million jobs by the end of 2010, leaving unemployment hovering around 10 percent.

Look, I understand the limitations of this bill, but we have to recognize something: Government spending is stimulative. We have to stimulate our economy. We have to do everything we can right now to try to lift America up.

Now we can debate the details of this bill, and they should be debated, but one thing for sure, we need to pass this stimulus. And we are probably going to have to come back here and pass another stimulus, which I hope will focus on putting millions of people back to work, rebuilding America, rebuilding and building a new energy infrastructure, and making massive investments and moving our health care system in a new direction. Vote for the stimulus.

SAMMY MAHAN: ''OPT ME OUT''

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this morning I was talking to my friend Sammy Mahan. He is from Baytown, Texas. He is a wrecker driver, and has five wreckers under his service. He was asking me about the stimulus bill. And he said, ''How are we going to pay for it?'' And I said, ''Well, we don't have the money, so we are probably going to have to borrow it maybe from the Chinese. Eventually there is going to be a tax increase.''

And he said, ''How much is it going to cost?'' And I said, ''$790 billion.'' Then he said, ''No. How much is it going to cost me?'' I said, ''It is about $10,000 per family, is what they say.''

Then he said, ''Well, I don't have $10,000; and unlike you government boys, I can't spend money I don't have. So I want you to opt me out of this deal.'' And I said, ''What do you mean, 'opt me out'?'' He replied, ''Give me a form. I want to sign it. You take $10,000 off that $790 billion, and I don't want to pay it because I don't have the money.''

Madam Speaker, I suspect that if most Americans read this bill and they realized how much it was going to cost them personally, they would want to opt out of this deal. We need to come up with a plan, but this isn't the deal. And since people I represent can't opt out, I am going to opt out for them.

And that's just the way it is.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PACKAGE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last month the unemployment rate increased from 7.2 percent to 7.6 percent. If these increases continue, we will hit double digits this summer and would

Printed on recycled paper.

reach our highest unemployment number since the Great Depression. But this unemployment number does not tell the complete story.

Last month alone, 731,000 people simply gave up looking for work out of frustration with the lack of employment prospects, and today 13.9 percent of Americans, or more than 21 million of our neighbors, have either given up looking for a job or are working in a job that is no longer full time. These workers are underemployed.

These numbers are a stark reminder of how important it is for us to get these people back to work, and that is why we need to pass the economic recovery package today without delay.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to create or save 3.5 million jobs. Let's do the right thing and get these people back to work.

THE JOBS BILL HAS TURNED INTO A SPENDING BILL

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, a couple of months ago, the talk from congressional leadership was to produce legislation that was about providing jobs for America's families and small businesses, with lots of opportunities for our needed investments.

Sadly, what was supposed to be a jobs bill has turned into a spending bill that is going to provide about a $7.70 tax break for workers while adding $9,400 of debt, plus or minus some, with interest, for each family that is going to have to be paid by our children and grandchildren. I think if you have got one person working in that family, it is going to take a few years of saving up all those tax credits in order to pay for this bill.

Plus, unfortunately, we still never got guarantees that the billions of dollars worth of automobiles, buses, furniture, computers, and everything else here even has to be made in the United States of America. I am not very happy about that, and I don't think Americans should be, either.

RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, we just can't ignore the facts. The facts are, we lost 600,000 jobs last month and the prior month and the prior month, and some 3.6 million jobs last year. Banks have failed. We have had a real contraction in the economy. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, their position is, ''Just say no. We like the status quo.''

We can't afford the status quo anymore, ladies and gentlemen. We must act. This is a time for bold action, and in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act we will maintain or create somewhere between 3 million and 4 million jobs in the construction industry and the energy industry; we will maintain jobs of teachers and firefighters and policemen. We will pass this bill today in the House of Representatives, and I am glad, because in Colorado we need this effort, we need these jobs, and so does the rest of the Nation.

KEEP OUR COMMITMENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. COLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask that we all uphold the honor of the House and keep our commitment to the American people.

Less than 3 days ago, my good friend and colleague, Mr. LEWIS of California, asked this House to instruct our conferees not to record their approval of the conference agreement on the stimulus bill until the text of that agreement had been made available in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 48 hours. That motion passed unanimously.

Essentially, we gave our word, the word of the people's House, to all Americans, guaranteeing them that they would have ample opportunity to review this proposed legislation.

This bill was filed last night. It is over 1,000 pages long. And, with the exception of omnibus legislation, it is the largest spending bill this House has ever considered. Madam Speaker, I must confess, I haven't had time to read the legislation; my staff hasn't had time to read the legislation; I doubt my colleagues have had time to read the legislation; and, most importantly, the American people have had no time to read the legislation.

So now, less than 10 hours since we could first see this 1,000-page bill, we are poised to break our commitment to the American people and to pass this legislation with little or no time to even read it.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, one of the attributes of this economic recovery plan is it is not based on yesterday; it is based on tomorrow.

It is not your grandmother's recovery plan where we just built asphalt and concrete; it is built on the new high-tech green collar jobs that can truly give us a prolonged burst of economic recovery. And that is why, when I vote for this today, I am going to be proud that we are launching a new Apollo clean energy project to give this country the thousands of green collar jobs, to start selling high-tech clean energy products to China, to start making lithium ion batteries so that we can make electric cars right here in America and start selling them across the world. And I hope some of my brethren across the aisle will not vote against research so we can find a way to burn coal cleanly, against research to make electric cars more affordable to Americans, against research to make our houses more efficient.

This is a plan to start an economic energy revolution. We should pass it and be proud of it today.

VOTE ''NO'' ON THE STIMULUS BILL

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, buried in the stimulus bill that we will be voting on today is a provision that will gut the welfare reform measures that the Congress passed in 1996. The legislation will move us down a path that will take us away from welfare reform that required work, training, and education in exchange for benefits, back to the old system that says to single young women that, as long as you don't get married, don't get a job, and keep having children, that we will continue to subsidize you at taxpayers' expense.

The old system that this legislation moves us to kept generations of American families in poverty, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the stimulus bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 168

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the conference report are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. The conference report shall be considered as read. All points of order against the conference report are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against this resolution because the resolution is in violation of section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution before us violates the provisions of 426(a) because it contains a waiver of all points of order against the conference report, including a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which prohibits the consideration of a conference report in violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

We got this 1,000-page package online after midnight, totally in violation of the 48-hour commitment that was made by every Member to support that period of time during which it could be read; and we have no idea, Madam Speaker, as to whether or not there are in fact unfunded mandates in this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Colorado each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying I see my friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) here. It was announced late last night when we were in the Rules Committee that the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, would be managing this rule; and I can only surmise that she is not here due to the very tragic news that we got overnight of the loss of 48 lives in the Continental plane crash that took place just outside of Buffalo.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Yes, I am happy to the yield to my friend.

□ 0915

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes, the plane crash is why she is not here today. And it is a tragedy that we all feel this morning.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what I wanted to say. As we begin this debate, our thoughts and prayers go to all of the victims and the families and Mrs. SLAUGHTER whom I know is dealing with that issue, Madam Speaker.

Let me say, as we now focus on this very, very important debate, we had a unanimous vote here in the House, a unanimous vote, that called for 48 hours to be provided for Members of Congress and the American people to see this measure before we would have a chance to vote on it. We all know, as Speaker PELOSI said yesterday, that this is both transformational and historic. And for that reason, I believe that if we have a measure before us that is historic and transformational, we should comply with the vote that was cast by every single Member who was present at the time saying that 48 hours should be provided. And unfortunately, there was virtually no time provided. We had a copy of the bill placed before us in the Rules Committee very late last night. And it is my understanding that the online measure at that point, which was touted by Members who were in the Rules Committee, actually omitted three sections of the bill and that it was not placed online as we're going to be voting on it today until after midnight; after midnight. So that means earlier this morning is when it was placed online.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have a statement here from our good friend, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER, who said, ''The House is scheduled to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow and is expected to proceed directly to consideration of the American Recovery and Reinvestment conference report. The conference report text will be filed this evening, giving Members enough time to review the conference report before voting on it tomorrow afternoon.''

Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting. We are going through one of the most difficult economic challenges that we've faced in modern history. There is no doubt about it. In fact, if one looks at the economic downturn, we suffered in 1991 and 2001 very, very shallow economic recessions. The early 1980s was the last time we faced a challenge as difficult as the one we are in the midst of today. We have put forward a very pro-growth economic package that I know that the American people would be able to support. And I'm convinced, based on the empirical evidence that we have of what took place in 1961 and 1981, it would unleash the potential of the American people, because we are the most productive worker on the face of the Earth. We are the people who are the most innovative in the world. And for us to, in any way, constrain that growth potential is, I believe, wrong.

And what we have before us is a 1,000-page bill. This is 1,000 pages, Madam Speaker. And I'm reminded when Ronald Reagan was delivering a State of the Union message when he held up a document that was just about like this, and he dropped it right there on the lectern. And he said that he would never sign anything like that again. And here we are on Friday the 13th of 2009, we are in the midst of considering a measure following a campaign that promised transparency, disclosure, accountability and hope. And as we listened to the debate last night in the Rules Committee, which went on for quite a while, I have to say that there is a lot of hope involved in this 1,000-page bill. But there are things about it that we know. It is approaching $1 trillion when you take interest in consideration. I know it is $790 billion, but when you take into consideration the interest that will be shouldered, it is a $1 trillion package. We know that.

The hope is that people are saying it is this or nothing else, Madam Speaker, this or nothing else. And I have got to tell you that that is not the case. That is not the case. We, as Republicans, have come forward with a package from our economic stimulus working group which I believe would prevent us from having to deal with anything like this whatsoever. And the point of order that I'm raising, Madam Speaker, has to do with the fact that we don't know what is in here. I don't think that anyone knows whether or not there are unfunded mandates in here that have been imposed on the private sector, on the American people, or on local governments.

And so with that, I would like to, at this juncture, reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Technically, this point of order is about whether or not to consider the rule and ultimately the underlying bill. But we know what it is really about, and that is about trying to block the bill without any opportunity for debate and without any opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the legislation itself. And that is just plain wrong.

I sincerely hope my colleagues will vote ''yes'' so we can consider this critical legislation today on its merits and not kill it on a procedural motion. We have a long day ahead. Let's not waste any more time on trying to stop this legislation from being debated or enacted. Those who oppose the bill can vote against it on final passage. That is their prerogative. We must consider this rule, and we must pass this conference report for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act today.

I have the right to close. But in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to consider the rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on the debate on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, procedure is important. Procedure rules are important because they are placed there for a reason. This House unanimously voted that there should be 48 hours after a bill is filed before we voted on it. The

reason for that is to give us time to read it. It is unconscionable that we would vote on a 1,000-page bill without at least reading the bill. But we didn't get 48 hours. I guess the motion really meant 4 to 8 hours, because that is all we've really received, 4 to 8 hours to decide whether or not to proceed.

We need more time to read the bill. Let's stay here until tomorrow or Sunday or Monday. But let's read the bill, regardless of our position on it, and then we can be knowledgeable to vote on this $1-trillion package one way or the other. The idea that we're going to vote on a bill we haven't read because we didn't get time to do it is absurd, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say this saddens me greatly. President Obama has come forward and talked about the issue of transparency, disclosure and accountability, and he has talked about hope, and he has talked about change. And we've all been very inspired by the words of President Obama. And we've been inspired by many of his actions and his effort to reach out and work with us in a bipartisan way to deal with the challenge of getting our economy back on track. It is something that I believe is terrific. It's wonderful. And it's what is needed at this time.

But I will say, Madam Speaker, that as we look at what has been put before us, a 1,000-page bill, and we are told by so many that if we don't vote for this bill, we're choosing to do nothing, in fact, I will say that I did not like it when the President said that there are some out there who want to do nothing. And Madam Speaker, I will say that I know of no Republican, no Democrat, I know of no one in this country who wants to do nothing. Because just the other night when I had a telephone town hall meeting and listened to a number of people, including a small contractor, a small businessman who is a building contractor, having trouble getting access to credit so that he can get to work, I was struck with the fact that he told me, looking at a $1-trillion measure is not only not going to help him, but in fact, it will exacerbate, it will worsen the challenges that he has. We talked about our alternative.

In fact, in this town hall meeting, Madam Speaker, one of my constituents asked me at the outset to support President Obama and his package. And when I began explaining the difficulty with this package and the alternative that we have that is focused on small businesses, entrepreneurs, the self-employed and families across this country, focusing on marginal rate reduction, focusing on encouraging responsibility so that people can gain equity in their homes by incentivizing them to make a greater down payment on that home and to take up the inventory that exists there, as I walked through these provisions, this person who began saying to me that it was imperative that I support this package then said, your alternative makes much more sense.

And so, Madam Speaker, I want to disabuse any of my colleagues of this notion that we want to do nothing. We very much want to work diligently to ensure that we can get our economy back on track. And we have a pro-growth package which is modeled after what John F. Kennedy did in 1961 and what Ronald Reagan did in 1981.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, again I want to urge a ''yes'' vote so that we can consider this rule and consider the legislation today. It is not a time for delay. It is not a time for inaction. For 8 years, we've had continued deferred maintenance, we've had continued problems in the economy to the point we are now required to move forward and move forward in a bold way. That is the purpose of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It has been discussed and debated over the course of the last month in full view of the American people. And it is time to take it up here in the Congress and pass it.

And with that I urge a ''yes'' on the consideration of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded for consideration of the rule is for debate only.

And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 168.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, America is in a tough spot today. Today we face one of the greatest economic challenges we've seen in the history of this Nation. With this great economic crisis comes great responsibility for this body which is vested to represent the best interests of the American people. Madam Speaker, the Bush administration left us with the worst economy we've faced since World War II. Like President Franklin D. Roosevelt did over 75 years ago, we must build a floor under our economic downward spiral and set America on a new, more prosperous course.

Since this recession began, 3.6 million Americans have lost their jobs. Last month alone, the country lost nearly 600,000 jobs, the equivalent of losing every job in the State of Maine. Even more troubling is the news that our Nation is expected to lose another 3 to 5 million jobs within the next year if we don't take action now. And it must be taken now. In fact, 2008 was the worst year for job loss since 1945, while unemployment has skyrocketed to the highest level in 26 years.

Madam Speaker, Americans are worried. Nothing is on the minds of American workers and families more than the troubled state of our economy.

□ 0930

At dinner tables across this Nation, American families are concerned, not only about our country's economy, but about their own futures and their own well-being. Will they have a job next week? Will they be able to retire when they plan to? Will they be able to afford their mortgage? Can they sell their house? What about the rent and the child's education?

We must act now to turn things around. If nothing is done, our economy will continue its downward spiral, jeopardizing the futures of all Americans.

As President Roosevelt once said, ''In our seeking for economic and political progress, we all go up, or else we all go down.''

And, Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues here today determined to make sure that all Americans go up, each and every one of us. We are here to take swift, bold action to boost our economy and put Americans back to work. Our actions today may determine the prosperity and well-being of Americans for generations to come.

This compromise of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is a major victory for the American people. It will help strengthen our economy and help Americans hurt by this recession today, as well as investing in our shared future.

This bill will create and save nearly 4 million jobs, jump-start our economy, and bring the process of transforming it for the 21st century with carefully targeted priority investments. We will also provide immediate direct tax relief to over 95 percent of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, for our future, we will significantly increase clean, renewable energy production, invest in a new smart power grid, put people to work in the short-term, while freeing us from our dependence on foreign oil in the long run.

We'll renovate buildings and homes to make them more energy efficient, and create jobs that can't be sent overseas, while helping to curb global warming at the same time. We will rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and improve our roads, bridges, and schools, and in doing so, we will strengthen our path forward.

We will invest in our health care system, cutting red tape and ensuring broader coverage, while saving countless lives and dollars.

Finally, this legislation will assist those who have been impacted most by

this crisis, by increasing food stamp and unemployment benefits, and making it easier for those who lose their jobs to keep their health insurance. These are just a few highlights of this comprehensive bill.

Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting and they demand action. But they are also justifiably concerned about government spending in such difficult times. I want them to know that this bill contains strict transparency and accountability measures. It is open and visible and will be for people to look on the Web for each dollar that is spent. Americans will be able to go on-line to see how their tax dollars are being spent and provide comment.

The bill contains no earmarks, and provides important protections to State whistleblowers who report fraud and abuse.

Furthermore, this legislation does not waste any time. It will immediately help put people to work, maintain their jobs, and begin to stabilize our economy. Just this week the CEO of Google said his company would ''absolutely'' hire new people if we pass this bill.

Additionally, economists and elected officials from across the ideological spectrum have broadly endorsed this bill, and beseech us to pass it, because they agree we need bold action to turn our economy around.

President Roosevelt told us that ''One thing is sure, we have to do something. We have to do the best we know how at the moment. If it doesn't turn out right, we can modify it as we go along.''

Madam Speaker, it took us many years to get into this situation. We know this bill alone will not solve all of our economic woes overnight. We know that the road back to economic stability and prosperity will require hard work over time. But this bill is the right size and scope necessary to truly help us turn things around. I'm proud to say that America has faced great challenges before and turned crisis into opportunity.

This legislation gives us the means to address this crisis immediately, and the opportunity to build the foundation for long-term prosperity. Like it has in the past, the ingenuity of American workers will be the engine of growth and prosperity if we just give them a chance to get back on the job.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and, by doing so, restore confidence, strengthen our economy, and ensure a brighter future for our citizens from coast to coast.

I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to begin by expressing my great appreciation to my friend from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Let me begin, as I did at the outset of the debate on the unfunded mandate point of order, Madam Speaker, by saying that we are all saddened with the very tragic news that Ms. SLAUGHTER and her constituents have faced with the tragic plane crash which has taken place just outside of Buffalo with, reportedly, 48 people killed, and our thoughts and prayers continue to be with all of them.

Let me say, at the beginning of this, Madam Speaker, I asked my friend who's managing this rule to yield to me, because I find it—I will associate myself with many of the points that he made. I will associate myself with certainly his closing remarks about the ability of the United States of America to take on great challenges that we face.

But, Madam Speaker, to stand here and somehow talk about the great degree of transparency, when we, at midnight, were sitting in the Rules Committee, and the questions being posed to us could not be answered; that we were posing could not be answered, number one. And number two, we had before us a bill that we were told was exactly what the gentleman had said, made available on-line so that the American people could see it, and then I arrived just a few hours later, had come in early this morning to find that the measure was not even available on-line until well after midnight because three sections of the bill were, in fact, missing.

And so, my point is that we all know how much pain there is right now across this country. When you look at the people who have lost their jobs, if you look at people who are losing their homes, if you look at the tragic loss of life that is taking place, I talked to a good friend of mine yesterday who told me that his son's best friend's father had just committed suicide because of the economic downturn that we are facing.

Madam Speaker, we know how personal this is. We know how terrible the situation that we face is. And that's why I believe that the commitment that has been made overwhelmingly, across the board, by Democrats and Republicans alike, that we would spend time deliberating over this issue to ensure that we get it right, that we would work in a bipartisan way, as President Obama repeatedly has promised, from his inaugural address right here on the west front of the Capitol to speech after speech that he's delivered, and through many of his actions.

Now, last night, as we sat approaching midnight in the Rules Committee, my very good friend, the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations was before us, talking about the fact that every single day, since the election, save two, he and members of his staff have been working to try and put this bill together. He referred to the fact that members of his staff, for the second time in a week or two, have gone 2 days without any sleep, working to put this bill together.

We all understand, Madam Speaker, the urgency that is there. No one wants to delay action. No one wants to delay action on this very important bill because of the fact that the American people are hurting.

But we do know this: What we've been able to see in this measure, in fact, goes way beyond the goal that is stated, that being stimulating our economy. We understand that important infrastructure spending cannot only play an important role in creating jobs, but it also can deal with the very important issue of goods movement, ensuring that our constituents are able to move around. We know that the grid and broadband infrastructure development is critical if we are going to remain competitive in this global marketplace. And yet, that is a very small fraction of this nearly $1 trillion measure, Madam Speaker.

Now, as we listened to the testimony that was delivered in the Rules Committee, an exchange took place between the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations and our new Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). And in that exchange, the question that was asked by Ms. FOXX was, how many jobs are going to be created by this measure?

And I congratulate the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations for pointing to the fact that he has no idea how many jobs are going to be created. And he correctly said that we can all find our own economists who support the notion of a certain number of jobs being created.

Now, I will say that the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Christina Romer, under President Obama, has, based on her study, found that the alternative proposal that we Republicans offered would create nearly twice as many jobs in half the amount of time than this package that is before us. So using one of his economists, Madam Speaker, I will say it buttresses our argument to ensure that we put into place our package for commission growth, as opposed to a massive spending bill.

So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said he has no idea how many jobs are going to be created.

And what is it that we have before us? We have before us a package that is indicative of what I describe as the ideological baggage of the past. It is nothing but throwing money at the problem, without the kind of oversight that is necessary, without the kind of scrutiny that is necessary.

And as my friend from Texas, Judge POE, said earlier, one of his constituents wants to opt out of this plan because the estimates are that it will cost $10,000 per family. Well, unfortunately, that's not an option that we have before us right now, because this is the measure that people are going to be voting on and I suspect will pass.

I believe that it's a mistake. I believe it's a mistake, and I will tell you who

else I believe if he were alive would conclude that it's a mistake. And we've used this quote repeatedly. It first came to my attention by our friend from St. Louis, TODD AKIN, who told me that his 88-year-old father who obviously lived during the time of the Great Depression found this quote. Henry Morgenthau was the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and he testified before the House Ways and Means Committee in 1939. And in that testimony, Madam Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, under Franklin Roosevelt, obviously, not some right-wing conservative economist, the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Roosevelt said: ''We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent, and it does not work. I say, after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.''

Now, that was in 1939, Madam Speaker. We are making a mistake if we proceed with this measure. I believe that.

The American economy is going to get stronger because, as I said earlier, we are the most productive, we are the most innovative people on the face of the earth. We're going to get stronger. My fear is that this measure will, in fact, slow the economic recovery that we all would like to see take place soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, just two points and then I would like to recognize my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

But I think the really sad story, Mr. DREIER, that you related about the suicide underscores the urgency of this bill and the reason that it needs to be handled without delay.

The second point I wanted to respond to is Christina Romer said that the Republican House analysis is flat wrong in its claim that the House Republican stimulus is much more effective. ''No matter what your analytical assumption,'' she says, ''the plan that the President supports would result in substantially greater job creation than the House Republican plan.''

And with that I would yield 3 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 0945

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on January 20, President Obama and his administration inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression.

A record budget deficit and a worsening economy, an economy that is now losing 600,000 jobs a month, was the result of failed economic policies. For too long, the previous administration allowed the deficit to rise through wasteful spending, including unpaid wars and tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, while ignoring the challenges facing our economy.

Let me be clear: This economy did not go bad overnight. No, Madam Speaker. It took years of neglect to bring us to this position.

As a result, we are here today, trying to help our economy with a bold and historic recovery package. Economists ranging from conservative to liberal all agree that a recovery package is needed and that such a package must be bold. Any recovery package, they say, must provide a real shot in the arm to the economy, and that is what we have before us today. We have a package that will provide immediate funding to help the economy, but it is also designed to prevent an economic lull like the one we saw a few years after the Great Depression.

Madam Speaker, we have people in our country who are going hungry, and there is money in this package for food stamps—the most effective and immediate stimulus available—and there is money for unemployment. There is money for roads and for bridges and for other important shovel-ready infrastructure programs. Yes, there are targeted tax cuts that will allow middle- and low-income families to receive tax relief during these trying times. Is it perfect? No. This is not the package I would draft if it were solely up to me, but it is the package that came through a bipartisan and open process.

Now, my Republican friends had the opportunity to address this problem. Former President Bush could have acted on these programs before he left office, but he chose not to do so, allowing the recession to worsen. When Republicans decided to put forth an alternative plan, it was simply comprised of the failed policies of yesterday. When economists said there should be money for food stamps, my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle said ''no.''

When economists said there should be money for transportation and infrastructure, my Republican friends said ''no.'' When economists said there should be money for unemployment and for aid to States for school construction, my friends on the other side of the aisle said ''no.''

Madam Speaker, it is not enough to say ''no'' and to simply revert to the failed policies of the past. My friends offered their package. We had a vote and it failed miserably. People have had it with the failed economic policies of George W. Bush. Yet, instead of trying to work with President Obama and this Congress on a real recovery package, they continued to defy the needs of the American people and continued saying ''no.''

Saying ''no'' is easy. Saying ''no'' means you don't have to take responsibility for anything, but that is not what the American people want, and that is not what the American people voted for in the November elections.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bill before us will save or create more than 3 million jobs, and it will help people put food on their tables and receive health care as they try to make it through this recession.

We need to fix this economy, and Democrats, with or without the Republicans, are going to do what is necessary to help the American people. Enough of politics as usual. We need to move forward. The American people are looking to us for help, and this package provides the help that they need.

I congratulate the Speaker and the leadership and the chairman who worked on this recovery package. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support H.R. 1.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

As I listen to my good friend from Worcester, I would say, my gosh, we certainly have seen a change in the level of debate around here. It is fascinating to see.

Madam Speaker, as I listen to my friend from Colorado, I have got to tell you that, when I was quoting Dr. Christina Romer, chief of the Council of Economic Advisers, it was her methodology that was used that created twice as many jobs at half the cost.

With that, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very hardworking Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is not petty when we say that each Member of this House should have the opportunity to read this legislation. We are the people's House. Every Member is elected. We are all cognizant of the great difficulty being suffered by the American people, of the jobs being lost, of the very, very sad stories facing each of our districts. So it is not petty to say that, as the House requested, we should have 48 hours to review this legislation.

With regard to the substance, what we have been able to gauge is in the legislation. I remember when we first started discussing this package and, really, the tone of bipartisanship that was engulfing the Nation at the time. I was pleased because I believed that we would be able to modernize with this legislation. I believed we would see a modernization of the infrastructure—of the roads and bridges—of the United States.

When I saw the first $800 billion bill that was passed on January 28, including $30 billion for shovel-ready infrastructure projects, I thought that was most unsatisfactory, that a great opportunity was being lost. Since we are going to burden the American people with all of this debt, I thought at least we would modernize our infrastructure. I thought, well, maybe when the bill comes back it will be improved, and we will see more of the $800 billion, more than $30 billion within the $800 billion for our roads and bridges and for the modernization of our infrastructure.

When I saw the bill returning and that instead of $30 billion there was $29

billion to modernize our infrastructure, I realized that this opportunity lost is more than sad, because the American people believed that this was sacrifice for modernization, for higher productivity, for the creation of jobs. That is not what it is.

So, with sadness, I rise not only to oppose the rule but to say that this is an unsatisfactory package and that we can do better. We all believe that we need to act. I hope that we all come to the conclusion that we must, that we can do better.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is clear that our economy is in peril. For months, the House of Representatives has been working to develop solutions to revive the job market, to keep people in their homes and to restore faith in the American economy. We have held substantive hearings and markups. We have debated the merits of different proposals. We have listened to nonpartisan expert testimony on what the Federal Government can do to save the jobs we have and to create millions more.

I have listened to and have participated in this debate, and I have weighed the opinions of the experts, but when I consider the package before us today, I think mainly of the people in my district who are suffering.

I think of families in my district who are living on food stamps. I think of seniors who can no longer afford to see a doctor when they're sick. I think of the new mother who has just been laid off and who is not sure if she can pay her mortgage next month.

I think of Francisca Monterjano. Francisca lost most of her 401(k) when the stock market crashed last year. She lined up outside of Raley Field earlier this month, along with thousands of my constituents, eager for part-time work even though she is retired.

Francisca and the rest of my constituents have spoken, Madam Speaker. They have told me clearly:

We need this package. We need the unemployment benefits and the increased access to health care that it represents. We need the nearly 4 million jobs it will save or create. 7,800 of those jobs will be in my district alone, and many of these will be in the clean energy industry that will drive our future economy. We need the public transit and flood protection infrastructure that the bill will provide. We need the investment in primary and secondary education that will help train our children for work in the jobs of the future, and we need the tax relief that this bill contains.

Today's package is a product of compromise and of negotiation. It is not perfect. Yet the state of our economy is too bleak not to act now. Millions of people across our country are suffering too much for this House to shy away from its responsibility to lead. Now is not the time for partisan bickering or for political gain. Now is the time for action, for leadership.

So today, Madam Speaker, I choose to lead by casting my vote in favor of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my very distinguished colleague from Tulare, California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, this legislation is not about creating jobs. If jobs were the priority of Democrats, leaders would have listened to my pleas to help California.

I had asked Democrat leaders to include a provision that would not have cost one penny. It would have simply brought water to my constituents, and it would have saved 60,000 jobs.

Folks may ask: Why didn't the Democrat leaders put this in? Well, it is because their friends in the radical environmental community have decided that 2-inch minnows are more important than the people in my district. Just listen to a California deputy attorney general who moonlights as a radical environmentalist. Here is what he said about my constituents:

''What parent raises their child to be a farm worker? These kids are the least educated people in America . . . They turn to lives of crime. They go on welfare. They get into drug trafficking, and they join gangs.''

This is pathetic. You are spending $1 trillion, and you will not put in one provision that would create or save 60,000 jobs. This is an insult to my constituents, an absolute insult.

Vote ''no'' on this rule. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 16 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Colorado has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman MILLER, and all of my colleagues for doing what this crisis demands and for doing what the American people have asked us to do.

This is no ordinary economic downturn. It is a rapid meltdown that threatens the very foundations of our capitalist system. The Bush administration took a record budget surplus and left us the largest deficit in U.S. history. Our national debt has doubled, and the amount we owe to foreign countries has tripled. Five million Americans no longer have health insurance, and 7.6 million families have fallen into poverty. The laundry list of mistakes from the previous administration's failed policies has left us no choice but to take swift and decisive action to tackle these challenges head on.

This landmark legislation represents a new chapter and a new direction for our great Nation. By creating 3.5 million jobs and by investing in our infrastructure—physical and human—we are taking immediate action to restore growth and prosperity to the American people. Americans understand that a healthy environment goes hand in hand with a healthy economy.

This bill gives States and renewable energy producers the tools they need to green our energy infrastructure. It promotes a green workforce, spurs green innovation and invests heavily in our public lands. It does this while creating new and long-lasting jobs that will make our country the economic, scientific and environmental leader that it once was and once again will be.

Madam Speaker, we can and will regain the world's confidence in our economy. We will retain our global competitiveness, and we will, indeed, save capitalism and free enterprise with one of the largest tax cuts ever.

With its robust commitment to our education system, this legislation invests in our children's future and paves the way for generations of success. Education is the only meaningful, long-term investment we can make to stimulate the American economy, and there is no better way to remain the world's leader in innovation.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I applaud President Obama and my colleagues in both Chambers for working hard to ensure that education from early childhood through college is an important part of the recovery package.

Again, I applaud the tireless efforts of all those involved in the crafting and in the negotiation of this historic legislation.

□ 1000

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it's not often that we have the opportunity to hear the brilliance of both DIAZ-BALART brothers in the same debate.

Now I would like to yield 1 minute to our good friend from Miami, the other DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, we clearly need a stimulus bill, a bill that creates jobs. Unfortunately, the only thing that this is going to stimulate is more government bureaucracy and government bureaucrats. This will not help the economy.

Let me add some ammunition.

Only $3 billion, which is one-third of 1 percent to help the job creators to stimulate small businesses. One-third of 1 percent for small businesses that are the job creators? And yet, it's going to add $9,400 for all of our American families in debt; $9,400. Less than

7 percent of the money goes to infrastructure. That's shameful.

You know, this House debated recently the TARP bill to try to cover itself for the embarrassment, the embarrassment and lack of accountability of that TARP bailout bill. This is just the ''Son of TARP.'' We're going to be embarrassed. It's not going to help the economy like it's supposed to, and we're going to read about the scandals.

Please vote this bill down.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), 3 minutes.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. This bill provides $64.1 billion for transportation and infrastructure investments under the jurisdiction of our committee. What is included in this bill from the jurisdiction of our committee will create and sustain 1.8 million jobs, real jobs, construction jobs, professional journeymen, career apprentice, brick layers, cement finishers, backhoe operators. Real jobs in the U.S. economy for people who will be paying taxes, not being paid unemployment compensation for not working. They will get a working day's wage, and they will pay taxes on it and their companies will pay taxes on it.

We'll generate $322 billion of total economic activity over the next 2 years.

And we are going to ensure that the States, departments of transportation, the municipal metropolitan planning organizations, the individual city and regional and metropolitan area planning organizations, and the transit organizations, and the airport authorities do what they have told this committee they will do: deliver jobs, half of that funding in the first 90 days. And we will hold hearings every 30 days with reports, according to a schedule we've laid out for the State agencies, on delivery of those jobs putting the money under contract.

The Portland Cement Association testified before our committee in January saying 45 companies had 130 million metric tons of Portland cement produced and invested in the marketplace in 2007. Last year it was 95 million metric tons. For this year they project 9 million metric tons. They can ramp up to over 90 million metric tons of cement produced for ready-mix concrete to put people to work in the marketplace.

In the transit sector, over 5,500 options are now on call for the producers who can go from their now 5,000 to over 7,000 transit vehicles ramping up in 30 days. I've been to one of the transit producers in this country, they are ready to move.

And 82 percent of their purchases are U.S. suppliers, all final manufacturers in the United States, and all steel. All cement in our surface transportation program will be made in America, produced in America, invested in America.

We can do this. We will put people to work. We will oversee the implementation of this program, and we will put that on our Web site so the American people will know that this program is working.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, the ''American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009''.

According to the employment statistics released by the Department of Labor last week, as of January 2009, there are 11.6 million unemployed persons in the U.S., for all sectors of the economy combined. In addition, when part-time and discouraged workers who want full-time jobs are included, the number of unemployed/under-employed workers increases to 22.3 million.

The construction sector has been particularly hard-hit—it has the highest unemployment rate (18.2 percent) of any industrial sector. As of January 2009, there were 1,744,000 unemployed construction workers in the nation.

This bill is urgently needed to put Americans back to work. The infrastructure investments funded by this bill will create good, family-wage jobs—jobs that cannot be outsourced to another country, because the work must be done here in the U.S. on our roads, bridges, transit and rail systems, airports, waterways, wastewater treatment facilities, and Federal buildings.

For more than a year now, I have worked to ensure that infrastructure investment plays a key role in our nation's economic recovery.

I thank Chairman OBEY for working so closely with me in this effort. We consulted extensively on the transportation and infrastructure provisions in the bill. Through his efforts and those of his staff, we were able to retain many of the good provisions in the House bill that were not in the Senate bill, and to develop good compromises where the bills differed. I particularly appreciate the hard work of Beverly Pheto, Staff Director, and Kate Hallahan and David Napoliello of the Transportation Subcommittee.

The legislation before us today does not include everything I had proposed. While I would have preferred increased funding levels, and tighter use-it-or-lose-it deadlines, I do not intend to let ''perfect'' become the enemy of ''good''.

This is a ''good'' bill. It is desperately needed by the American people, and it deserves our support.

This bill provides $64.1 billion for Transportation and Infrastructure Committee infrastructure investments. This funding will create or sustain 1.8 million jobs and generate $322 billion of economic activity. It will get construction workers off the bench and back on the job.

To ensure that the purpose of this legislation is achieved, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will exercise vigorous oversight over the economic recovery funds within its jurisdiction. Federal agencies and grant recipients within our Committee's jurisdiction must understand that ''business as usual'' is not good enough anymore, and they will be held accountable to a high standard. We will insist that States, cities, and transit agencies live up to their assurances that they will be able to have contracts in place in 90 days for a substantial portion of the funding authorized by this bill. We will insist that projects under this bill be new projects, not simply replacements for projects which States were planning to carry out under existing programs. We will insist that Federal agencies expedite the process of approving projects and awarding grants.

With aggressive action by Federal agencies and grant recipients, the infrastructure funds provided by this bill can produce a substantial number of jobs by June, while also improving our deteriorating infrastructure and laying the foundation for our future economic growth.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Chairman OLVER, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, and our colleagues for working with me and other Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure throughout the development of this legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report on H.R. 1, a true investment in America's future.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to our hardworking new colleague from Tequesta, Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I can't tell you how disappointed I am as a new Member of this body as to the process that we are deliberating here today having only received this bill late last night and now we are voting on it today. What happened to the open and transparent Congress that I promised my constituents and that the President asked us to do when I was elected here not too long ago? The Democrats say that there has been transparency, but we know that this is not true.

What about the backroom deals? What about reaching across party lines? The minority has been left out of the discussion, and the people of my district expect and deserve better. I cannot vote for such a large bill that levies our economic future on the backs of my children.

Where is the help for more take-home pay for Martin County? Thirteen dollars a week? Where is the foreclosure relief for St. Lucie County? It's been cut in half. And what about jobs? I couldn't find one specific job for St. Lucie County which unemployment rates are now rivaling Detroit, Michigan.

The majority says it's their plan or nothing, and we are the party of ''no.'' But we had a plan. It was a good plan. And I sincerely hope in the future we will be able to work together as the people expect us to do.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, the chairman of Education and Labor, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker and Members of the

House, we all know, and the people know, that the American economy is in a crisis. It's not that this bill in and of itself will fix the American economy, but this bill takes a major step to fill in the huge gap, and that is the loss of spending at the local level among our school districts, our water districts, our cities, our counties, and our States. Why is that happening? Because they're hemorrhaging a huge loss. And over the next couple of years, over $2 trillion will be missing in economic activity. This is a bill that's designed to stimulate those local economies.

In the education area, there's $56 billion that's available to local school districts for the rehabilitation, the repair, and the renovation of school buildings so that children will go to school in safe, well-lighted, modern facilities so that they will be green. They can put in new heating, new air conditioning systems, $600 million for new technologies so every school in this country will be connected to the best technology in the world. They will be able to engage in curriculums that now are impossible for them. They can have modern labs. That's the promise of America in this.

And who will do those jobs? Local contractors, heating contractors, electricians, plumbing contractors, building contractors from our local communities who will hire other people in our local communities. That's what will happen with this legislation. That's the promise of this legislation.

It will help school districts from keeping to lay off teachers. In the matter of a few weeks, California will start issuing its advanced pink slips. Hundreds of thousands of teachers across this nation will be in this same situation. Now, school districts will know that they're going to get $13 billion in title I in IDA money that will help them reduce the number of people who will be unemployed if we do nothing.

If we do nothing, unemployment will continue, and we know that it will continue for the next few months. But we're trying to mitigate against the increased unemployment through school construction, through highway construction, making sure the students can stay in college as their families are under pressure because of the loss of jobs, the diminished work hours, the loss of pay. We want to make sure that they can stay there so we provide an additional increase in the Pell Grant.

This is very important to this Nation. It's very important to our students, and it's very important that we have an opportunity to create in this economic crisis a 21st century education plan.

You know, it's just amazing. We always hear that history repeats, and here we see it again. And if you go back and you look at Arthur Schlesinger's study of the failures of the Hoover administration leading up to the elected of 1932, this book, ''Crisis of Old Order,'' we see that today, history is repeating itself.

Today, when this country cries out to help this economy, to help America's families who are unemployed, who are losing income, who are losing jobs, President Obama stepped forth with the American Recovery Act. The Republicans stepped forth with saying ''no.'' That was reflected when Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER gave instructions to his colleagues to oppose the bill. Even as President Obama was traveling the Hill to meet with them and discuss this bill with them, they decided in advance of that meeting they would say ''no.''

Minority Whip ERIC CANTOR of Virginia has said that ''no'' is going to be the Republican strategy on this economic crises. ''No'' is going to be their strategy, he said.

The Republican national spokesman of late, radio host Rush Limbaugh, added that ''no'' is the strategy by asserting on the air that he wants President Obama to fail. Does he understand if President Obama fails that the American families lose income, they lose their jobs, and the crisis continues? And here we see the repeating of ''no.''

It was President Hoover in the midst of the Depression with his policy that the Federal Government could do nothing to help this Nation, and he was so wrong. He asked Will Rogers to think up a joke that would stop hoarding by the American public. He asked Rudy Vallee, Can you sing a song that would make people forget the Depression? I will give you a medal. He asked Christopher Morley, Perhaps what this country needs is a poem.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This economic crisis will not be solved by a song, a poem, or a good joke. It will be solved by this Congress going to work with this new President to meet this crisis head on. It will be solved when we provide jobs in this country, when we free up the credit markets, when we force the banks to lend as they should be doing, and we provide this stimulus bill.

All Members of Congress should be very proud to vote ''aye'' on this legislation and yield to the cries and the needs of American families and workers.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we share the goal of getting our economy back on track. One of the most compelling stories came from a town hall meeting in the hometown of our great friend, the distinguished chair of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE). I yield him 3 minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind remarks.

The American people know and House Republicans know our Nation is facing a serious recession. American families are hurting. Many have lost their jobs. Many million more are worried they will be next. House Republicans know that Congress must do something. But it's important that we do the right thing.

As this debate begins today, we just heard moments ago from a distinguished colleague and others that somehow Republicans are about saying ''no.'' Well, let me say with great respect to the gentleman, this is not about saying ''no.'' This is about saying ''yes'' to solutions that will put Americans back to work.

Republicans have brought forward such solutions built on the time honored experience of President John F. Kennedy, of President Ronald Reagan, and the experience of this Nation with the impending recession that followed September 11. We didn't go on a spending spree on Capitol Hill. We didn't offer Americans a $13-a-person tax cut. John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, and this Congress and this government after September 11, under George W. Bush, cut taxes across the board for working families, small businesses, and family farms; and the economy grew.

But what has the majority brought to the floor today? The truth is this stimulus bill will do nothing to stimulate this economy in the long term. The only thing the Democrats' stimulus bill will do is stimulate more government and more debt.

The American people are asking, what's 13 bucks a week going to do to get this economy moving again for the average American? What's $2 billion for community organizing to organizations like ACORN going to do to get Americans from the unemployment line to the factory line or millions to begin rationing health care or to purchase green golf carts going to do to put families back to work in Indiana?

As the gentleman said, I had a town hall meeting Monday, myself, in Indiana. A 13-year-old girl stood up, told me that her dad, raising her and her sister, alone as a single parent had lost half of his hours at work. He'd gone from 40 hours to 24 hours. And she stood up bravely in front of 300 Hoosiers, and she said, Anything in that bill, Congressman, that can help my dad get back to full-time? And I looked at little Hillary, congratulated her for her courage, and I said, Hillary, because I can't answer ''yes'' to your question that there is anything in this bill that's going to help get your dad back to full time, I can't vote ''yes'' on this bill. And the 300 Hoosiers in that room exploded in agreeing applause.

The American people know what's going on here. The American people know that this administration and this Congress are about to pass a bill that will not grow our economy. It will merely grow our government. We can do better. We must do better. This Congress owes the American people no less.

□ 1015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 11¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve my time so we can kind of even up.

Mr. DREIER. At this time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to our very dynamic new member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague for yielding me time, Madam Speaker.

I'm highly insulted by the comments of the Deputy Attorney General from California that were shared with us a few minutes ago. As a lifetime farmer and a representative of many farmers, this is another indication of the atmosphere of arrogance within the majority party. It's an arrogance also expressed here this morning that only the President of this country can save us. Well, thank you very much, the American people have done very well by themselves over the last 200-plus years, and we haven't needed any President to save us.

The majority says saying ''no'' is easy. Republicans aren't saying ''no'' to the needs of the American people. We have a better alternative that's not being considered. For the majority, spending other people's money is easy. That's what this bill does. It's generational abuse.

Last night, Mr. OBEY said that the bill had been worked out with the White House. So I asked him to show us the accountability the President's been promising, show me how the spending leads to job creation section by section. He could not. I ask you, where's the beef?

Then he said, it's irrelevant what we think about this bill. The first article in the Constitution is about the Congress. It's not irrelevant what we think about this bill. My constituents don't like this bill. I don't like the bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, vote ''no'' on the bill and say to the majority, we're not going to take your arrogance and we are not going to take your stealing the money from us, our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I continue to reserve.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I was just congratulating Ms. FOXX on her thoughtful statement. At this time, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to our good friend from Westminster, South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule to this conference report between Democrats to H.R. 1. This backroom-written Democrat spending bill costs too much money, doesn't fix the problem fast enough, and fails to make enough good jobs.

In the long run, Madam Speaker, this bill will cost working families over $1 trillion. After today, each American household will owe $100,000 to pay for government debt. What's even scarier, in this conference report Democrats took what little bit of tax relief was in there away from families and small businesses so they could increase spending on pet projects like $50 million to the National Endowment of the Arts and $300 million for green golf carts.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that less than half the money in the Democrat stimulus plan will be spent in the next 2 years. Madam Speaker, folks in South Carolina and across this country are losing their jobs today. American families are struggling to make ends meet and cannot afford to wait 2 years to see a potential improvement in their economy.

The real problem, Madam Speaker, is Democrats have lost their faith in the American people. They don't see what I see. I look at the people back home in South Carolina, and I know that they are the key to moving America forward. The barbershop on the corner, the hardware store down the street, they're the driving force of the economy, not the bureaucrats in Washington.

And it's because of my faith in the American people that I support the House Republican economy recovery plan. This plan allows small businesses, the heart and soul of our economy, to take a tax deduction equal to 20 percent of their income, a deduction that will allow small businesses to hire new employees, to grow. In South Carolina, this plan will create 34,000 jobs more than the Democrat plan and will cost half.

It's my sincere hope that the spending bill fails, and we in Congress can debate a bill that won't put a crushing burden on our children, won't take 2 years to work, and will rely on our small businesses. Vote ''no'' on this plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd like, Madam Speaker, to yield 1 minute to my friend from New York, Mr. BISHOP.

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, let me start by taking this opportunity to commend both the House and Senate conferees on crafting this compromise legislation that will create and preserve nearly 3.5 million jobs here in America and will set our Nation on a course toward economic recovery.

It is imperative that we plug the holes in our job market that lost 600,000 jobs last month alone, and these holes will not be plugged by a strategy of saying ''no'' nor will they be plugged by a strategy of returning to the failed policies of the past, which is all our friends on the other side of the aisle are offering.

Through investing in our infrastructure and investment in our children's education and preserving the ability of our States to provide essential services, this bill will create jobs for millions of Americans, even as we better prepare the next generation for the challenges they will face.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that this historic effort will return our Nation to economic prosperity and provide hope to the millions who have suffered as a result of the failed policies of the past.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to a former Rules Committee member, the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I had some prepared remarks, but I'm going to set those aside because I saw an article this morning in The Hill newspaper by Cheri Jacobus, and I think it says it all and I want to quote an excerpt.

''Congress should throw this greasy pile of pork into the grinder. Instead, give every American household a $10,000 stimulus check to spend as we please. With approximately 100 million households nationwide, we hit that magic number of $1 trillion. This, along with a 2-year moratorium on capital gains taxes, will get the economy off life support.

''Instead of condoms, green golf carts, mouse habitats and government-run health care, Americans would spend based on individual priorities, thus spurring competition, resulting in higher-quality goods and services. Good banks succeed; bad banks fail. Well-priced, quality automobiles hit the streets; lemons fade away. Capitalism lives to fight another day and the greatest country on Earth narrowly survives its near-death experience with socialism.''

Mr. PERLMUTTER. At this time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and applaud our Speaker and President Obama and our leadership for a fair and balanced bill.

The disastrous economic policies of the previous administration, including the irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthy, the war in Iraq and a regulated financial services industry, have left our Nation in shambles. Many more people, millions more, are living in poverty, without health insurance, and unemployment is through the roof.

Recognizing this urgency, I established the Congressional Black Caucus Economic Recovery Task Force, chaired by Congressman CLEAVER, to help guide our response to the economic crisis.

Historically, the role of the Congressional Black Caucus has been to act as the conscience of the Congress and ensure that no American is left behind.

This is our moral responsibility. That was our overriding goal with this bill, as we sought to create more jobs for more people.

This package will help working families by expanding food stamps, unemployment insurance, and health coverage for the uninsured, and investing in education and job training, infrastructure, foreclosure relief, and assistance.

It's not perfect. It should have been much, much bigger, but it's a critical first step. It reflects our values as a Nation.

Although the American dream has turned into a nightmare for many during this economic crisis, many people, many people have been living this nightmare for years. So we've got to continue to fight on their behalf, and we will.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to our good friend from Roswell, Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you really can't be serious. You can't be serious. This would be humorous if it wasn't so sad. Got this at 11 o'clock last night, over 1,000 pages. What's in it? Have you read it? We found $30 million for mice. Got $30 million for mice. You can't be serious. What a joke. $30 million for mice. Does that create jobs?

Imagine what we could do with $30 million, Madam Speaker. Imagine what we could do with $1 trillion, Madam Speaker, if we worked together for real solutions.

We understand that people are hurting, but this majority is only interested in paying off and buying political friends like $2 billion for ACORN and $300 million for golf carts for bureaucrats. What a joke.

But the American people aren't laughing. This bill is selfish because it robs from future generations. It's irresponsible because it won't work. What a joke. The American people aren't laughing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and as she's getting ready, I would say to my friend, Dr. PRICE from Georgia, there's not anything in that bill about mice, $30 million for mice. We talked about it yesterday. It's not in there, and I challenge him.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will ask Members to refrain from interrupting another in debate after that Member has expressed a refusal to yield.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and the Rules Committee for the heavy lifting, along with the Appropriations Committee and Financial Services Committee, and all of those who have joined the leadership in this heavy responsibility of governance.

I'm proud to be part of the governing party, if you will, the Democratic caucus that has the responsibility of leading this Nation, and we accept the burden and responsibility of making sure that there is a credible answer to America's problems.

Someone needs to talk to the unemployed construction worker or the young woman laid off in the retail industry or retiree who wants to come back to work. This bill is a responsible bill, $64 billion in transportation and infrastructure, 1.8 million jobs; the construction worker back to work; $800 payment for a couple, $400 payment for a single person. It's not $13 a week, as they'd like to say. It's a lump sum that people are desperately in need of.

This is an important and responsible act. We're putting together in my office task forces to ensure that Houston communities get this relief. It's important to vote for this bill. America needs this bill. It's time to answer the call of America. I support the Rules Committee and economic recovery bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to our friend from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A lot has been said about the process here, and it needs to be said. To receive a bill that's over 1,000 pages at 11 o'clock last night and expect to vote on it with any knowledge of really what's in it today is simply absurd. So the process is wrong, but we need not lose sight of the broader picture here. We know enough about this legislation to know that it is bad legislation. First and foremost, the process is bad, but it's bad legislation.

Now, some will say, well, you're just not a Keynesian, you don't believe in Keynesian economics. Keynes would be embarrassed by this legislation. If you believe in Keynesian economics, then certainly you would spend money in a way that stimulates the economy. I doubt that John Maynard Keynes would believe that $50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts would be stimulative. All that it stimulates is more spending later.

And the problem here is we're creating hundreds of new Federal programs that will continue in perpetuity, that will become a drag on the economy, not bolster it.

Vote against this legislation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, this is no joke. To my friends on the other side of this aisle, this is a very serious matter. We've lost 3,673,000 jobs in the last year alone. Madam Speaker, that is 10,000 jobs every day.

Now, what we have here is plain and simple. Our economy has leaks and holes in it all throughout. That's why you've got 1,000 pages there because it's big. Our economy is big.

You say you haven't read it. I would say you have read it. You've come down here and poked holes about it, said this is what's wrong with it and that's what's wrong with it. How do you know that if you haven't read it?

□ 1030

The other point is this, Madam Speaker: last November the people of the United States made a decision and that decision was to put Barack Obama as President, because they wanted a new direction. He has pleaded, he has cajoled, he's gone all across this country asking for help. I say, Madam Speaker, let us give him the help, let us come together, and let us go ahead and pass this bill without delay. The American people are counting on us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

I would yield my friend 30 seconds. Has his time expired, Madam Speaker?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to simply say to my friend, who unfortunately wouldn't yield, we do have a thousand pages here. This was put online after midnight. We all voted in favor of 48 hours—you voted in favor of 48 hours—to allow the American people and our colleagues to see this. We all understand the urgency of this matter. Has my colleague read this? Many of us have been trying to go through it since after midnight in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I was up until 3 o'clock this morning reading it. If you had done this, Mr. DREIER, you were here debating it last week——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Two-and-a-half hours, and you went through a thousand pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to inquire how much time remains, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to a former Rules Committee member, one of our new appropriators, the gentleman from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 1. This underlying bill is unfocused, it's bloated, and it's self-defeating. It won't stimulate our economy. It will certainly stimulate growth in the size of government.

The bill fails in four basic areas:

First, its tax cuts are too small, too temporary and simply don't encourage people to purchase products or employers to hire people.

Second, much of the spending in the bill is recurring and will add to the size of government and ultimately slow future growth.

Third, our country is at war and yet nothing in this bill helps those protecting our freedom. And by ignoring legitimate procurement issues, we fail to take a measure that would actually stimulate the economy.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this bill is sold as an infrastructure bill, yet only 7 percent of the spending is actually on infrastructure. We can do better than this. We can have a bipartisan, open process and pass legislation we can all be proud of.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, the United States of America is in a great recession and we will be judged as a United States Government by two measures—by action or inaction.

And I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle who are not going to vote for this measure today, you are walking away from America and Americans in her greatest time of need. I remember as a C–130 pilot flying missions in and out of Iraq how much money we were spending over there to rebuild roads and bridges in Iraq and to make sure every man, woman and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage. You didn't bat an eye to vote for them. You didn't bat an eye to bail out $700 billion for Wall Street. This is about investing in America and Americans in their greatest time of need. We have to be measured by what we're going to do. Are we going to be leaders or are we going to be blockers? Are we going to act or are we not? Are we going to vote for Iraqis or Americans?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members seated in the Chamber will refrain from shouting interjections out during debate, and Members should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield a minute to my good friend from Tyler, Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this rule is so cynical. The biggest spending bill in the history of the world and the rule says we can't even have the bill read out loud here on the floor so the American people really know what we're doing to future generations.

And to hear my colleagues across the aisle, Madam Speaker, talk about the jobs, 600,000 jobs being lost in the last month, it breaks my heart for every job. We lost 1200 in east Texas yesterday. Why? Because the hope and the change that people voted for in the President has come to doom and gloom. They have held on to avoid letting their workers go, but now for the last month they've heard the Democratic proposals and what they see is no hope. There's no hope left in this bill. It's not going to help the economy, so they're having to let their workers go. We say yes to the American people. We say no to the atmosphere of arrogance that says the American people are not the solution. They are the solution. Give them a tax holiday. Let them keep their own money and spend it to get the economy going. That's yes to America. That's yes to the American solution.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. This is going to be a clear point of demarcation. Eight years of the Bush administration and we lost millions of jobs. Millions of Americans lost their homes, lost their investments. Our schools crumbled. And now as we launch into these 4 and 8 years, we're going to see schools rebuilt, millions put to work, we're going to see the economy turn around, and it starts today.

Now in '93 when we had the Clinton economic plan, not one Republican voted for it in the House or Senate. But we did get 27 million new jobs, we did balance the budget, and pay down the national debt. History has a way of repeating itself.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield at this point 30 seconds to our good friend from Texas, distinguished secretary of the Republican Conference, Mr. CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman.

The President told us that this bill was not going to have any earmarks in it and if it was, he was going to do something about it and I'm proud of him.

I'm concerned about an earmark. An earmark is a Member-directed initiative. We have an earmark for a train from Las Vegas to California. That seems to be one of the earmarks we had. I'm not sure in this 25 feet high bill we've got here that we've still got the mouse, but we had a $30 million earmark for a mouse in California.

I hope you'll veto this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time do we each have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I began by reporting to the House of the sad news that I received yesterday when a man telephoned me to say that his young son's best friend's father had just committed suicide because of the economic difficulty their family was facing. We all know how serious this situation is. We have friends who have lost homes, people who have lost jobs, and we all know that it is imperative that we take action and that we take action now, and most important, Madam Speaker, that we do the right thing.

Now I'm going to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question on this measure. Why? So that we can do what every single Member of this institution on a unanimous recorded vote said they wanted to do on Tuesday, and, that is, say that 48 hours should be provided for Members to look at this bill. The Rules Committee got this package very late last night, around midnight. We were told at that time just before midnight that it was online, available for the American people to see, and, Madam Speaker, it was not. Three sections were missing. Not until well after midnight was this made available. And so any Member who cast a vote in favor of allowing 48 hours for this measure to be considered should vote no on the previous question so that we will provide an amendment to allow for what everyone said they wanted to in fact take place.

This measure is, as has been reported, a thousand pages, and no one knows what it's going to do, including our friend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who in his testimony last night before the Rules Committee said he had no idea how many jobs would be created. He had no idea how many jobs would be created, but we have to take action. And, Madam Speaker, we can take action by putting into place a growth-oriented tax package which will in fact get our economy back on track.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, my friend from California's story about the gentleman who committed suicide underscores the urgency of this matter. This is not a time for delay. This is not a time for inaction. It is a time for action. The President has requested this bill get passed to put America back to work. This bill will maintain or create 3.6 million jobs. We've lost hundreds of thousands of jobs over the course of the last few months. We need to stop that downward spiral and this will do that. It has five major components. First there's construction and reconstruction of our infrastructure. Current jobs, long-term investment. A look to the new energy future, new jobs in science and technology, in health care and in energy. It gives our States a chance to stay on their feet by backfilling some of their losses for teachers and firefighters and policemen and maintenance workers. There is a tax

cut for 95 percent of America in this bill. Finally, there is a piece that helps those folks who have been hurt by this downturn with Medicaid and food stamps and unemployment insurance.

This bill is a fantastic step forward. There will be a series of steps that have to be taken and it will take time. But we have faith in the American people. We have faith in this country. We are going to change the direction of this Nation and put 3.5 million people back to work.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 168 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike ''upon adoption of this resolution'' and insert ''not sooner than 10:45 p.m. on the calendar day of February 14, 2009''.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 194, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—234

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

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kilroy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Campbell
Lee (NY)
Solis (CA)
Stark

□ 1107

Messrs. SHADEGG, BLUNT, MARSHALL and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—231

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

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Cao
Israel
Lamborn
Lee (NY)
Radanovich
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1114

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 67, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on February 10, 2009, the House adopted a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1 by a vote of 403 yeas and no nays. That motion directed the managers on the part of the House to withhold their signatures on the final conference agreement until that agreement had been available electronically for at least 48 hours.

Madam Speaker, it is a matter of public record that the three majority House conferees affixed their signatures to the conference agreement while the hard copy had been available for less than 1 hour and the electronic copy was as yet unavailable. In fact, a correct electronic copy was not made available until after midnight last night. So it is uncontroverted that the majority House conferees acted in direct opposition to the unanimous instructions of the House.

Madam Speaker, my inquiry is this: Given that the majority managers on the part of the House ignored the instructions given them by 403 of their colleagues, without a single dissenting vote, what remedy do we have against the managers who disregarded the instruction to make the conference report available for 48 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may illuminate such questions by their remarks in debate.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Just to clarify then, there is no point of order or other remedy available to address this flagrant violation of the instructions of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the province of the Chair to render advisory opinions or rule on questions of order not actually presented.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 168, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the

unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1) contains an emergency designation for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles. Accordingly, the Chair must put the question of consideration under clause 10(c)(3) of rule XXI.

The question is, Will the House now consider the conference report?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 195, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Campbell
Davis (TN)
Gordon (TN)
Lee (NY)
Stark

□ 1137

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the rule has allowed for 90 minutes of debate on this $800 billion package; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ninety minutes is correct.

Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is my understanding that many Members who wish to debate this matter, thereby, will not be allowed time because of the limited time. I further understand that I am not allowed to ask for an extension of time under the rule; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot anticipate what request will be made.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Then let me further say it is my understanding that an extension of time, which would be the request, can only be made by the gentleman from Wisconsin; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will deal with the unanimous consent requests as they may occur.

Mr. LEWIS of California. You are forcing me to do that which we really should not have to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the Chair thinks the gentleman can read the rule and can understand it, but if he wishes to proceed, he may go ahead.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will respond, but I would ask unanimous consent that we extend debate time by 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would look to the gentleman from Wisconsin to propound such a request.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Then let me ask the gentleman from Wisconsin: Would you consider such a request?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, I would simply note the House has already voted on how it intends to proceed, and I see no reason to depart from that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I believe the gentleman could initiate it by unanimous consent, and he has the authority for that. I urge the gentleman to do so. All of our people want more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman stating a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate the Speaker for his time.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman is asking, would the gentleman yield for a response?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California no longer seeks recognition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state the inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the House passed a unanimous motion to instruct which directed the conferees to make the text of this report available for 48 hours before being considered.

Under House rules, what is the effect of a motion to instruct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Instructions by the House to its conferees are advisory in nature and are not binding as a limitation on their authority.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Then a unanimous motion to instruct adopted by this House is not binding at all and, therefore, is of no consequence; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will repeat: Instructions by the House to its conferees are advisory in nature and are not binding as a limitation on their authority.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Under House rules, isn't it true that a conference report cannot be made in order and considered on the floor unless it has been available for 3 calendar days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This question is hypothetical as any such point of order has been waived.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order under rule XXII, clause 8 whereby the conference report shall not be in order and will be considered as read unless it has been available for 3 calendar days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order has been waived.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a further inquiry then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Is there an opportunity under the rules to allow for a reading of the over 1,000-page bill that is being considered currently?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The order of the House provides that the conference report is considered as read.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As the ruling of the Chair, as the ruling of the Speaker, it is my understanding then, in having this bill of over 1,000 pages made available to the Members of the House after 11 or 12 o'clock last night, that this is to have been considered read even though it is physically impossible for any Member to have read this bill; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 168 provides that the conference report is considered as read.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 168, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 12, 2009, at page H1307.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. 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 the conference report accompanying H.R. 1, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

As Senator COCHRAN said, the time for talk is over. It is time to vote. The country needs this package. I urge support. I think we ought to get on with it.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT

Economists generally agree that the Nation is facing one of the most dire economic crises in our history. Over the past three months 1.8 million jobs have been lost after falling the same amount in the prior ten months. Other economic data also point to an ever-faster sinking U.S. economy:

Unemployment has soared by 4.1 million, an increase of more than 50 percent from 7.5 million to 11.6 million since December 2007 when the recession began.

Full time employment dropped 3.5 million over the last three months, much faster than at any time since the data began in 1967.

Consumer demand for goods fell at an 11 percent rate in the second half of 2008, faster than at any time in the 62 years of data.

Only five months in six decades of data saw lower use of our manufacturing capacity than the 70.2 percent recorded in December.

Exports fell at a 19.7 percent annual rate in the most recent quarter.

Nothing indicates that these trends will not continue unless the federal government acts. While forecasters differ on specifics, many believe that without quick and decisive action the Nation could suffer another 5 million job losses over the coming year.

The U.S. economy is caught in a vicious downward spiral with self-reinforcing declines in spending, sales, jobs, income, profits, government revenues, state and local services, investment, and global trade. The federal government is the only major actor in the U.S. economy with the capacity to stop the downward spiral.

The current downturn looks a lot more like the early stages of the Great Depression than any episode since the 1930s:

Rapid shrinkage in private credit, with crisis in every major financial sector;

The favorite tool of the Federal Reserve (the short term rate to banks) already lowered to virtually zero;

Evaporating household wealth with plunging values of homes and financial assets;

Record high supplies of vacant homes and declines in home values with no end in sight;

The fewest cars sold relative to the population since the 1940s; and

Inflation is verging on negative territory or deflation, a condition that discourages consumption, as people wait to buy at lower prices, and investment, as sales become more problematic and effective borrowing costs rise. Deflation also undermines monetary policy because interest rates cannot go negative.

Opponents of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act often argue that ''spending is not stimulus'' because spending by government just reduces spending by others. That argument effectively assumes that total spending in the economy cannot be raised. That would make sense if either (1) we were at full employment or (2) increased government borrowing came from lenders who would otherwise spend the money on U.S. goods and services. Neither condition applies today. We have high rates of unemployed labor and capital equipment. We also find lenders eager to fund federal borrowing rather than to spend, as evidenced by exceptionally low interest rates on U.S. Treasury Bills. These are textbook conditions justifying federal government borrowing to boost the economy.

Some critics of this legislation have misinterpreted Congressional Budget Office (CBO) analysis of the effects of this legislation on jobs and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) over the next ten years. CBO found that bills like those passed in the House and Senate would increase job-years by 3.1 million to 9.0 million over the next six years and would not lower jobs thereafter. CBO also found that GDP would be raised over the next ten years. GDP would be boosted 3 to 10 percent over the next several years. If only this bill is enacted and nothing is done to raise saving, the bill would have a zero to 0.2 percent annual reduction of GDP in the long run.

Other opponents of this legislation have proposed as an alternative measures intended to boost housing production or prices. With 2.9 percent of homes still vacant, half again as much as at any time prior to 2005, we could fritter away hundreds of billions of dollars of additional deficit with a negligible boost to the economy or jobs.

The Congressional Budget Office and private economic forecasters have evaluated various options for boosting national spending from an additional dollar of federal deficit. They have consistently found that the highest ''bang for the buck'' occurs with either direct federal spending or transferring funds to those with tight budget constraints such as cash-strapped households and state and local governments with falling revenues and balanced budget requirements. In contrast, they find that much less additional spending would result from making more money available to those with high incomes or to companies with excess capacity. In recent testimony, CBO Director Elmendorf stated, ''In CBO's judgment, H.R. 1 would provide a substantial boost to economic activity over the next several years relative to what would occur without any legislation.''

The bill's $789 billion price tag sounds large, but it is more likely to be too little than too much. The CBO director has testified that, if nothing is done, our economic output will fall below its potential by close to a trillion dollars this year and next and by another $600 billion in 2011. He noted that this would be the largest gap relative to the size of potential output since the Great Depression. It would represent a loss in Americans' income and output of $2.5 trillion, or about $8,000 per person, that will be lost forever.

The forecasters at the Congressional Budget Office, Moody's Economy.com, Macroeconomic Advisors, and the Obama Administration have all estimated that enactment of this legislation could create or save 3 to 4 million jobs. If we can gainfully employ

those millions of people, as opposed to having them be unemployed, they can create a stronger economy for the future by building infrastructure, creating technologies, and improving their education and skills.

The following table summarizes the funding levels in division A of the conference report:

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Office of the Secretary	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Office of Inspector General	22,500	22,500	22,500	---	---
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, research and education activities	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	44,000	---	24,000	-20,000	+24,000
Agricultural Research Service:					
Buildings and facilities	209,000	---	176,000	-33,000	+176,000
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	245,000	---	50,000	-195,000	+50,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations.					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	---	(300,000)	---	---	(-300,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	---	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)
Subtotal	---	(400,000)	---	---	(-400,000)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	---	(200,000)	---	---	(-200,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
Subtotal	---	(250,000)	---	---	(-250,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	---	17,200	---	---	-17,200
Unsubsidized guaranteed	---	330	---	---	-330
Subtotal	---	(17,530)	---	---	(-17,530)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	---	23,600	---	---	-23,600
Unsubsidized guaranteed	---	1,300	---	---	-1,300
Subtotal	---	(24,900)	---	---	(-24,900)
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account	---	42,430	---	---	-42,430
(Loan authorizations)	---	(650,000)	---	---	(-650,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency	245,000	42,430	50,000	-195,000	+7,570
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Watershed and flood prevention operations	350,000	275,000	290,000	-60,000	+15,000
Watershed rehabilitation program	50,000	65,000	50,000	---	-15,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	400,000	340,000	340,000	-60,000	---
Rural Development Programs					
Rural development salaries and expenses	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
Rural Community Advancement Program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Rural community facilities direct loans	(1,102,000)	---	---	(-1,102,000)	---
Business and industry guaranteed loans	(2,000,000)	---	---	(-2,000,000)	---
Rural water and waste disposal direct loans	(2,736,000)	---	---	(-2,736,000)	---
Subtotal	(5,838,000)	---	---	(-5,838,000)	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Loan subsidies:					
Rural community facilities direct loans	63,000	---	---	-63,000	---
Rural community facilities guaranteed loans	---	---	---	---	---
Rural community facilities grants	137,000	---	---	-137,000	---
Business and industry guaranteed loans	87,000	---	---	-87,000	---
Rural business enterprise grants	13,000	---	---	-13,000	---
Rural water and waste disposal direct loans	400,000	---	---	-400,000	---
Rural water and waste disposal grants	1,100,000	---	---	-1,100,000	---
Subtotal	(1,800,000)	---	---	(-1,800,000)	---
Total, Rural Community Advancement Program	1,800,000	---	---	-1,800,000	---
(Loan authorizations)	(5,838,000)	---	---	(-5,838,000)	---
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account.					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct loans	(4,018,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-3,018,000)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	(18,111,000)	(10,472,000)	(10,472,000)	(-7,639,000)	---
Subtotal	(22,129,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-10,657,000)	---
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct loans	270,000	67,000	67,000	-203,000	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	230,000	133,000	133,000	-97,000	---
Subtotal	(500,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(-300,000)	---
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct	---	67,000	67,000	+67,000	---
Guaranteed	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Grants	---	50,000	63,000	+63,000	+13,000
Subtotal	---	127,000	130,000	+130,000	+3,000
Total, Rural Housing Service	500,000	327,000	330,000	-170,000	+3,000
(Loan authorizations)	(22,129,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-10,657,000)	---
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account.					
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy	---	130,000	130,000	+130,000	---
Rural business enterprise grants	---	20,000	20,000	+20,000	---
Subtotal	---	150,000	150,000	+150,000	---
Biorefinery assistance	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Rural energy for America program	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	---	400,000	150,000	+150,000	-250,000
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Direct loans subsidy	---	412,000	412,000	+412,000	---
Grants	---	963,000	968,000	+968,000	+5,000
Subtotal	---	1,375,000	1,380,000	+1,380,000	+5,000
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Distance learning and telemedicine loans	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Distance learning and telemedicine grants	---	90,000	---	---	-90,000
Broadband subsidies and grants	2,825,000	---	2,500,000	-325,000	+2,500,000
Total, Rural Development Programs	5,125,000	2,282,000	4,360,000	-765,000	+2,078,000
(Loan Authorizations)	(27,967,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-16,495,000)	---
Food and Nutrition Service					
Child nutrition programs	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	100,000	120,000	100,000	---	-20,000
Contingency fund	---	380,000	400,000	+400,000	+20,000
Subtotal	100,000	500,000	500,000	+400,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Emergency food assistance program (emergency)	150,000	150,000	150,000	---	---
Total, Food and nutrition service	250,000	750,000	750,000	+500,000	---
General Provisions					
Supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits increase (H. Sec. 2001)(S. Sec. 102)	4,859,000	8,231,000	4,859,000	---	-3,372,000
FY 2010	6,056,000	4,864,000	6,056,000	---	+1,192,000
FY 2011-2014	9,076,000	3,467,000	9,076,000	---	+5,609,000
Subtotal	(19,991,000)	(16,562,000)	(19,991,000)	---	(+3,429,000)
Afterschool feeding program (Sec. 2002)	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---
FY 2010	38,000	---	---	-38,000	---
FY 2011-2019	673,000	---	---	-673,000	---
Subtotal	(726,000)	---	---	(-726,000)	---
Agricultural disaster assistance (S. Sec 103)	---	806,000	744,000	+744,000	-62,000
Farm Bill administration (S. Sec. 106)	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
FY 2010	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
FY 2011-2019	---	26,000	---	---	-26,000
Subtotal	---	(34,000)	(8,000)	(+8,000)	(-26,000)
Total, General Provisions	20,717,000	17,402,000	20,743,000	+26,000	+3,341,000
FY 2009	(4,874,000)	(9,041,000)	(5,607,000)	(+733,000)	(-3,434,000)
FY 2010	(6,094,000)	(4,868,000)	(6,060,000)	(-34,000)	(+1,192,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(9,749,000)	(3,493,000)	(9,076,000)	(-673,000)	(+5,583,000)
Total, title I	27,012,500	21,088,930	26,465,500	-547,000	+5,376,570
FY 2009	(11,169,500)	(12,727,930)	(11,329,500)	(+160,000)	(-1,398,430)
FY 2010	(6,094,000)	(4,868,000)	(6,060,000)	(-34,000)	(+1,192,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(9,749,000)	(3,493,000)	(9,076,000)	(-673,000)	(+5,583,000)
(Loan Authorizations)	(27,967,000)	(12,122,000)	(11,472,000)	(-16,495,000)	(-650,000)
TITLE II - COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE					
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
Bureau of Industry and Security					
Operations and administration	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs	250,000	150,000	150,000	-100,000	---
Bureau of the Census					
Periodic censuses and programs	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses	350,000	350,000	---	-350,000	-350,000
Wireless and broadband deployment grant programs	2,825,000	---	---	-2,825,000	---
Broadband technology opportunities program	---	6,650,000	4,700,000	+4,700,000	-1,950,000
Digital-to-analog converter box program	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	3,825,000	7,650,000	5,350,000	+1,525,000	-2,300,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services	100,000	168,000	220,000	+120,000	+52,000
Industrial technology services	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Technology Innovation Program	(70,000)	---	---	(-70,000)	---
Manufacturing Extension Partnership	(30,000)	---	---	(-30,000)	---
Construction of research facilities	300,000	307,000	360,000	+60,000	+53,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	500,000	475,000	580,000	+80,000	+105,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities	400,000	377,000	230,000	-170,000	-147,000
Procurement, acquisition and construction	600,000	645,000	600,000	---	-45,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	1,000,000	1,022,000	830,000	-170,000	-192,000
Departmental Management					
Office of Inspector General	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Total, Department of Commerce	6,585,000	10,323,000	7,916,000	+1,331,000	-2,407,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Tactical law enforcement wireless communications	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Detention trustee	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, General Administration	2,000	202,000	2,000	---	-200,000
United States Marshals Service					
Salaries and expenses	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Construction	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Total, United States Marshals Service	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Construction	---	300,000	---	---	-300,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	---	375,000	---	---	-375,000
Federal Prison System					
Buildings and facilities	---	800,000	---	---	-800,000
State and Local Law Enforcement Activities					
Office on Violence Against Women:					
Prevention and prosecution programs	---	300,000	225,000	+225,000	-75,000
Office of Justice Programs:					
State and local law enforcement assistance	3,000,000	2,190,000	2,765,000	-235,000	+575,000
Community oriented policing services	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---
Salaries and expenses	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, State and Local Law Enforcement Activities	4,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	---	+500,000
Total, Department of Justice	4,002,000	5,027,000	4,002,000	---	-1,025,000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Science	400,000	450,000	400,000	---	-50,000
Aeronautics	150,000	200,000	150,000	---	-50,000
Exploration	---	450,000	400,000	+400,000	-50,000
Cross agency support	50,000	200,000	50,000	---	-150,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	602,000	1,302,000	1,002,000	+400,000	-300,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Research and related activities	2,500,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	---	+1,500,000
Education and human resources	100,000	50,000	100,000	---	+50,000
Major research equipment and facilities construction	400,000	150,000	400,000	---	+250,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, National Science Foundation	3,002,000	1,202,000	3,002,000	---	+1,800,000
Total, title II	14,191,000	17,854,000	15,922,000	+1,731,000	-1,932,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE III - DEFENSE					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Facility Infrastructure Investments, Defense					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	1,490,804	1,169,291	1,474,525	-16,279	+305,234
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	624,380	571,843	657,051	+32,671	+85,208
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	128,499	112,167	113,865	-14,634	+1,698
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	1,236,810	927,113	1,095,959	-140,851	+168,846
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	110,899	79,543	98,269	-12,630	+18,726
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	62,162	44,586	55,083	-7,079	+10,497
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	45,038	32,304	39,909	-5,129	+7,605
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	14,881	10,674	13,187	-1,694	+2,513
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	302,700	215,557	266,304	-36,396	+50,747
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	29,169	20,922	25,848	-3,321	+4,926
Total, Facility Infrastructure Investments	4,045,342	3,184,000	3,840,000	-205,342	+656,000
Procurement					
Defense Production Act Purchases	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Energy Research and Development, Defense					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide	87,500	200,000	75,000	-12,500	-125,000
Total, Energy Research and Development	350,000	200,000	300,000	-50,000	+100,000
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operations and maintenance	454,658	250,000	400,000	-54,658	+150,000
Office of the Inspector General	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	469,658	265,000	415,000	-54,658	+150,000
Total, title III	4,865,000	3,749,000	4,555,000	-310,000	+806,000
TITLE IV - ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations	---	25,000	25,000	+25,000	---
Construction	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	---	---
Mississippi River and tributaries	250,000	500,000	375,000	+125,000	-125,000
Operation and Maintenance	2,225,000	1,900,000	2,075,000	-150,000	+175,000
Regulatory program	25,000	25,000	25,000	---	---
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Total, Department of Defense - Civil	4,500,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	+100,000	---
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	500,000	1,400,000	1,000,000	+500,000	-400,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	18,500,000	14,398,000	16,800,000	-1,700,000	+2,402,000
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	---	---
Advanced Battery Loan Guarantee Program	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Institutional Loan Guarantee Program	500,000	---	---	-500,000	---
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	8,000,000	9,000,000	6,000,000	-2,000,000	-3,000,000
Fossil Energy	2,400,000	4,600,000	3,400,000	+1,000,000	-1,200,000
Science	2,000,000	330,000	1,600,000	-400,000	+1,270,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	---	---	400,000	+400,000	+400,000
Non-defense environmental cleanup	---	483,000	483,000	+483,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning	---	390,000	390,000	+390,000	---
Office of the Inspector General	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Total, Energy Programs	36,915,000	33,716,000	33,588,000	-3,327,000	-128,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense environmental cleanup	500,000	5,527,000	5,127,000	+4,627,000	-400,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance: Western Area Power Administration	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	500,000	5,537,000	5,137,000	+4,637,000	-400,000
Total, Department of Energy	37,415,000	40,253,000	38,725,000	+1,310,000	-1,528,000
General Provisions					
Western Area Power Administration (borrowing authority) (H. Sec. 5004)(S. Sec. 402)	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
FY 2010	125,000	125,000	125,000	---	---
FY 2011-2018	3,115,000	3,115,000	3,115,000	---	---
Subtotal	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration (borrowing authority) (H. Sec. 5006) (S. Sec. 402) FY 2010	50,000	50,000	50,000	---	---
FY 2011-2018	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	---	---
Subtotal	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	---	---
Total, General provisions	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	---	---
FY 2009	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
FY 2010	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	---	---
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	---	---
Total, title IV	48,915,000	52,753,000	50,825,000	+1,910,000	-1,928,000
FY 2009	(42,425,000)	(46,263,000)	(44,335,000)	(+1,910,000)	(-1,928,000)
FY 2010	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	---	---
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	---	---
TITLE V - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices					
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration	---	7,000	7,000	+7,000	---
Community development financial institutions fund program account	---	250,000	100,000	+100,000	-150,000
Internal Revenue Service					
Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total, Department of the Treasury	---	257,000	187,000	+187,000	-70,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000
General Services Administration					
Federal Buildings Fund:					
Construction, repairs and alterations	7,700,000	5,548,000	5,550,000	-2,150,000	+2,000
Energy efficient federal motor vehicle fleet procurement	600,000	300,000	300,000	-300,000	---
Office of Inspector General	15,000	7,000	7,000	-8,000	---
Total, General Services Administration	8,315,000	5,855,000	5,857,000	-2,458,000	+2,000
Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board	14,000	7,000	84,000	+70,000	+77,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses	---	84,000	69,000	+69,000	-15,000
Office of Inspector General	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct and guaranteed loans subsidy	426,000	621,000	636,000	+210,000	+15,000
Administrative expenses	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Total, Small Business Administration	440,000	730,000	730,000	+290,000	---
Total, title V	8,769,000	6,974,000	6,858,000	-1,911,000	-116,000
TITLE VI - HOMELAND SECURITY					
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
Departmental Management and Operations					
Office of the Under Secretary for Management	---	198,000	200,000	+200,000	+2,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000	5,000	5,000	+3,000	---
Total, Departmental Management and Operations	2,000	203,000	205,000	+203,000	+2,000
U.S. Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and expenses	100,000	198,000	160,000	+60,000	-38,000
Border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology	---	200,000	100,000	+100,000	-100,000
Construction	150,000	800,000	420,000	+270,000	-380,000
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection	250,000	1,198,000	680,000	+430,000	-518,000
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Automation modernization	---	27,800	20,000	+20,000	-7,800
Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation security	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+500,000	---
Coast Guard					
Acquisition, construction and improvements	---	450,000	98,000	+98,000	-352,000
Alteration of bridges	150,000	240,400	142,000	-8,000	-98,400
Total, Coast Guard	150,000	690,400	240,000	+90,000	-450,400
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Management and administration	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000
State and local programs	---	950,000	300,000	+300,000	-650,000
Firefighter assistance grants	---	500,000	210,000	+210,000	-290,000
Emergency food and shelter	200,000	100,000	100,000	-100,000	---
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	200,000	1,556,000	610,000	+410,000	-946,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Acquisitions, construction, improvements, and related expenses	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Total, title VI	1,102,000	4,690,200	2,755,000	+1,653,000	-1,935,200
TITLE VII - INTERIOR AND ENVIRONMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	---	135,000	125,000	+125,000	-10,000
Construction	325,000	180,000	180,000	-145,000	---
Wildland fire management	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management	325,000	330,000	320,000	-5,000	-10,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	---	165,000	165,000	+165,000	---
Construction	300,000	110,000	115,000	-185,000	+5,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	300,000	275,000	280,000	-20,000	+5,000
National Park Service					
Operation of the National Park System	---	158,000	146,000	+146,000	-12,000
Historic Preservation Fund	---	---	---	---	---
(transfer from construction)	(15,000)	---	---	(-15,000)	---
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Construction	1,700,000	589,000	589,000	-1,111,000	---
Centennial Challenge	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Total, National Park Service	1,800,000	747,000	750,000	-1,050,000	+3,000
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	200,000	135,000	140,000	-60,000	+5,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	---	40,000	40,000	+40,000	---
Construction	500,000	522,000	450,000	-50,000	-72,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	500,000	572,000	500,000	---	-72,000
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories	---	62,000	---	---	-62,000
Office of Inspector General	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Central Hazardous Materials Fund	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Total, Department of the Interior	3,140,000	2,156,000	2,005,000	-1,135,000	-151,000
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Hazardous substance superfund	800,000	600,000	600,000	-200,000	---
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---
State and tribal assistance grants	8,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	-2,000,000	---
Office of Inspector General	20,000	---	20,000	---	+20,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	9,420,000	7,200,000	7,220,000	-2,200,000	+20,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Capital improvement and maintenance	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Wildland fire management	850,000	485,000	500,000	-350,000	+15,000
Total, Department of Agriculture	1,500,000	1,135,000	1,150,000	-350,000	+15,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services	---	135,000	85,000	+85,000	-50,000
Indian health facilities	550,000	410,000	415,000	-135,000	+5,000
Total, Indian Health Service	550,000	545,000	500,000	-50,000	-45,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Smithsonian Institution					
Facilities capital	150,000	75,000	25,000	-125,000	-50,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
Total, Other Related Agencies	200,000	75,000	75,000	-125,000	---
Total, title VII	14,810,000	11,111,000	10,950,000	-3,860,000	-161,000
TITLE VIII - LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION					
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Employment and Training Administration					
Training and employment services	4,000,000	3,250,000	3,950,000	-50,000	+700,000
Community service employment for older Americans	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (trust funds)	500,000	400,000	400,000	-100,000	---
Total, Employment and Training Administration	4,620,000	3,770,000	4,470,000	-150,000	+700,000
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses	80,000	---	80,000	---	+80,000
Office of Job Corps	300,000	160,000	250,000	-50,000	+90,000
Office of Inspector General	6,000	3,000	6,000	---	+3,000
Total, Departmental Management	386,000	163,000	336,000	-50,000	+173,000
Total, Department of Labor	5,006,000	3,933,000	4,806,000	-200,000	+873,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Health Resources and Services Administration					
Health resources and services	1,638,000	1,958,000	2,500,000	+862,000	+542,000
FY 2010	550,000	---	---	-550,000	---
Subtotal	(2,188,000)	(1,958,000)	(2,500,000)	(+312,000)	(+542,000)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention					
Disease control, research, and training	462,000	---	---	-462,000	---
Buildings and facilities	---	412,000	---	---	-412,000
National Institutes of Health					
National Center for Research Resources	1,500,000	300,000	1,300,000	-200,000	+1,000,000
Office of the Director	750,000	9,200,000	8,200,000	+7,450,000	-1,000,000
FY 2010	750,000	---	---	-750,000	---
Subtotal	(1,500,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,200,000)	(+6,700,000)	(-1,000,000)
Buildings and facilities	500,000	500,000	500,000	---	---
Total, National Institutes of Health	3,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+6,500,000	---
FY 2009	(2,750,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+7,250,000)	---
FY 2010	(750,000)	---	---	(-750,000)	---
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality					
Healthcare research and quality	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	---	---
Administration for Children and Families					
Low-income home energy assistance: FY 2010	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,000,000	---
FY 2010	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Subtotal	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	---	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Social services block grant	---	400,000	---	---	-400,000
Children and families services programs	1,600,000	1,250,000	3,150,000	+1,550,000	+1,900,000
FY 2010	1,600,000	---	---	-1,600,000	---
Subtotal	(3,200,000)	(1,250,000)	(3,150,000)	(-50,000)	(+1,900,000)
Total, Administration for Children and Families	6,200,000	3,650,000	5,150,000	-1,050,000	+1,500,000
FY 2009	(2,600,000)	(3,650,000)	(5,150,000)	(+2,550,000)	(+1,500,000)
FY 2010	(3,600,000)	---	---	(-3,600,000)	---
Administration on Aging					
Aging services programs	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
FY 2010	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal	(200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-100,000)	---
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	---	-1,000,000
Office of Inspector General	19,000	19,000	17,000	-2,000	-2,000
Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund	900,000	---	50,000	-850,000	+50,000
Prevention and wellness fund	2,202,100	---	1,000,000	-1,202,100	+1,000,000
FY 2010	797,900	---	---	-797,900	---
Subtotal	(3,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Total, Office of the Secretary	5,919,000	3,019,000	3,067,000	-2,852,000	+48,000
FY 2009	(5,121,100)	(3,019,000)	(3,067,000)	(-2,054,100)	(+48,000)
FY 2010	(797,900)	---	---	(-797,900)	---
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	19,569,000	20,239,000	21,917,000	+2,348,000	+1,678,000
FY 2009	(13,771,100)	(20,239,000)	(21,917,000)	(+8,145,900)	(+1,678,000)
FY 2010	(5,797,900)	---	---	(-5,797,900)	---
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION					
Education for the disadvantaged	6,500,000	12,400,000	13,000,000	+6,500,000	+600,000
FY 2010	6,500,000	---	---	-6,500,000	---
Subtotal	(13,000,000)	(12,400,000)	(13,000,000)	---	(+600,000)
Impact aid	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
School improvement programs	533,000	1,070,000	720,000	+187,000	-350,000
FY 2010	533,000	---	---	-533,000	---
Subtotal	(1,066,000)	(1,070,000)	(720,000)	(-346,000)	(-350,000)
Innovation and improvement	225,000	---	200,000	-25,000	+200,000
Special education	6,300,000	13,500,000	12,200,000	+5,900,000	-1,300,000
FY 2010	7,300,000	---	---	-7,300,000	---
Subtotal	(13,600,000)	(13,500,000)	(12,200,000)	(-1,400,000)	(-1,300,000)
Rehabilitation services and disability research	350,000	610,000	680,000	+330,000	+70,000
FY 2010	350,000	---	---	-350,000	---
Subtotal	(700,000)	(610,000)	(680,000)	(-20,000)	(+70,000)
Student financial assistance	15,881,000	13,930,000	15,840,000	-41,000	+1,910,000
FY 2010	245,000	---	---	-245,000	---
Subtotal	(16,126,000)	(13,930,000)	(15,840,000)	(-286,000)	(+1,910,000)
Pell Grants--maximum grant (NA)	(4,860)	(4,760)	(4,860)	---	(+100)
Student aid administration	50,000	---	60,000	+10,000	+60,000
Higher education	100,000	50,000	100,000	---	+50,000
Institute of Education Sciences	250,000	---	250,000	---	+250,000
School modernization, renovation, and repair	14,000,000	---	---	-14,000,000	---
Higher education modernization, renovation and repair (Sec. 9302)	6,000,000	---	---	-6,000,000	---
Office of Inspector General	14,000	14,000	14,000	---	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
General Provisions					
Mandatory Pell Grants (Sec. 9303)	643,000	---	643,000	---	+643,000
FY 2010	831,000	---	831,000	---	+831,000
Subtotal	(1,474,000)	---	(1,474,000)	---	(+1,474,000)
Increase student loan limits (Sec. 9304)	-730,000	---	---	+730,000	---
FY 2010	-810,000	---	---	+810,000	---
FY 2011-2018	1,510,000	---	---	-1,510,000	---
Subtotal	(-30,000)	---	---	(+30,000)	---
Student lender special allowance (Sec. 9305)	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Department of Education	66,685,000	41,574,000	44,638,000	-22,047,000	+3,064,000
FY 2009	(50,226,000)	(41,574,000)	(43,807,000)	(-6,419,000)	(+2,233,000)
FY 2010	(14,949,000)	---	(831,000)	(-14,118,000)	(+831,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(1,510,000)	---	---	(-1,510,000)	---
RELATED AGENCIES					
Corporation for National and Community Service					
Operating expenses	160,000	160,000	160,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
National service trust	40,000	40,000	40,000	---	---
Total, Corporation for National and Community Service	201,000	201,000	201,000	---	---
Social Security Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	900,000	890,000	1,000,000	+100,000	+110,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000	3,000	2,000	---	-1,000
Total, Social Security Administration	902,000	893,000	1,002,000	+100,000	+109,000
Total, Related Agencies	1,103,000	1,094,000	1,203,000	+100,000	+109,000
Total, title VIII	92,363,000	66,840,000	72,564,000	-19,799,000	+5,724,000
FY 2009	(70,106,100)	(66,840,000)	(71,733,000)	(+1,626,900)	(+4,893,000)
FY 2010	(20,746,900)	---	(831,000)	(-19,915,900)	(+831,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(1,510,000)	---	---	(-1,510,000)	---
TITLE IX - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
Government Accountability Office:					
Salaries and expenses	25,000	20,000	25,000	---	+5,000
TITLE X - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Military construction, Army	920,000	637,875	180,000	-740,000	-457,875
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps	350,000	990,092	280,000	-70,000	-710,092
Military construction, Air Force	280,000	871,332	180,000	-100,000	-691,332
Military construction, Defense-Wide	3,750,000	118,560	1,450,000	-2,300,000	+1,331,440
Military construction, Army National Guard	140,000	150,000	50,000	-90,000	-100,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	70,000	110,000	50,000	-20,000	-60,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Military construction, Navy Reserve	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---
Subtotal	5,700,000	2,877,859	2,190,000	-3,510,000	-687,859
Family housing construction, Army	---	34,570	34,507	+34,507	-63
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army	---	3,932	3,932	+3,932	---
Family housing construction, Air Force	---	80,100	80,100	+80,100	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force	---	16,461	16,461	+16,461	---
Homeowners assistance fund	---	410,973	555,000	+555,000	+144,027
Subtotal	---	546,036	690,000	+690,000	+143,964
Base realignment and closure account 1990	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Total, Department of Defense	6,000,000	3,423,895	2,880,000	-3,120,000	-543,895

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical support and compliance	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Medical facilities	950,000	1,370,459	1,000,000	+50,000	-370,459
Subtotal	950,000	1,375,459	1,000,000	+50,000	-375,459
National Cemetery Administration	50,000	64,961	50,000	---	-14,961
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses	---	1,125	150,000	+150,000	+148,875
Information technology systems	---	195,000	50,000	+50,000	-145,000
Office of Inspector General	1,000	4,400	1,000	---	-3,400
Construction, major projects	---	1,105,333	---	---	-1,105,333
Construction, minor projects	---	939,836	---	---	-939,836
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	---	257,986	150,000	+150,000	-107,986
Total, Departmental Administration	1,000	2,503,680	351,000	+350,000	-2,152,680
Total, Department of Veterans Affairs	1,001,000	3,944,100	1,401,000	+400,000	-2,543,100
RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	---	60,300	---	---	-60,300
Total, title X	7,001,000	7,428,295	4,281,000	-2,720,000	-3,147,295
TITLE XI - DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs	---	90,000	90,000	+90,000	---
Capital investment fund	276,000	228,000	290,000	+14,000	+62,000
(transfer to USAID capital investment fund)	---	---	(38,000)	(+38,000)	(+38,000)
Office of Inspector General	---	1,500	2,000	+2,000	+500
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	276,000	319,500	382,000	+106,000	+62,500
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.					
Construction	224,000	224,000	220,000	-4,000	-4,000
Administration of Foreign Assistance					
Funds Appropriated to the President					
U.S. Agency for International Development					
Capital Investment Fund	---	58,000	---	---	-58,000
(by transfer)	---	---	(38,000)	(+38,000)	(+38,000)
Office of Inspector General	---	500	---	---	-500
Total, U.S. Agency for International Development	---	58,500	---	---	-58,500
Total, title XI	500,000	602,000	602,000	+102,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE XII - TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Supplemental discretionary grants for a National Surface Transportation system	---	5,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000	-4,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration					
Supplemental funding for facilities and equipment	---	200,000	200,000	+200,000	---
Supplemental discretionary grants for airport investment	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	+1,100,000	---
Grants-in-aid for airports	3,000,000	---	---	-3,000,000	---
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	3,000,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	-1,700,000	---
Federal Highway Administration					
Highway infrastructure investment	30,000,000	27,060,000	27,500,000	-2,500,000	+440,000
Federal Railroad Administration					
Capital assistance for high-speed rail and intercity passenger rail service	300,000	250,000	8,000,000	+7,700,000	+7,750,000
Capital and debt service grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	800,000	850,000	1,300,000	+500,000	+450,000
High-speed rail corridor program	---	2,000,000	---	---	-2,000,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,100,000	3,100,000	9,300,000	+8,200,000	+6,200,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Transit capital assistance	7,500,000	---	6,900,000	-600,000	+6,900,000
Fixed guideway infrastructure investment	2,000,000	---	750,000	-1,250,000	+750,000
Capital investment grants	2,500,000	---	750,000	-1,750,000	+750,000
Supplemental grants for public transit investment	---	8,400,000	---	---	-8,400,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration	12,000,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	-3,600,000	---
Maritime Administration					
Supplemental grants for assistance to small shipyards	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Total, Department of Transportation	46,120,000	45,480,000	48,120,000	+2,000,000	+2,640,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Public Housing Capital Fund	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Native American housing block grants	500,000	510,000	510,000	+10,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	5,500,000	5,510,000	4,510,000	-990,000	-1,000,000
Community Planning and Development					
Community Development Fund	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	+1,000,000
Neighborhood Stabilization Program	4,190,000	---	2,000,000	-2,190,000	+2,000,000
Subtotal	(5,190,000)	---	(3,000,000)	(-2,190,000)	(+3,000,000)
HOME investments partnerships program	1,500,000	250,000	---	-1,500,000	-250,000
Gap funding for low income tax credit program	---	2,000,000	2,250,000	+2,250,000	+250,000
Subtotal	(1,500,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(+750,000)	---
Self-help and assisted homeownership opportunity program	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Homeless assistance grants	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	---	---
Total, Community Planning and Development	8,200,000	3,750,000	6,750,000	-1,450,000	+3,000,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Housing Programs					
Assisted housing stability and energy and green retrofit investments	---	2,250,000	2,250,000	+2,250,000	---
Elderly, disabled and Section 8 assisted housing energy retrofit	2,500,000	---	---	-2,500,000	---
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
General Provisions					
GSE conforming loan limits (Sec. 12003)	37,000	---	37,000	---	+37,000
FY 2010	13,000	---	13,000	---	+13,000
Subtotal	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
FHA Hope for Homeowners (S. Sec. 1211)	---	260,000	---	---	-260,000
FY 2010	---	193,000	---	---	-193,000
FY 2011	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Subtotal	---	579,000	---	---	-579,000
Total, General Provisions	50,000	579,000	50,000	---	-529,000
FY 2009	37,000	260,000	37,000	---	-223,000
FY 2010	13,000	193,000	13,000	---	-180,000
FY 2011	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	16,365,000	12,204,000	13,675,000	-2,690,000	+1,471,000
FY 2009	16,352,000	11,885,000	13,662,000	-2,690,000	+1,777,000
FY 2010	13,000	193,000	13,000	---	-180,000
FY 2011	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Total, title XII	62,485,000	57,684,000	61,795,000	-690,000	+4,111,000
FY 2009	(62,472,000)	(57,365,000)	(61,782,000)	(-690,000)	(+4,417,000)
FY 2010	(13,000)	(193,000)	(13,000)	---	(-180,000)
FY 2011	---	(126,000)	---	---	(-126,000)
TITLE XIII - STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND					
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION					
State Fiscal Stabilization Fund	39,500,000	39,000,000	53,600,000	+14,100,000	+14,600,000
FY 2010	39,500,000	---	---	-39,500,000	---
Total, title XIII	79,000,000	39,000,000	53,600,000	-25,400,000	+14,600,000
Grand total	361,038,500	289,794,425	311,197,500	-49,841,000	+21,403,075
FY 2009	(276,935,600)	(274,624,425)	(288,727,500)	(+11,791,900)	(+14,103,075)
FY 2010	(66,528,900)	(5,236,000)	(7,079,000)	(-59,449,900)	(+1,843,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019	(17,574,000)	(9,934,000)	(15,391,000)	(-2,183,000)	(+5,457,000)

Note: Each amount in this Act is designated as an emergency requirement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in just a short while, the House will be voting on the President's $790 billion economic stimulus package. It is by far the most expensive piece of legislation ever considered by this legislative body in its more than 200 years. I will be voting ''no'' on this legislation. Over the next few minutes, I would like to share my concerns about this bill as it is currently written.

The President, whom I respect a great deal, is a fine salesman. But as I have said on more than one occasion, facts are stubborn things. The fact is that this stimulus package does more to promote the growth of the Federal Government than it does to create jobs or to stimulate our economy. The fact is there are 104 government programs in this legislation that are being permanently expanded.

□ 1145

This includes 31 new government programs and permanent expansions to 73 existing programs. Taxpayers will pay for these programs well into the future. Of the total funding in this package, $190 billion—or 61 percent—is devoted to increasing the size of government. Only $122 billion—or 39 percent—is for a temporary one-time infusion of money into 98 Federal programs to stimulate the economy.

Again, these are the facts.

The interest on this new spending alone will cost no less than $350 billion. And, if all of the new spending in this bill is carried forward in the future years, Federal nondefense budgets will have to increase by at least 42 percent each year. One more time, these are the facts.

My colleagues, is there anyone in Congress who really believes that this spending can be sustained?

Let's not kid ourselves. When it comes to Washington spending taxpayers' money, a trillion has become the new million.

So how did we get to this point today?

Two nights ago, the President's chief of staff came to Capitol Hill under the cover of darkness and presented the framework of a final deal to Senator REID and Speaker PELOSI. The only negotiation that took place occurred in the middle of the night in several back rooms of the U.S. Capitol between the White House and these two leaders.

There are hundreds of billions of dollars of spending in this legislation, and yet not one member of the House Appropriations Committee—not even Chairman OBEY—was in sight when the final deal was cut.

There are hundreds of billions of dollars of tax provisions in this legislation, and yet not one member of the House Ways and Means committee—not even Chairman RANGEL—was in sight when the final deal was cut.

The purpose of a conference committee is to negotiate differences between competing versions of the House and Senate bills. Amendments are usually offered, debated, and considered. But there were no negotiations between Republicans and Democrats at Wednesday's conference. The negotiations had taken place the night before.

Outside of the Speaker and Senate Majority Leader REID, no one in the Congress has any idea what is really in this legislation. It was filed in the House as it was negotiated—in the darkness of night. And it became available to Members and the public on a Web site at 12:30 a.m. this morning, less than 12 hours ago.

This is precisely why every single Member present on Tuesday, more than 400 Members of the House, voted to have the conference report available 48 hours before House consideration. But the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader are clearly afraid that the more Members and taxpayers learn about this bill, the more Members will walk away from it.

The House should not vote on the largest spending bill in the history of the United States when no one on either side of the aisle has any real idea of what's in it. There is no doubt that urgent action is needed to stimulate the economy and create jobs. Had the President and congressional leaders focused and put their attention on the real need for job creation, with an emphasis on infrastructure jobs, this package would be sailing through the House and Senate with broad bipartisan support. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who would support reasonable transportation and infrastructure projects as well as reasonable tax reform, but that is not what is before us today.

In the end, funding for roads, highways, flood control measures, and other job creating infrastructure projects were downsized in order to increase the size and scope of government programs.

Mr. Speaker, that's not stimulus. That's not job creation, and it certainly isn't what the country needs or deserves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank you for the tremendous job that you and the leadership have done during this historic period in our Nation's history.

There is a common expression that we have in our committees, and that is, ''How is the gentlelady and gentleman recorded?'' You don't have an opportunity to say you were confused, you didn't know what you were doing, or you wish there was another way.

And I gather when you get back home, people will be asking, ''And how were you recorded?''

How were you recorded when you had an opportunity to give some assistance to the working people in this country, where 95 percent of them will be receiving a tax cut so that they will be able to assist them in keeping their kids in school, paying their rents, their mortgages, keeping up their health insurance?

How were you recorded when we said that this Nation should take care of those people who unfortunately lost their job, lost their dignity, lost their health insurance?

Are we going to explain that we thought there was a better idea?

How were we recorded when there comes a time that we're saying that we have to find alternative ways in order to fuel the country's energy needs?

How were we recorded when the bridges and the tunnels and the hospitals and the schools are in trouble, when the mayors and the governors are asking and screaming for help?

How is history going to record what you have done at a time when everyone is screaming out, every economist is asking us to come to our Nation's economic savior?

And how are we recorded when it comes time to make certain that there is hope for those people who are not only jobless but hopeless?

I do hope that people recognize that we're not talking about a Presidential plan, a Republican plan, or a Democratic plan. We're talking about the heart of America, just as patriotic as the flag is, is the energy of people who want to be middle class. Are we going to give them an opportunity or are we going to ask the question how were we recorded because we didn't know what the right thing to do was.

Well, I suggest to you, just as people talk about how they voted in support of Roosevelt, how they went and tried to give assistance not just to the big-time CEOs who were hardly embarrassed and never even inconvenienced—these are people that are our constituents. To put them back to work means that we're helping small businesses out. To put them back to work means that we're talking about their dreams and the aspirations that we have. To restore our schools mean that we're going to, once again, become imaginative, be able to go to the international market with the genius that this great Nation always had.

These are hard times, and we have an opportunity to say how were we recorded and to be proud of our vote, or to try to do the worst thing that any legislator can do, whether it's local, whether it's State, or whether it is a Member of this august body, and that is trying to explain your vote if you don't support this effort.

I think that it's a rough time for the Nation, but we've always responded with ways that we can show that we will persevere and come out of this stronger than ever. And your kids and your grandkids who know that you've been privileged to serve here, historians are going to look to see one thing that's going to be so important to all

of us, and that is, how were you recorded.

So we can't talk about the process, we can't talk about what we wish will happen; but we can talk about how are you recorded in this vote that would long-time be remembered.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time at the request of the chair, I'd like to yield to the chairlady of the Small Business Committee and thank her for the great work that she has been doing.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, small businesses are finally getting their stimulus. It is about time. This act marks the first step towards economic recovery for our country's entrepreneurs. In fact, this bill will result in nearly $21 billion in new investments and lending for small firms and the creation of more than 630,000 new jobs.

In terms of accessing loans from the Small Business Administration, the legislation clearly puts borrower first. It does this by mandating that no funds provided for fee relief can go to lenders unless the SBA has reduced fees charged to borrowers to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House believes we should and must act to get this economy moving again to help struggling families and employers through this global economic crisis. But action for the sake of acting will mean little to families if it is not accompanied with positive results.

This morning we awake to a spate of headlines that the deal made behind closed doors, and what we've still not been able to fully review, given its $1.1 million price tag will do more harm than good.

From the McClatchy News Service: ''Will the stimulus actually stimulate? Economists say no.''

From the Associated Press: ''Analysis: Stimulus won't jump-start the economy.''

From the Congressional Budget Office—and there's a chart behind me that shows it—''This partisan stimulus package ends up harming our economy.''

And, again, while it's clear we must act, we must ensure the action we take actually stimulates the economy and lays the foundation for real sustained job creation in the private sector.

There's a smarter, simpler way to stimulate the economy. It's not by running up the deficit by funding pet projects that are often wasteful. As you well know, we produced an alternative to both the Senate and House versions that would create twice the jobs at half the cost. Let me repeat that. Republicans developed a plan that would create twice the jobs at half the cost. And that isn't my analysis or some conservative think tank. That fact is based on the data and methodology of Dr. Christina Romer, the Chair of the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Now, I'd be remiss if I didn't point out to my Republican and Democrat colleagues exactly how they were treated in this process. As one of five Members of this House who was appointed to the conference committee, I think it's my obligation to tell you this story.

As I walked from the House to the Senate for our first meeting of the conferees, I passed a press conference being held by the Senate majority leader announcing a final deal that had been struck by Senators and only by Senators. This is the first conference I've ever been on where the press conference announcing the results happened before the actual meeting. So I can understand why Speaker PELOSI was reportedly incensed.

The people's House should not be trampled on. We were frozen out. And as Chairman RANGEL noted, many Democrats were frozen out. But most importantly, the American people were frozen out.

This is what happens when a few select people negotiate behind closed doors. You end up with flawed legislation that better reflects the priorities of a few, rather than those of the entire country.

And under this deal we're bring presented with this morning, the so-called middle class tax cut, the signature tax cut has been reduced to 20 cents an hour for a full-time worker. One of the few provisions to help struggling businesses was more than cut in half by shortening the length of the relief and making thousands of employers ineligible for help.

The work requirements within the historic 1996 Welfare Reform Law—the hallmark legislation of President Clinton and the Republican Congress—has been eroded. And the stealth health provisions will drive up costs and have the government making more health care decisions instead of doctors and patients.

□ 1200

Given the severity of the crisis American families are facing, to conduct the people's business in this fashion may be the grossest violation of our constitutional duties and the oath of office we swore to uphold that I have seen in my 18 years in the House.

Record me as a ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. This is what is in the recovery package for Michigan families: Creating jobs for 519,000 unemployed in Michigan. I spoke to the electrical workers this morning, 40 percent of whom are unemployed, 2,000 individuals; 50 percent of iron workers, 1,200, are unemployed. This package has $1 billion for Michigan transportation and water infrastructure. This is just one example of the recovery package putting people to work.

For the unemployed, an extension of unemployment benefits to an additional 161,000 unemployed workers and the historic expansion of TAA.

For individuals in Michigan losing health care for the first time, some help to purchase health insurance.

For Michigan schools, $2 billion to help make up for reduced State assistance.

And for the State of Michigan, under immense budget strain, over $2 billion to shore up our Medicaid program.

For the restructuring auto industry, $2 billion in grants to help develop and manufacture advanced batteries here in the U.S., incentives to buy new cars and a tax credit for the purchase of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles.

Families in Michigan and everywhere are fearful for their jobs, for their health care, education, and the stability of their local communities.

For the minority, they say they acknowledge the pain but they have no prescription, only wornout ideology.

I will head home and look families straight in the eye and say the Federal Government is on your side, providing support during this downturn and making key investments for the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to HAL ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

(Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I want to thank the ranking member for this time.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our country's storied history, we've witnessed some truly extraordinary efforts from the floor of this hallowed Chamber to address our country's most dire needs. We've stood united, setting geographic and party labels aside, to pass legislation that pushed our country forward.

In the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, in the shadow of 9/11, in the wake of numerous natural disasters, this body has traditionally responded by pulling together to produce results for the American people.

But today, Mr. Speaker, sadly, is not one of those extraordinary moments.

Thousands of pages of text, given to us at midnight last night, the Speaker even preventing it from being read to us by the House Clerk, 90 minutes of debate only—some Members will not even be allowed to speak a word for or against this monstrosity—and $790 billion of spending, the largest bill ever to pass through this body.

Hardly any Member, Republican or Democrat, was allowed to help work and write up this bill. This bill was written by the Speaker of the House, with absolutely no collaboration with the Republican side of the aisle and, frankly, little with even Democrats. The principles of democracy are being compromised here today, now.

The American people deserve better. The Members of this Chamber deserve better. And our Founding Fathers expected better.

At best, all you're going to do here today, Mr. Speaker, is ram through this Congress an ill-conceived, wrong-headed, misdirected spending spree. This bill is not targeted toward creating jobs like we wanted. It's just spending a borrowed trillion dollars that our children, grandkids, even great-grandkids are going to have to pay.

When all is said and done with today, and the balloons are put away and the champagne toasts are over, we will leave a whopping and record-breaking $12.1 trillion debt for our children to try to mop up. Even worse, leading experts tell us more every day, the results of this bill will not jump-start our economy or create real high-wage jobs.

Reject the bill.

Mr. Speaker, they say just the exact opposite. That the inflation this spree will cause will only further our fragile economy. The world markets are bracing for the worst as our nation tries to sell a record level of Treasury notes. At the same time, foreign nations are posting huge deficits of their own and selling their own bonds. This competition only impedes the very businesses you and I want to see grow, prosper and expand.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I fear that interest rates will soar, inflation will rise, and the value of the dollar will plummet.

The President has spoken correctly of our need for immediate action. However, the American people would be better off with a thoughtful, comprehensive bill that creates jobs by keeping taxes low, incentives for our small businesses to expand, and reigns in wasteful spending. We offered such a bill. It was refused. Instead, we have a hasty product that will actually do our country harm.

Let us rise to the occasion and pass a bill that brings this Chamber together with a plan for genuine stimulus, rather than political gain. I urge rejection of this Conference Report.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, jobs, jobs, jobs—that is job number one for this Congress. That is the job that President Obama said is the first order of business this year for this body.

Let me amend that. Not just jobs, jobs, jobs. Good paying jobs, 21st century jobs, jobs that invest in and build America tomorrow for our kids. When you are hemorrhaging 5- to 600,000 jobs a month, that means by the time I finish my remarks, 28 Americans will have lost their job in 2 minutes. Jobs, jobs, jobs. We need to do something now.

President Obama has said we need bold, swift action to move us into 21st century jobs and using the technology of this century. We can't continue to live with 20th century technology.

This bill invests close to $20 billion to help our doctors who today communicate with a more obsolete technology than our kids do every day as they communicate with each other. Today, our children are talking to each other during their breaks in school; yet, most doctors can't communicate with each other about what their patients need.

This bill lets us have our doctors invest in that technology so that while today only one of every 20 doctors' offices uses high technology to communicate with other health providers, within the decade we will have 90 percent of our health care providers, doctors, and hospitals being able to communicate instantaneously. Jobs, jobs, jobs, but for the 21st century and do it now.

We can quibble. We all have proposals. We've all made compromises, but we all know the task is before us today. You want to complain, you want to debate—let's do that. But every day that we don't do something, 20,000 American jobs are lost. Let's move today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to say, the Republican Party is in absolute agreement. This is about jobs. This is about immediate action. That's why we have offered a plan that gives twice the jobs at half the cost. We believe it should be also debated today, but instead, the Democrats have chosen to pass the largest appropriation bill in the history of the United States.

Now, I don't think they've read it. We all know this bill hasn't been read but by a mere handful of people, but part of this bill actually increases the debt ceiling to $12 trillion. And you know what, if deficit spending worked, we would be in great shape.

Last March, $29 billion to Bear Stearns; in May, $168 million for another stimulus package; in July, $200 billion for Fannie Mae; in September, $85 billion for AIG; in October, $700 billion for Wall Street. My goodness, we would be in great shape if deficit spending stimulus bills like this and bailouts worked.

But instead, what we're doing here today is just one more of the same. This is a bill that has 17 percent tax cuts, a big 20 cents an hour for the workers out there. It has a mere 7 percent in shovel-ready projects, dams, roads, bridges that need to be rebuilt.

But the Democrats have instead decided to increase the Federal Government spending: 31 new Federal programs; $200 billion in phantom earmarks that will be decided where the money is spent by State and local governments, even though the Federal legislative branch should be deciding where Federal money goes; $2 billion for groups like ACORN; $500 billion in a non-earmark bill for the NIH headquarters in Maryland. Isn't that interesting? $600 billion for DTV; $30 million for a rat in San Francisco. Mickey Mouse is going to be envious. He's no longer the mouse with the greatest net worth in California. Now, there's a San Francisco rat that has edged him out.

While people are being foreclosed and unemployed, the Democrats are spending $30 million for a rat.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 10 seconds.

I wish the other side would make up their mind whether it's mice or rats, neither of which are in this bill if they will read it. Got it right here. Find it and show it to me. Show it to me. Show it to me.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time America has faced an economic crisis, but it may be the first time that one entire political party will sit on the sidelines with their arms crossed, their fists clenched, and their rhetoric numb to the suffering being experienced by millions of Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

The American people are waiting and watching, and we will be judged not by the volume of the rhetoric but by the boldness of our actions. And we have plan, and it's rooted in one fundamental tenet: America once again belongs to Americans.

And this Congress and this President will respond to the needs of the people with programs and promises that can and will get America moving again.

Another 600,000 Americans lost their jobs in January. Overall, 4 million Americans have lost their jobs in the last year, the last year of the Bush administration.

This legislation extends unemployment benefits to keep people with their heads above water while they look for a job, and this legislation provides incentives for States to modernize their unemployment system to meet the demands of the American people in the 21st century.

FDR included unemployment insurance in the New Deal 70 years ago, at a time when women typically stayed at home to raise a family and part-time jobs didn't exist. We are offering a new deal for a new century. This legislation will help working moms and dads. It will help States make the adjustments that one would like them to make to better respond to their people.

This legislation adds $100 a month to the UI benefit, but before some on the other side jump up and shout ''moral hazard,'' know this. The average UI benefit check does not even reach the

poverty level. We offer a helping hand while you offer rhetoric. For instance, every dollar we provide in UI provides $1.64 in economic impact.

I urge you to vote for H.R. 1.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this agreement. People back home want us to work together to do something to save their jobs, make up their lost savings, and restore the value of their homes.

Quite correctly, Americans are asking for help, and we had—I repeat, Mr. Speaker, had—the opportunity to respond by passing a bill that actually created jobs. Unfortunately, the House-Senate agreement, to the extent that we've been allowed to see its contents, does little to help their cause.

Most of this massive domestic spending will be sucked up by an enlarged government bureaucracy, hiring more Federal and State public workers, not helping small businesses and families survive.

□ 1215

The majority ''markets'' this measure as a transportation infrastructure package. But a mere 17 percent of the funding is directed towards the road, highway, and Army Corps of Engineers programs that would immediately create real jobs.

In fact, H.R. 1 creates over 33 entirely new government programs, at a cost to the taxpayers of over $97 billion, and adds 600,000 new government jobs. And when will Americans see the effects of this spending? Probably not any time soon.

According to the CBO, less than half of the spending in this nonstimulus package will be paid out in the next 2 years. At that rate, an economic recovery will probably outrun most of the spending in this expensive legislation.

And while the agreement does contain some tax relief, it's not targeted to small businesses, which employ half of all of us. And if that weren't enough, the package before us weakens the work requirements of successful welfare programs we enacted years ago. And it may lay the groundwork for a government takeover of American's health care system by creating a Federal bureaucracy that will decide how to ration health care.

Mr. Speaker, Congress had the opportunity to ''jump-start'' our economy, and failed in that responsibility.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Let me first commend the conferees for putting this legislation together and then to remind our friends on the other side that the operative word here today is ''necessary.'' That is the most important word as we move this legislation forward today, ''necessary.''

Mr. RANGEL did a good job negotiating the tax title to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in immediate fiscal stimulus, starting with The Making Work Pay credit, which will cut taxes for 95 percent of all taxpayers, including 2 million families in Massachusetts.

Working families will also benefit from improvements in the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and a new higher education tax credit.

Businesses across the country will benefit from bonus depreciation allowance and small business expensing provisions, as well as relief for small and medium-sized businesses with net operating losses. Incidentally, I pushed for a larger number there, as the other side knows. And State and local government will see substantial relief for infrastructure and other critical needs through the Recovery Zone bonds and Build America bonds.

As a former mayor, I was happy to lead and take the lead on changes to the bond rules that will allow cities and towns to borrow at lower costs at a time when credit is tight.

The compromise also includes AMT protection for 26 million American families—70,000 families in my district alone.

Now, we're going to hear criticism from some that this legislation is too much, it's too little; it's too fast or it's too slow. By definition, by definition, fiscal stimulus means spending. And with an economy as great as ours, it needs to be significant.

We did move at a very quick pace, and we needed to. There are 10,000 families a day in America slipping into foreclosure. That's 10,000 families a day. Clearly, the policies of the last 8 years did not work, and we need a change.

I hope support for this legislation will move today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that gets the vast percentage of increase in spending in this bill, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California. Today, another Kansan is going to get laid off, and they will struggle to pay their bills. Our economy needs help and our people need help. But this bill isn't help. This bill will only place a drag on our economy because it does nothing to solve the underlying problems that hamper our economy.

The Federal Government has a role to help ensure American workers are free to prosper. But borrowing money for massive government spending is not the answer.

The reality is, this bill, some nearly $800 billion in spending and tax cuts, consists entirely of money we do not have. So how are we going to get this money?

There's only three ways to get it. We can ask the Treasury Department to print more money. But we know from the 1970s that causes inflation. The second is we can raise taxes. We'd have to raise taxes $2,600 per American. And we know that higher taxes create higher unemployment. I'm not interested in raising taxes.

The third way is to borrow money from investors. But our investors here in America don't have the money. We'd have to go to other countries, like the United Arab Emirates or Saudi Arabia, because China and the United Kingdom have their own economic problems. They can't raise the money themselves.

So, to attract this money, we're going to have to raise interest rates, and higher interest rates—some 4 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office—causes higher credit card rates, higher car loan rates, and higher home mortgage rates.

We are following the legacy of Paul Volcker from the 1970s. Back then, they called it the misery index. During the 1970s, the media added inflation, unemployment, and interest rates together to get the misery index. And it's coming back. Back then, it was 21.98. Today's, it's 7.92.

There's a better plan than the misery index. We could give every American money by giving them a payroll tax holiday for several years. That would be a 10 to 20 percent pay increase for working Americans, and they would know best how to spend the money for their families. With the money they will buy goods or they will save their money or they will invest their money. All of that creates jobs. Because making more money available for new ideas in the marketplace does create jobs.

Vote ''no'' on this legislation. Vote ''no'' to the misery index. This package will get more money to hardworking Americans by giving it directly to them with a payroll tax holiday, because that is the best plan.

We can stop the return to the misery index by getting people back to work, by getting more money in their pocket. Let's go for a payroll tax holiday. Vote ''no.'' Let's go back to conference. Cut the government spending, add back a payroll tax holiday for working Americans, and return the economy to the strength it once had.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for the time to speak in support of this bill. I thank you for your leadership and for this economic recovery bill, on the issues that are in it, but also on school construction.

I thank Mr. RANGEL, who's been a tireless advocate for investment in our future economy. He and I have been proud to be able to be partners in authorizing the America's Better Classroom Act, which we are finally going to enact into law in this piece of legislation.

For more than 12 years we have been working to improve our Nation's schools and opportunities for the future. The idea that we created, to put the Federal Government into partnership with our local school districts to create private sector jobs and improve schools, was a perfect fit for the needs of our troubled economy. And I am proud that it is included in this final piece of legislation.

I strongly support the conference report for H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which takes needed steps to restore our economy. This bill provides urgently needed relief to struggling individuals and businesses, and will create or save 3.5 million jobs in this country.

Hundreds of thousands of these jobs will be created by the $25 billion in school construction bond tax credits in this piece of legislation. And they will be created quickly. Hundreds of school building projects have been stalled or delayed in this economic downturn. Chairman RANGEL and I have introduced the ABC Act to help school districts get the funding that they need.

Everything I have achieved in life is due to my educational opportunities, the ones that I was given by my friends and neighbors. I want today's generation to have similar opportunities. High-quality schools, with strong teachers and modern facilities, are the key to the future.

Students can't prepare for the 21st century economy in schools from the 20th century that are crumbling, deteriorated, and overcrowded. In today's economic downturn, we have a chance to change this. I urge your vote on this.

In today's economic downturn, we must give our students every tool we can to compete in the global economy. The new school construction enabled by this bill is a good step in that direction. School construction creates jobs today, and provides the foundation for jobs for the future. I am proud that the tax credits in this bill will give local school districts support to improve their schools and the education they provide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference agreement.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield $8.8 billion to the gentleman from Tennessee for 1 minute. That's the cost of the minute I'm yielding him on this bill, to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, we know there's a problem. Republicans have great empathy with the people that are hurting. Our constituents are your constituents. But there's little faith that the Federal Government is going to make things better.

The financial rescue didn't work, the TARP was mismanaged grossly, the auto bailout didn't work. They're looking and seeing home budgets being cut to get through hard times. Local government is being cut, State governments' budgets being cut. But only in Washington can we spend our way into prosperity.

It's an ill-conceived thought. Confidence is lost. It's a wrong approach. If ever there was a massive bill where the devil is in the details, it is this bill. And there are many devils in the details of this bill.

The government is ill-equipped to ramp up and do these things. We're going to be disappointed over time. There's going to be waste, fraud, and abuse everywhere you look.

Just because Republicans spent too much money after September 11th and lost our way on financial matters doesn't mean the Democratic Party should be allowed to wreck our ship of State. This has taken us very quickly down the wrong road. Vote ''no.''

Mr. OBEY. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favor of this conference report. Our Nation's economy is foundering. We need to respond. We're in a deep and long recession. Our unemployment rate is over 7 percent, and growing. And we urgently need an economic recovery package to set the Nation on the proper course to rebound.

I am pleased the House and the Senate moved rapidly to resolve the differences between the two bills and to get this bill to the President so it can finally take action.

The final conference agreement retains provisions that were passed out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in January in three critical areas that will accelerate economic recovery and protect American families: Broadband, energy, and health.

The first piece is an investment in expanding broadband Internet access so businesses and households in rural and other underserved areas can link to the global balance economy.

Broadband networks are as important to the Nation's economic success as the postal roads, canals, rail lines, and interstate highways of the past. Unfortunately, the United States has fallen behind other nations in terms of broadband deployment and adoption.

This legislation would authorize approximately $4.7 billion for grants to be administered by the Commerce Department and another $2.5 billion in grants to be administered by the Agriculture Department to put people to work building new broadband infrastructure.

The second piece we're considering is a major investment in the Nation's energy future. The conference agreement will accelerate deployment of smart grid technology throughout the country, offer loan guarantees for renewable energy and transmission projects, and promote energy efficiency throughout the country.

I am pleased that we were able to adopt these provisions. We also will support economic recovery through the creation of thousands of jobs, especially for low- and middle-income Americans, as the Nation dramatically increases the efficiency in which it uses energy and relies upon renewable sources of energy.

And the final and biggest piece involves investments in health. And there are three sections. First, the bill would help people who lose their jobs and have no health insurance. It provides temporary subsidies for COBRA premiums to enable workers who had insurance, to hold on to that insurance.

The bill would protect health insurance for an additional 7 million Americans. It will also provide an 18-month extension of the health insurance program that helps families transitioning from welfare to work to keep their Medicaid coverage.

Second, the bill would provide $19 billion in funding to accelerate the nationwide adoption of health information technology.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. WAXMAN. This will expedite the development of nationwide health information infrastructure that will enhance real-time communication between providers and improve the coordination of care.

Finally, the bill would provide $87 billion in temporary funding to assist State Medicaid programs facing surges in caseloads and State revenue shortfalls. The bill would provide a temporary increase in the Federal Medicaid matching rate, FMAP. It balances an across-the-board increase of 6.2 percentage points, with an additional increase targeted at those States with high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary to set the course to turn the economy around and deliver on our promise and duty to assist our constituents in this difficult time. I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report.

□ 1230

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the ranking member.

I just want folks to step back for just a second here. You know, last year at the end of the year we spent $700 billion on the TARP. Who knows if it has had any effect. No one knows for sure. This Tuesday, the Secretary of the Treasury said we are going to spend another $2 trillion. Today, we are going to spend $890 billion; with interest, well over another $1 trillion. In another couple weeks, we are going to spend another $400 billion on the omnibus bill. Then there is going to be a war supplement. We are talking about over $4 trillion here in less than 3 months.

This is the most selfish bill I have ever seen generationally. We are saying to our children and grandchildren: We don't care about you, because we just want self-gratification now. We want

to feel better today. We can't take any pain ourselves.

Our kids and grandchildren are paying for this, and it is going to limit their opportunities for the future for the next generations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished dean of the House, the longest-serving Member in the House of Representatives of any Member in history, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding time.

As a boy, I was a page in this body during the Depression. My father was a Member of Congress. A third of the Americans were out of work. People were losing their homes and their farms, businesses were closing. Hardship was terrifying. It was the worst economic experience in the history of this country. Let's learn from history, my dear friends and colleagues, and let's do something about this so that it doesn't happen.

Herbert Hoover became the most reviled President in the history of the United States because he didn't do anything about the recession which was coming. Those who have studied that Depression tell us that had Congress acted and had the administration acted with vigor, that the Depression would have been much shorter and much less severe.

We have a chance to learn from that experience and to do something about it, and to see to it that this generation doesn't leave a depression to the next generation. It is not just about spending money; it is about doing something right about a terrifying problem that faces this country. I urge us to learn from history so that we don't repeat it. Support this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like I went to bed a couple weeks ago and woke up in bizarro-world. We are about to spend over $1 trillion for a stimulus bill which will do little, if anything, to stimulate the economy. What it will stimulate is the growth of government.

I have no doubt that those on the other side of the aisle feel that this is the right thing to do to help the economy, but sincerity does not make something right which is fundamentally wrong, and this bill is fundamentally wrong.

We were just told a few minutes ago that the key word here is ''necessary.''

Millions of dollars for mouse habitat? Yes, it is not specifically put in the bill. What they have done is put in a fund for habitat restoration, which the agency says they will spend up to $30 million on mouse habitat restoration. That is beautiful. Necessary? I don't know.

Fifty million dollars for the NEA. I love the NEA. Necessary in a stimulus bill?

Billions of dollars for a sin express train from Los Angeles to Las Vegas. Necessary? I don't think so.

And, of course, we have got the infamous Frisbee golf course. And if you are going to have a Frisbee golf course, you had better have green golf carts, So we put money in for green golf carts. That is good, too. Necessary? I don't think so.

The list is too long to complete when you look at this bill; but, fundamentally, the problem is the process that created this bill. None of this stuff would have been in here had we gone through a process which allowed Members to have input and debate and so forth on this bill. Instead, this has been created in the Speaker's office, in the President's office, and handed to us and said, ''We have got to pass this bill.''

This process stinks. There is no other word for it. And for the first time in my public life, 4 years on a local city council, 14 years in the Idaho legislature, and 10 years in this body, for the first time in my life I am embarrassed to be a Member of this body.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed, frankly, from the comments I hear from the other side of the aisle about mouse traps, Frisbees, golf carts. The economy is in terrible shape, it is getting worse every day, and we are trying to address it in a bold way. That is what is necessary here, not talking about these trivial things that the other side is bringing up.

At a time when States are facing fiscal problems and more people are in need of health care services, we provide in this bill critical financial assistance so that States can maintain their Medicaid programs, health care. It would provide access to health coverage for those who recently lost their jobs by making COBRA coverage more affordable. And, finally, the package would modernize our Nation's health care system by investing nearly $20 billion in health information technology.

These are the important things that we face right now. People are losing their health care. We are addressing this. We are giving money back to the States. We are helping people with their health care so that they can stay insured.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, now is the time for bold action. This package is a good package. Vote ''yes.''

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 20½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, I created the E-Verify program, and I will not idly stand by while a coalition of pro-amnesty groups and their allies in big business kill this program in the dead of night. The American people have repeatedly voiced their support for employment verification; yet, we find that, once again, special interests win out.

While nearly 1 trillion taxpayer dollars are going to be spent in this Reid/Pelosi stimulus plan, there is no assurance that the job it created will go to American workers. Amendments to reauthorize the E-Verify program, which expires on March 6 and requires any entity receiving stimulus funds to participate in E-Verify, both of which had been accepted in the House Appropriations Committee, were stripped out of the bill without discussion or debate.

The one candle in the darkness of this disastrous bill was the reauthorization requirements to use E-Verify. Now, we are left with legislation that places the interests of illegal immigrants above those of hard-working American families and leaves this bill at the foot of future generations.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman OBEY, and Chairman RANGEL for their hard work on the compromise legislation that we have before us today. In a time when so many Americans are in the grips of economic hardship and despair, now is the time for all of us to come together and act on the part of those who are in need.

Mr. Speaker, our people need jobs. Our people need jobs and our Nation needs jobs. And we need to invest in our infrastructure, invest in our communities, and invest in the next generation of Americans. This package includes all the tools and all the money to make our dream of a better tomorrow for all Americans a reality.

With the passing of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we will act by deeds, not just words. The Bible tells us that a tree will be known by the fruit it bears. This bill has good fruit in it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

I want to start out by talking a little bit about the process. I know that is not very sexy. But when the President and people complain that Republicans are not being bipartisan, they need to know that we haven't been given much of a chance, if any of a chance, to be bipartisan.

As this bill started in the House, there were no hearings in the House of

Representatives. There was a markup in Ways and Means and a markup in the Approps Committee and a markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Energy and Commerce Committee that I am on, Mr. WAXMAN, to his credit, had a 12-hour markup, and five Republican amendments were accepted. Three of those were stripped out before the bill came to the floor; one was kept in as is, and one was materially changed.

When we went to conference with the other body, our chairman Mr. WAXMAN was appointed a conferee, as he should have been, because it is about $200 billion of the bill is in the Energy and Commerce jurisdiction; but no Republican, no minority member was appointed. So we had no Republican input into the conference. Of course, that is probably okay, because it really wasn't a conference. There were five House conferees and five Senate conferees. The majority party Members, three on the House and three on the Senate, signed the conference report without anybody actually on the Republican side being given a copy to look at. So it was kind of a done deal.

So on process alone, when the President asks why Republicans tend to be appositive of the bill, it is because we really were not given any input into the finished project.

On the policy, the Energy and Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over energy, over telecommunication, and over health care. The energy section, they took out all the energy grants for things like clean coal technology. They left in a little thing called electricity decoupling; which means, in order to get some of these green energy grants, the Governor of a State has to certify to the Department of Energy's Secretary that they are going to do this decoupling. That means that you can allow the PUC to decouple the price you pay from the amount of electricity that you use. So it is a revenue guarantee for the utility; so as the utility gets the green grant and goes out and educates you on how to use less electricity, you use less electricity, your bill stays the same or goes up. It is the most anticompetitive, anticonsumer, antifree-market piece of legislation I have ever seen on the House floor and it is in this bill.

On health care, my friends on the other side have made a big point of talking about all the things they are doing on health care. Well, you have the health IT grants, which some of that may be good, but do you really need to give every doctor in America $44,000 to switch to electronic records? And, oh, by the way, a lot of that money is not available in 2011, until 2012? I am not sure that is very stimulative of the economy.

We give the States more FMAP money for Medicaid. It doesn't have to be spent on Medicaid. Fifty percent or 65 percent is allocated on the standard formula package, and the rest is allocated on high unemployment. But the once the State gets that Medicaid money, they can use it for other purposes. And, oh, by the way, that is theoretically temporary. But do you really believe that adding $90 billion to the baseline for Medicaid is going to be temporary? It is going to go into the permanent baseline, and it is going to raise the cost over time to the U.S. taxpayer.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. But the point of the subject is those of us on our side, we understand that people are hurting, we understand that we need to do things to help the economy. Shouldn't we start by keeping the people that have a job, let them keep a little bit more of their money by doing some tax cuts? A lot of those got diluted in this bill. Shouldn't we require that, if you are going to spend money, it has a long-term effect, it helps basic infrastructure? This bill doesn't do that. Vote ''no.''

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago a Presidential candidate, John Kennedy, said the following: The Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word ''crisis.'' One brush stroke stands for danger; the other stands for opportunity. In a crisis, be aware of the danger, but recognize the opportunity.

That is what we are doing today. We recognize the full danger that faces America, the greatest danger since the great depression. But we also recognize the opportunity for the people of our great Nation that we love so much, and what we are doing is building for the future: Health care for the unemployed, extension of unemployment benefits for those that find themselves unemployed. The building blocks not only for today, but the opportunities for tomorrow by making investments in technology, broadband, the sciences.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider this opportunity for America.

Mr. Speaker, America has been shaken to its core by an economic disruption unlike anything we've seen since the Great Depression. For too many Americans it seems that nothing is certain or secure—not our jobs, not our homes, not the very businesses our economy stands upon.

Today the American people and people around the world can take heart that our Nation is acting to reverse course and begin the difficult work of rebuilding our economy, our infrastructure, and our confidence in our country's future.

This legislation responds to the pressing needs of today, creating and saving 3.5 million jobs by rebuilding America through new investments in roads, bridges, mass transit, energy efficient buildings, flood control, clean water projects, school construction, and other infrastructure projects. 95 percent of American workers will receive an immediate tax cut to ease the impact of the harsh economic conditions and jumpstart consumer spending on goods and services.

Just as importantly, this final bill makes critical investments in science, technology and innovation which will ensure that our recovery is strong and that the United States continues its leadership in the competitive global economy.

To secure America's technology leadership in the 21st Century we are renewing America's investments in basic science and research, providing $15 billion for scientific research, including $3 billion for the National Science Foundation, $1.6 billion for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and $10 billion for the National Institutes of Health.

To achieve energy independence, we have invested $30 billion in energy programs such as a new, smart power grid, advanced battery technology, and energy efficiency measures, plus another $20 billion in tax incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency.

To provide all Americans an 'on-ramp' to the Information Superhighway, we are investing $7 billion for extending broadband services to underserved communities across the country.

Fifty years ago John Kennedy said ''the Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word 'crisis.' One brush stroke stands for danger; the other for opportunity. In a crisis, be aware of the danger—but recognize the opportunity.''

This economic recovery package is a bill filled with hope and belief—hope that the danger of the current crisis will be averted, new jobs will be created, and old jobs will be restored so that people will once again enjoy the dignity of a day's work, and a belief that we recognize this opportunity to reinvigorate the great innovative spirit of our country that we love so much.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the partner of our chairman, Mr. OBEY, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

□ 1245

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the President said, ''We don't want any tired old ideas.'' I agree. One-time rebate checks, special interest pork and runaway spending, those tired old ideas didn't work in the past administration. They won't work now. This is just more of the same. Both parties have messed this thing up. So the question is, are we going to come together and fix this?

The crown jewel of the American economy is the risk-taker, the entrepreneur, the small businessmen and women, the person who put it all on the line and created jobs. That is the way out. That is not what this bill does. This bill says, let's take money out of the economy and away from the private sector through higher borrowing and higher taxes, ultimately so that government bureaucrats can spend money and try and re-micromanage the economy back to prosperity.

This bill, which will lead to higher costs and higher taxes, will be not a road to prosperity, but a road to stagnation. The priorities are just all wrong. There is more money in this legislation for the National Endowment for the Arts, for the National Endowment for the Arts, than there is to helping small businesses keep and create jobs. We can do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, please, if you want bipartisanship, that means collaboration,

working with us. You have all the rights. The majority can do whatever they want. But when you look at the minority's alternative, a plan to create jobs, to help families and small businesses keep and create jobs using the administration's own methodology, you will see that our plan creates twice the jobs for half the cost. This bill sends us on a worldwide borrowing binge. We're going to go out and borrow four times as much money this year than we ever have in the history of this country in a single year. This is not just a road to stagnation, it is a road to stagflation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, which will reinvest in America's future and which will create jobs. Do you know that there are still sectors of our economy that are hiring? And one of those is health care. I'm so proud to see that this legislation recognizes the need to educate new nurses, physicians and dentists and responds by investing $500 million for professional education. In 2008, over 27,000 qualified applicants were turned away from nursing schools because we don't have enough faculty to train them. The programs that will be funded through this bill will help train more faculty and also entry-level nursing students so that we can shore up our health care workforce.

If we continue simply at the pace we are today, we will have a shortage of 1 million nurses by the year 2020. This bill makes an excellent investment to alleviate that shortage, to create jobs for nurses, for doctors and for health care professionals.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Nobody knows the pain of a bad economy like us fellow Michiganders, and we're suffering worse than any other State in the Nation. And if this bill even came close to providing hope or a job, I would be for it, but this bill is dangerous. And this is the kind of thing that happens when you rush it and you don't let people in to see it.

Think about it. They do say, listen, it gives credits for hybrid plug-ins. But what they don't tell you is that in this bill, for every dollar the average family saves by going green, the electric companies charge you $1. Your electric bill is going up with this piece of legislation. They say, do you know what? There is business relief in this bill for small businesses. They don't tell you that less than 1 percent of this bill goes to small businesses.

As was said before, we spend more on arts than we do on small business, which is 80 percent of our job providers. They say this bill spends money on roads and bridges. But they don't tell you it is less than 7 percent, and only about $10 billion in the first year over 50 States. That is hardly an investment in our roads and our bridges.

They say there is no mouse in this bill. But there is, sir. What they don't tell you is that in the EPA projects, it cites for sure and for certain they will spend money on the salt marsh habitat for the mouse in San Francisco. Certainly, the Speaker is getting her cheese. The people in Michigan are waiting for theirs. I will tell you this. Do you know what? We spend money in this bill. True enough. And what they don't tell you is that this is one of the most massive, massive transfers of debt to our children in the history of this country. There are lots of IOUs, but not much for jobs in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I stand in strong support of the economic recovery legislation before us today. We cannot stand idly by like our Republican friends are doing and let our economy sink any further. The cost of inaction is far too great. The American people are hurting, and we're trying to do something about it.

Our Republican friends, unfortunately, are becoming the party of ''no.'' Well, while they are saying ''no,'' we are saying ''yes,'' yes to creating 3½ million jobs, yes to providing tax breaks to the middle class, yes to providing AMT relief, yes to improving our infrastructure to be more energy efficient, yes in providing health care coverage for millions of Americans during this recession, providing an estimated $87 billion in additional Federal matching funds.

This will help States like mine, like New York, maintain their Medicaid programs in the face of massive State budget shortfalls over the next 2 years. We say ''yes'' to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. FMAP funds are important. I have long fought hard for more FMAP funds. The stimulus will provide much-needed relief to our States. We say ''yes'' for energy-efficient programs. Say ''yes'' for this bill. This is a good bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Chairman.

It is sad that this House has imposed a gag rule so that the American public can't hear today what's in this bill. The special interests know what's in this bill. They certainly do. Congress is going to rain billions of dollars of cash across this land, and special interests and lobbyists have big buckets out to catch it.

We all want this President to succeed. We want this economy to get going because people are hurting. But when the economy is drowning, you throw it a life preserver. You don't build a 40-foot yacht for it. This bill is too big. It is too expensive. It is way too slow. And at the end of the day, it is not going to rescue this economy. And at the end of a couple of years, it's middle-class families and small businesses that are going to have to pay for all this cash.

Taxpayers just aren't willing to spend one-quarter of $1 million to trade a new job. They're not willing to spend more money on art than on small businesses. They're not willing to buy Frisbee golf courses and gambling trains. That is a bad use of our dollars. We can do better.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me highlight two issues. First, temporary increases in COBRA, FMAP and DSH coverage, a lifeline for hard-hit families and communities. Mr. WAXMAN played the critical role in the conference on these issues, and constituents in our adjoining congressional districts are very grateful. Harbor-UCLA Medical Center is the only level 1 trauma center near top terror targets, like LAX and the Ports of LA and Long Beach. Without DSH, Harbor will have no surge capacity to treat victims of terror and natural disasters.

Second, energy innovation and efficiency. This is a stimulus bill, and the smart grid and transportation projects it funds are a jobs engine. It sets the framework for future climate change legislation.

Mr. Chairman, enhanced safety net and clean energy jobs are good reasons to vote ''aye.''

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So I was at a birthday party for some young kids not too long ago, and everybody is playing the normal games that all little kids play. But there is one kid—and this is typical at every kid's birthday party—that sees the cake and starts scraping the icing off the cake, and he leaves the grubby mess for everybody else. That's exactly what this bill does.

According to the CBO, an entity that everybody pauses and recognizes as authoritative, the CBO says, yeah, you may get a short-term sugar buzz off this. But in 2013, because of the passage of this bill, you're going to have negative growth. From 2013 to 2019, what we're basically going to be foisting on this economy is that grubby, nasty birthday cake without any of the icing. We can do much better than this. I think the President expects us to do much better than this. And I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. For millions of Americans, after 8 years of laissez-faire economics, they know it is

just a fancy word for ''left behind.'' Fixing the economy is not a spectator sport. That's what has been going on for 8 years. And that's what's going on with the Republicans here today.

This bill creates or saves 3.5 million jobs. It provides tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans. It spurs a green jobs revolution. It has health IT that will revolutionize medicine with privacy and security built in that I requested and the majority has placed in this bill. There's more money in this bill after 5 years of cutting the NIH budget, there's a dramatic increase in the NIH budget to find a cure for cancer, for heart disease, for Parkinson's and for Alzheimer's. This is a revolution in health care, in energy and in job creation.

This bill must be passed today and break with the 8 years of laissez-faire, which has hurt every single American family. Vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Today we're responding with determination and bold action to combat the most severe economic crisis our country has faced since the Great Depression.

For years, as hardworking American families struggled to make ends meet and the economy shed millions of jobs, Republicans told us not to worry—we are in the midst of a ''jobless recovery'', they said. But ''jobless recovery'' is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife—it just doesn't exist.

The failed ''laissez-faire'' approach of the past 8 years has now been discredited by rising unemployment, loss of confidence in our financial markets, and the economic hardships suffered by families across the country.

For millions of Americans, ''laissez-faire'' is just a fancy name for ''left behind.''

With this economic recovery package, we are taking the bold action that is needed by creating or saving 3-and-a-half million jobs, rebuilding America, making us more globally competitive and energy independent, and transforming our economy.

I say to my Republican friends: ''fixing the economy is not a spectator sport.''

While our country is facing enormous challenges, we also have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create millions of new jobs, invest in vital priorities, and position our economy for future growth. Today we are seizing this historic opportunity and setting our country on a new direction.

This is about greenbacks and green energy.

This urgently-needed economic recovery package funds infrastructure projects that are ''shovel-ready'', while also supporting future-oriented projects that are ''circuit-ready'': broadband, electronic medical records, smart grid, advanced battery technologies, and other vital priorities.

The massive investments in weatherization, state energy efficiency grants, and federal building efficiency are some of the safest and smartest investments our country can make right now. They put money into the pockets of American workers and pay for themselves in the form of energy savings and lower energy prices. This energy efficiency ''double dividend'' is a proven, reliable phenomenon that our current weak economy must capitalize.

The bill provides $19 billion for a new health IT infrastructure to improve care, lower costs and reduce medical errors. I am pleased that the conference report includes patient privacy safeguards that I have long advocated, including a provision that I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to ensure that patients' medical records are made unreadable to unauthorized individuals.

This balanced, well-thought out package provides tax relief for 95 percent of Americans and targets investments in key areas to turn around the American economy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

3.5 million jobs created or saved.

Tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans.

Green job revolution.

Health IT, with privacy.

NIH increase—cure Alzheimer's.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady fighting for jobs in Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, for 1 minute.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from Macomb County, Michigan, which is the proud home of the Reagan Democrats. And it is a community that has been impacted as much as anybody in this Nation by the economic downturn. And I do not need to be lectured by anyone about the challenges we are facing, because we live with it every single day. I understand. Believe me, I understand.

So when President Obama talked about an economic stimulus plan that was focused on tax cuts or massive infrastructure investment, I was there. But what we are about to vote on today is unrecognizable from what he talked about. Michigan is a State of about 10 million people, and we are the hardest hit, as I said, by this economy. And yet we are expected to get approximately $7 billion from this bill. And apparently the Senate majority leader has earmarked $8 billion for a rail system from Las Vegas to Los Angeles? You have got to be kidding. You have got to be kidding.

As everyone knows, Michigan is dependent on the auto industry, which is on its knees right now. So I was incredibly disappointed to see an $11 billion auto incentive to spur auto sales reduced to $2 billion in the conference report.

Please vote ''no'' against this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank personally Congressman WAXMAN, Congressman RANGEL, Congressman OBEY and particularly their staffs for their hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, no one disputes that we're in an economic crisis. It continues to deepen. Families are hurting. In my home State of North Carolina, more than one-third of our 100 counties are now suffering from double-digit unemployment, including 10 of those counties in the First Congressional District.

Without question, we need to quickly pass this stimulus bill this afternoon which will put people back to work, provide relief for the people who need it the most and make investments in our future. Americans demanded change last November. And we must answer that call today. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama understands something that every Vermonter knows, and that is that this economy faces the biggest challenge since the Great Depression. We have a very simple choice in Congress. It is to do nothing, as Herbert Hoover did, or it is to act boldly, as Franklin Roosevelt did.

□ 1300

This bill embraces the philosophy of Franklin Roosevelt that when the economy is deteriorating, people are losing their jobs, Congress must act to save jobs and rebuild our economy.

This bill is well-balanced and can provide 8,000 jobs in Vermont. It helps our taxpayers, property taxpayers and State taxpayers. It provides a safety net to the people who, through absolutely no fault of their own, lost their jobs. We owe it to them. And it provides investments in the future. Green jobs, health care information technology.

This is essential as a step to start revitalizing our economy and putting it in a growth path for the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, people want to know how did we get into this painful economy. Too many of our fellow citizens borrowed too much. They spent too much, and they couldn't pay it back. And now the mistakes of individuals, the Democrats want to force upon us collectively.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity. Even the Democrats' own Congressional Budget Office says H.R. 1 is the single greatest spending bill in the history of America, will leave us the greatest debt in the history of America, and ultimately, will hurt our economy, leaving a legacy of debt, crushing debt for future generations.

The Republicans want to stimulate the economy by helping small business. The Democrats want to stimulate big government. The Democrats want to spend millions on urban canals. The Republicans want to spend millions on small businesses like Williams Paint and Body, to preserve and grow 21 jobs. Democrats want to spend $300 million to buy government bureaucrats new cars. Republicans want to spend money on Terry Manufacturing, to preserve and secure 20 new jobs. Big government or small business? Choose small business.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. We are coming close to the end of this debate. America and Americans are in trouble. They're hurting. Millions of our constituents are in great pain. They've lost their homes, they've lost their jobs. Their salaries are not keeping up with the costs that confront them.

And so we come here, 435 of us, and five representing the territories and the District of Columbia. We come here to act, to act on their behalf, to try to make a difference, to try to ease the pain that this economy has visited upon them.

Those of us who have been here for many years have heard this debate very often. And I tell my friends, I'm sure that had I been here in 1929 and 1930, I would have heard much the same representation.

And we were told, frankly, in the last of the 1980s, stick with us on this economic program. And it didn't work. And we were told in 2001 and 2003, stick with us on this economic program, and it didn't work.

And like the failed program of the 1920s that brought our economy so low, the failed policies of the early part of this century have brought this economy to the lowest point it has been since the policies of the late 1920s.

And so we hear the debate. We hear the debate about investing in our people. We hear the debate about trying to build up our economy, create jobs. And we hear one argument, do it our way, do it our way and you'll create those jobs. Well, my friends, we did it your way. In 2001, in 2002, in 2003, in 2004, in 2005, 2006, 2007 and in 2008. And we had the worst job performance of any administration since the late 1920s and early 1930s.

I would hope that every Member on this floor, of whatever party, of whatever ideological persuasion, would pray that this bill works; not for political purposes, because if this bill works, we will create those 3½ million jobs. Am I absolutely assured that it will? I am not. I regret that I'm not.

But the best advice and counsel that I have received over the last 5 months that we've been working on this bill, September, October, November, December, January, as we hemorrhaged jobs in this greatest economy on the face of the earth, as a million people lost their jobs over the last 60 days, as 65,000 Americans lost their jobs in 1 day 2 weeks ago. And so America expects us to act.

And none of us can guarantee that we have all the answers. But economist after economist after economist, including one of JOHN MCCAIN's economic advisers, says that we have to act, we have to act with speed, and we have to act substantively, and we have to act with large investment.

On the tax side, in cutting taxes, millions and millions and millions of Americans will receive a tax cut when we pass this bill and President Obama signs it. Millions and millions and millions of people will be helped as they've lost their jobs and can't put food on the table of their families, will be helped by this bill. Millions of families who know that their children are going to have to compete in a global marketplace will be able to send their children to college because of this bill. And in addition to that, we will invest billions of dollars in making sure that we are no longer subject to being held hostage by the oil barons who wish us no good will.

And so, my friends, we come pretty close to the end of this debate. And we ought to vote, not as Republicans, not as Democrats. We ought to vote recognizing the policies that we've been pursuing have not worked, demonstrably, statistically, obviously. There's no argument on that. Millions of people unemployed. Millions lost their jobs under the economic policies we've been pursuing.

And so, yes, President Obama said to the American public, we need to change. This is our moment. We need to move in a new direction. And that's what this bill does.

Some would like to stay on the same path, pursuing the same failed policies. The sign of a good person and a good legislator is to say, I moved in this direction and it didn't work, and so I'll change directions. That's what this bill does.

Every American prays that this bill will work. I think all of us pray that this bill will work. I hope that we come together, not because this bill is perfect, but because it is a substantial investment of America's money in resuscitating its economy that is causing it such great pain.

My friends, it is time for us to act. Vote for this bill to restore, to recover, to invest in a better future for all those who sent us here, hoping that we would act in their best interests and the best interest of their children, their family and their country. I believe voting ''yes'' is doing just that. And I urge my colleagues to do just that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the newest Member of the House, AARON SCHOCK of Illinois.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege yesterday of traveling with the President to my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, to visit a company that has made the news recently, Caterpillar Corporation. And during that speech, the President had me stand up in front of the hundreds of my constituents and Caterpillar workers and urged them to call on me to support this bill, and asked them to approach me after his speech to put pressure on me to vote for this bill.

I found it very interesting that after the President finished his speech and I stayed around, not one employee at that facility approached me and asked me to vote for this bill. In fact, I have received over 1,400 phone calls, e-mails and letters from Caterpillar employees alone asking me to oppose this legislation. Why? Because they get it. They know that this bill is not stimulus. They know that this bill will not do anything to create long-term sustained economic growth. This bill is too big to get it wrong.

I hail from a district that once had Everett Dirksen, who is famous for a billion here, a billion there.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. SCHOCK. Everett Dirksen once said, a billion here, a billion there. Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, we're now a trillion here, a trillion there. We cannot afford to get this wrong. It is too important to get it wrong.

My district also had a man by the name of Abraham Lincoln who served in this seat for 2 years. We celebrated his 200th birthday yesterday. I'm reminded of his quote: ''What kills a skunk is the publicity it brings itself.'' Perhaps that is the haste by which this bill is being brought forward.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today we stand shoulder to shoulder with President Obama to say to the American people, help is on the way. This package packs a punch where it's needed most: ready-to-go infrastructure projects, tax relief for middle America and small businesses, essential forward-looking investments in areas like clean energy, health IT, scientific research and education, priorities that will create or save millions of jobs in this country.

Now, throughout this debate we've heard from those who, for a variety of reasons, think we should do nothing. While those voices may be sincere, inaction is not an option. Just say no is not an answer to the American people at this time.

And if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to define themselves as the party of ''Nobama'' I think that the American people will call them and say it's time for us to work together.

There are also those that say we should do this through tax cuts alone. And they propose substituting a middle class tax cut package with a tax package that once again benefited those who are relatively well off.

We don't need more of the same. We need to put this country to work. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just received official scoring of the $792 billion bill at 12:04 p.m. Unfortunately, we didn't receive

this critical information until one-third of our very limited debate time was over.

While portions of the bill were scored by CBO earlier, in the case of the appropriations section, 40 percent of this entire package, the Members have not had the benefit of knowing what effects this bill would have. Now that we have this information, let me tell you what the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concedes.

In the case of the more than $311 billion in spending, CBO estimates that less than half of this spending will occur over the next 2 years, the time frame that many economists say such spending must occur to have the stimulative effect.

CBO estimates that only 11 percent of the money will spend out this year. It begs the question why has the majority decided to include this in this bill rather than through the regular appropriations process? Why have they decided to create 33 new programs and permanently expand 73 programs?

□ 1315

By growing the Federal Government now in this bill, the majority knows that they have a much better chance of permanently increasing government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of this economic recovery package—a bold, urgent plan to create American jobs and to move to long-term economic growth. Every day reminds us of why this recovery package is so critical and urgent, and it reminds me of why we serve in this institution.

Last month, the economy lost 600,000 jobs. States are facing major midyear budget shortfalls. They have already begun to furlough employees. This week, we worked with President Obama and with the Senate to create 3.5 million jobs to get our economy moving—putting resources in the hands of people who need relief and who will spend it quickly, giving 95 percent of working Americans an immediate tax cut, expanding the eligibility of the child tax credit, benefiting over 16 million children, $20 billion to increase the food stamp benefit, which will reach 14 million families immediately, putting Americans back to work with $100 billion for building roads, bridges, mass transit, energy-efficient buildings, and clean water projects.

No investments are more critical than those that we make on our human capital. We got this right. Let's get it right today and support this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Could I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I believe I have two.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would ask the gentleman to proceed. We have only two left—the Speaker, and I will be closing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have been told, since the Speaker wants to close, then our leader ought to precede her, we will have three.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would suggest the gentleman proceed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, outside the walls of Congress, America is paralyzed by a suffocating crisis of confidence. A virus that began in the credit and housing markets has spread to infect the broader economy. Small businesses are hunkered down. The promise of retaining or of finding a solid job slips further out of reach for America's workers.

With this stimulus package, Congress has a responsibility to re-instill lost confidence, and it has an obligation to focus our efforts like a laser on the creation, preservation and protection of sustainable jobs. That is why the bill we are voting on today represents a fundamental dereliction of duty on the part of this majority. This legislation will not put people to work right away, nor does it contain the time-honored incentives for work, investment, innovation, and job creation that are proven to stimulate growth.

This week, I spoke with a struggling business owner in my district. How could I tell him I am voting for a bill that gives more money to projects like Federal Government cars than it gives to businesses like his. This bill is loaded with wasteful deficit spending on the majority's favorite government programs. We need jobs, not mountains of debt to be paid by our children. We can do better. We proposed a plan on our side that did do better. It created twice as many jobs at half the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be offering the motion to recommit momentarily, which will be offering to restore the tax credit for car purchases to the full $11.5 billion, which was reported by the Senate to the conference committee. Unfortunately, it was stripped out of there. The Democrats watered down this proposal to $1.6 billion, which will have almost no impact on the auto industry. Of course, my being from Michigan and as we all know, the auto industry is on its knees.

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

Mr. OBEY. Could I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have one speaker remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Mr. OBEY, the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. RANGEL, the chair of Ways and Means; Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ—the chairs of the committees which had the most to do with putting this legislation together. I thank them for their great work on behalf of the American people.

My colleagues, as we gather here today, the American people are watching and are waiting. They want to see if we can act on their behalf. They want to know if we have heard their pleas. They are concerned about their jobs—whether they can hold them—and those who have lost their jobs are concerned about how they are going to be able to have any economic stability for their families. They are concerned about their health care. They are concerned about putting food on the table.

There is a great deal of apprehension in our country about our economy. What we need now, though, is not fear. We need confidence. We need confidence in our economy, in our markets. We need consumer confidence. We need to do the job for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than 3 weeks ago, in his very inspirational inaugural address, President Obama pledged ''action—bold and swift—not only to create new jobs but to lay a foundation for growth.'' Today, only a little more than 3 weeks later, Congress is boldly and swiftly delivering on the President's promise of new jobs, new hope and a new direction for the American people.

I said on this floor that the ship of state is difficult to turn. Yet the American people know and historians will judge that this is a remarkable achievement for President Barack Obama. Never before has a President passed his first major economic proposal so boldly and so swiftly.

It is also a remarkable achievement for this Congress that we dubbed 2 years ago the ''New Direction Congress.'' With the extraordinary articulation of the President's vision and our own represented in this legislation, the name ''New Direction Congress'' rings more true now than ever. It is in sharp contrast to the ''do nothing'' approach that some want us to take here, and certainly, it is in very sharp contrast to the approach taken when our country was in big economic trouble leading into the Depression.

My colleague, Mr. MILLER, has already told you some of this, but I want to revisit it.

When President Hoover was faced with the Depression, he said, ''What the country needs is a big laugh,'' he said in 1931. ''If someone could get off a good joke every day, I think our troubles would be over.''

In 1932, Hoover asked Will Rogers to think of a joke that would stop hoarding. He told Rudy Vallee, ''If you could sing a song that will make people forget the Depression, I will give you a medal.'' President Hoover told Christopher Morley, ''Perhaps what this country needs is a good poem . . . Sometimes a good poem can do more than legislation.''

Sometimes it can. But not this legislation.

What President Hoover was saying then was not funny then, and it is not funny now. The American people need action, and they need action now. They have a right, as they listen to this debate, to ask about this legislation: What is in it for me?

After all of the debate, this legislation can be summed up in one word, ''jobs''—new jobs for the 3.6 million Americans who were put out of work since the recession began in December 2007, new jobs and an economy transformed by this legislation's new investments in health, education, science, innovation, and in clean, efficient American energy, new jobs created through modernizing America's roads, bridges, transit systems, and waterways. It is the first such large-scale effort in half a century since the creation of the Interstate Highway System under President Eisenhower. The jobs that the American people care about most—their own—will be dramatically safer the day that President Obama signs this into law.

While we jump-start and then transform our economy for years to come, we must also lift those harmed by the economy we inherit—the workers and families who have been hurt in the recession. What is in it for them?

More than 35 percent of this package will provide direct tax relief to 95 percent of American workers through the Making Work Pay Tax Credit. We provide the most significant expansion of tax cuts for low- and moderate-income Americans ever, which will lift more than 2 million Americans out of poverty.

College will be made more affordable for 7 million American college students who will see an increase in their Pell grants. Four million students will benefit from a new $2,500 American Opportunity Tax Credit that is partially refundable.

We will also help workers and families make ends meet by extending unemployment benefits, COBRA for unemployed workers, by investing in job training and by increasing nutrition assistance. Economists tell us that every dollar invested in food stamps and in unemployment insurance creates $1.73 or $1.63 respectively, making the right thing to do for the American people the right thing to do for the economy. We get the biggest bang for the buck on those initiatives that address the needs of our working families.

The historic scope of this bill is matched by an unprecedented accountability in our tax dollars and transparency so that the American people can see where each dollar is invested and can contact by name those responsible for how those dollars are spent, ensuring a strong result for our economy.

Just yesterday, the President and leaders of Congress came together in the Rotunda of the Capitol to honor the legacy and courage of our Nation's greatest President, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's stirring words captured the very heart of our democracy and representative government. A few years after his sole term in the House of Representatives—and aren't we proud to call him ''colleague,'' one who has served in our House—Lincoln offered his thoughts on the aims of government:

''The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.'' Abraham Lincoln.

More simply put, we are all in this together.

As you cast your vote today, I think I feel this more than on any occasion when we have had a very important vote, and this vote today is, indeed, historic. When we put our cards in to register our support for this important legislation or not, let us think that our hands are being held and that our hands are being pushed by all of the American people who want us to vote for them—for their health, for the education of their children, for their jobs, for the economic security of their families, for a better future built on innovation, science and technology, and on a future that will give them hope.

Their expectations are high. Our opportunity is great. This legislation helps fulfill the promises that President Obama not only made in his inaugural address but that many of us have been working over the years in a bipartisan way to achieve. I never thought I would see the day when we would have an opportunity so great to do so much for so many people in our country.

I urge a strong and resounding ''yes'' for the American people.

□ 1330

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to call upon my last speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that according to the Congressional Budget Office, only 11 percent of the appropriations in this bill will be spent by the end of 2009; 47 percent would be spent by fiscal year 2010; 53 percent would not be spent until after October of 2011.

It is my pleasure to call upon, for 1 minute, the Republican leader of the House, JOHN BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the American economy needs help. Our neighbors, our friends, our constituents, they're hurting. And there's not a Member in this body on either side of the aisle that doesn't understand that. And I think everyone in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle understands that Congress needs to act and we need to act now to help American families and help small businesses and to help bring more confidence back to our economy.

The question is, how do you do that?

The President, when he outlined his desires for this bill, summed it up pretty simply when he said, ''This bill needs to be about jobs.'' I don't think there is anybody in this Chamber that disagrees that this bill needs to be about jobs, preserving jobs in America, and helping to create new jobs and helping to get our economy rolling again.

But the bill that was supposed to be about jobs, jobs, jobs has turned into a bill that's all about spending, spending, and spending.

This is disappointing. The American people expect more of us. They expect to have something that's going to work for them. And my opposition to this bill isn't the fact that we're doing a bill—we need to act. But how?

When you look at some of the spending of this bill, it will do nothing about creating jobs in America. Tell me how spending $50 million for some salt marsh mouse in San Francisco is going to help a struggling auto worker in Ohio. Tell me how spending $8 billion in this bill to have a high-speed rail line between Los Angeles and Las Vegas is going to help the construction worker in my district. Or how about the family who called me about the fact that the bread winner in the family's hours are going to be cut from 40 hours to 20 hours. Can't hardly make his payment. What's it do for him? Absolutely nothing.

And so, my concern about this is that we have to have a plan that will work for the American people, work for families, work for small businesses, and help get our economy going again. I don't think this bill does it.

I hope this bill works, I really do, for the good of our country. But my concern is that the plan that's outlined will not do what we want it to do.

That's why Republicans came to the table with what we thought was a better idea, a plan that would create twice as many jobs as the bill that we're debating at exactly half the cost. But our ideas weren't considered. We weren't allowed in the room, we weren't allowed to participate at all. And all of the talk about bipartisanship that we've heard over the last several months went down the drain.

Now, my Democrat colleagues know I know how to be bipartisan, even when we were in the majority. I've worked with many Members on the other side of the aisle to bring bills to this floor that truly were done together. But we would usually start at the beginning of the process.

Not only were we not included at the beginning of the process, we weren't even included at the end of the process.

And it's not about us being excluded. It's about our ideas to help make this economy better, our ideas about how to give American families and small businesses the ability to keep more of what they earn to help their families, to help their businesses, to create more jobs. That's what the American people want. They don't want more spending on a couple hundred million dollars to get the country ready for some national health plan, money that's going to go to the bureaucracy. They want to know how their budgets are going to be helped. And unfortunately, they're not.

If all of that wasn't enough, here we are with 1,100 pages—1,100 pages—not one Member of this body has read. Not one. There may be some staffer over in the Appropriations Committee that read all of this last night—I don't know how you could read 1,100 pages between midnight and now. Not one Member has read this.

What happened to the promise that we're going to let the American people see what's in this bill for 48 hours? But no, we don't have time to do that.

We owe it to the American people to get this bill right. We owe it to American families, we owe it to small businesses, and we owe it to ourselves to get this right so that we can, in fact, help our economy. I don't believe this is the way to do it.

It's disappointing the way this process has worked and the outcome that we've got. And I'm a big believer that we shouldn't come to the floor and talk about process, but bad process leads to bad policy. And that's what we have here, in my view. Bad policy that will drive up, drive up the debt and put all of this cost on the back of our kids and our grandkids and their kids.

I hope it works, but I surely have my doubts.

So I'm going to vote ''no.'' I'm going to vote ''no,'' and I'm going to hope, I'm going to hope that the next time that we get into a major piece of legislation on this floor, that you will include us. You will include our ideas.

I said on the opening day that Republicans would not be the party of ''no,'' that we would be the party of better ideas. And I'm committed to bringing better ideas to the floor, and let's debate those better ideas.

Our tax policy, fast-acting tax policy that helps American families and small businesses does, in fact, create twice as many jobs. Twice as many jobs. Because we want the American people to keep their money to invest in their family and their small business. We're not interested in growing the size of government.

I asked my colleagues yesterday in our conference, ''Think about the first time you ran for Congress.'' The freshman Members, they can remember this because they just did it. For me, it was 18 years ago. But I can tell you what I said 18 years ago: that I would come here to fight for a smaller, less costly, and more accountable Federal Government. This is the epitome—the epitome—of what I came here to stop.

And I don't think there is one Member of Congress who came here to pass an $890 billion bill—if you add interest on it, about $1.1 trillion—of spending to help grow the size of the Federal Government and to do very little to help American families and small businesses.

I'd suggest that you vote ''no.''

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman has.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Assuming that you're the last speaker, I'm ready to yield back the balance of my time, and I do yield back.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this country faces the greatest crisis that we've seen in terms of our economy since the 1930s. Unemployment is expected by many people to hit 12 percent. We're told if we do nothing, we're likely to see unemployment at least around 12 percent; and we hope that with the passage of this proposal, we can mitigate that disaster to a significant degree.

Why are we in this trouble? Because we have had a virtual collapse and a freeze-up of the financial system and the credit markets; we've had a collapse of the housing sector of the economy and the auto sector of the economy.

In normal circumstances in a normal recession, we are usually led out of that recession by housing and by automobiles. This time, those two sectors are in shambles. They're not going to lead us out of anything for the moment.

The other tool normally available to us is monetary policy in the form of low interest rates through action of the Federal Reserve. We've already fired that bullet.

The only bullet left is fiscal policy. And so what we are trying to do with this bill is to save and create several million jobs, we're trying to help the victims of the recession who are losing their jobs, losing their health, losing their pensions, losing their ability to send their kids to college; and at the same time, we're trying to invest in new portions of the economy through science, technology, new energy initiatives to try to modernize the economy and make it stronger as we come out of this recession, as we most certainly eventually will.

And we are also, despite the objections of some on the minority, trying to put a quite significant amount of money into the health care system. What on earth is wrong with trying to save money in the health care system and at the same time making it more efficient by transferring our medical records to computerized records to reduce errors, and to save money at the same time?

Guess what? This bill isn't perfect. Guess what? I've never seen a perfect bill produced by this or any other legislative body.

You know, the worst thing that people can do in this town is to believe their own baloney. And I think what the likelihood is on this bill, frankly, is that supporters of the bill are inclined to overstate its possibilities and opponents, as we've seen here today, are certainly inclined to trash it.

I was criticized in the Rules Committee last night and again on the floor today because I frankly said, ''I do not know how many jobs this bill is likely to produce.''

What I do know is that the consensus of reputable economists around the country is that this bill will save or create several million jobs. Exactly how many will be determined by history.

Now, the critics say a number of things. They say the bill is too big, and then they announce they're going to produce a recommit motion which adds $9 billion to the cost. That's what I call falling off both sides of the same horse at the same time.

I would suggest that this bill is big, all right, but I'll make you a deal: You show me a smaller problem that we have to confront, and I will be happy to produce a smaller bill.

The fact is, we face, over the next 2½ years, a hole in the economy of approaching $2.5 to $3 trillion.

This is an $800 billion package over 2½ years. That means the annual fiscal thrust without the economic multipliers is about $300 billion. I personally think that it is smaller than it needs to be, but it has been downsized since it left the House to some degree in order to try to pick up Republican support in the Senate, and I understand that.

The critics have another technique: They trash by trivializing. They follow the guidelines laid out by one of the Members of their leadership a few months ago when he said in The Post that the way they ought to deal with the Democratic majority is to behave like a thousand mosquitos inflicting mosquito bites and tormenting the majority.

And so what do they say? They tell us, for instance, that there's an earmark in here for rail under ''high-speed rail.'' The fact is, there is not. All of the funding in that account is discretionary. It will be awarded competitively, and the decisions will be made entirely by the Department of Transportation. And the last time I looked, the new Cabinet Secretary was a Republican.

□ 1345

Secondly, they tell us that we're spending more money on the arts than we are on small business. We're putting $750 million in this bill for small business. There's $50 million in here for the arts. And you know what, there are 5 million people who work in the arts industry, and right now, they've got 12½ percent unemployment. Or are you suggesting that somehow if you work in that field, it isn't real when you lose your job, it isn't real when you lose your mortgage, it isn't real when you

lose your health insurance? We're trying to treat people who work in the arts the same way as anybody else.

And then they tell us there are mice, except when they say they're rats. Well, I would simply urge you to read The Mercury News because The Mercury News points out that that is a fallacious attack.

They say that we're spending $30 million on mice. Where did the $30 million figure come from? According to The Mercury News, and I will read this, ''It turns out that $30 million is the total amount that the California Coastal Conservancy, a State agency, recommended more than a month ago to numerous Federal agencies looking for lists of 'shovel ready' projects as part of the stimulus bill planning.'' And the staff director for the minority leader himself told the press yesterday that he had to admit there was no specific reference to any mice or rats in this bill.

There is one place in this budget, however, where you do have mice. It's at NIH. One of the Members of this House told me today, ''I'd be happy to talk about mice because research projects at NIH saved my life''. Cancer research, the research is done on mice. Would you rather have the experimentation done on human beings? I don't think so.

If you look at what this bill does, it provides an $800 tax break for middle American couples. It provides $120 billion in infrastructure to create hundreds of thousands of jobs. It shows some mercy to people who are unemployed by extending and expanding unemployment benefits. It tries to modernize the economy to create new jobs through science and technology. It provides $170 billion to help States avoid catastrophic tax increases that would be counterproductive during this kind of a recession. And it also helps them to avoid drastic cutbacks in education, in law enforcement, so that they don't have to fire cops, they don't have to fire teachers, they don't have to fire prison guards and all of the other people who are paid for out of State budgets. Those are some of the ''terrible'' things the bill does.

Now, this bill does have one problem. It is estimated that it creates about 1 million fewer jobs than it did when it left the House earlier. It does that in an effort to be bipartisan because the President reached out to try to get Republican support in the Senate, and he makes no apology for that and neither do I. But the fact remains, we still have 86 percent of the House bill that we had when the bill left the House. That is a pretty doggone good ratio.

I think we need to appreciate that this bill is the largest change in domestic policy since the 1930s. Think of what has happened.

One month ago, we had a President who insisted on holding up the entire domestic appropriation part of the budget because he wanted to impose $30 billion in cuts in education, in health care, science and the rest. In contrast today, we have a President who is willing to invest $800 billion to attack this recession and to turn this economy into a stronger and better economy for every American, not just the top 10 percent who have benefited by Republican policies.

One month ago, we had a President who resisted raising the minimum wage and resisted providing expanded unemployment insurance. Today, we've got a President who's reversing that policy and says ''Go to it, help those people, they need it.''

And we've also got a President who is willing to put $90 billion into States to preserve our society's ability to see to it that poor families and kids don't get knocked off the Medicaid rolls.

One month ago, we had a President who asked us to pass No Child Left Behind and then for the next 8 years reneged on the promise to provide additional funding to pay for the cost of those mandates. We had a vote today on the issue of mandates. The mother of all mandates has been No Child Left Behind, which I voted for, but I expected the President not to welch on the deal, and financially, he did. This changes that. This reverses that policy.

I would ask Members to vote for this bill. It will change this country for the better.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reestablish 30 seconds of my time to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that all of us appreciate Members and staff who are willing to work around here. There's no Member in the House who puts in more energy and time and hours than my friend, Chairman OBEY. I do not necessarily have to agree with everything that he might suggest, but in the meantime, you certainly cannot discount his commitment to this effort.

And to the staff on both sides of the aisle who spent endless nights, weekends and otherwise trying to evaluate and work through this package and help each other where we can, I want them all to know that they have our thanks, the entire House's thanks, for that effort.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply thank the gentleman for his comments and say that I appreciate the fact that we can debate these issues and still remain personal friends.

And I also want to thank, as the gentleman has, I want to thank profoundly the staff of this committee and all the committees who worked so hard. So often these people go 1 and 2 and 3 days in a row with little or no sleep. That certainly has been the case this week, and I'm profoundly grateful to the staff, certainly on our side of the aisle, especially Beverly Pheto who has become staff director because the White House stole our previous staff director.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

I want to commend House Leadership and President Barack Obama for ushering this legislation through a tricky process. Though this may not be the perfect bill, we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Frankly, our economy is in uncharted territory. At a time when unemployment is pushing 7.6 percent and key economic indicators show a downward spiral, Congress has a duty to come together and act on behalf of the people. I worked in conjunction with my Blue Dog colleagues to ensure that the final version of this bill was better than the original House version and was streamlined towards effective spending and tax provisions that are temporary, targeted, and timely.

Stimulative spending including the funding for transportation and education infrastructure projects, job training and workforce development, and critical investments in rural communities like broadband services and wastewater projects will be extremely beneficial to communities in Northwest Florida. The temporary tax provisions, such as the expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit and the increase of the refundable portion of the child credit, are also critical to bolstering the economy by ensuring that money will quickly get into the hands of Americans who are going to spend it. Additionally, H.R. 1 increases unemployment benefits, provides more funding for food stamps and a one-time payment to recipients of Social Security and veterans receiving disability compensation and pension benefits. Finally, this bill helps small businesses quickly recover costs of new capital investments by extending the bonus depreciation for making investments in plants and equipment. In the end, these combined provisions are our best bet for a shot in the arm of this economy. H.R. 1 will create or save over 8,300 jobs alone in the 2nd district of Florida which I represent and over 200,000 jobs statewide.

Despite the positive aspects of the bill, I do have concerns with the bill and even more serious concerns with our long-term economic problems.

For one, billions of dollars to fix the Alternative Minimum Tax are included in this bill. Though this prevents many middle-class families from tax increases, it does so in the most fiscally irresponsible way possible. It is not justifiable emergency spending. We need a long term, sustainable solution to this problem and I have consistently voted to support a paid-for, offset Alternative Minimum Tax over the years.

Furthermore, I would have chosen a better, more inclusive process in considering this bill. I would have preferred more time to study the major incentives for health information technology, increased federal assistance for higher education programs, and alternative energy investments, even if they are provisions that will make our economy stronger and more innovative. My Blue Dog colleagues and I appreciate the recent commitment of the Leadership of the House to have a return to regular order and process in this body.

I was also concerned that the House voted on this bill before having two days to review

the final text. I voted against the Previous Question and the Rule for the bill to make this point.

Finally, I am very concerned about the unprecedented federal deficits and burden to future generations that the levels of spending in this bill will create. We are living in unparalleled economic times with regards to loss of jobs, houses, and credit throughout the country and I firmly believe that only by tackling long-term fiscal issues can we ensure a prosperous nation today, tomorrow, and well into the future. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to balance our annual budgets and address the entitlement spending issue that threatens our future.

I am heartened that President Obama committed to a ''Fiscal Summit'' later this year to tackle the issues of long-term fiscal responsibility. These actions, coupled with a commitment to address the underlying causes in the housing and financial markets at the root of our economies woes, are encouraging.

Despite the concerns I have outlined, I stand in support of H.R. 1 and I will continue to work with fellow elected officials at all levels of government to oversee accountability and transparency during the spending of the stimulus funding provided by this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the speed at which both chambers and both parties have come together on this recovery package shows how committed Congress and the Administration are to shoring up our troubled economy.

The landmark legislation that we will pass today will create millions of jobs, provide cut taxes for hard working families, provide basic necessities to families in need and make investments necessary to transform our economy for the 21st Century.

Economists, business leaders, and labor unions across the political spectrum know that decisive action is the only way to jolt our economy out of its intensifying tailspin.

Everyone in the process has compromised, except for House Republicans. It's time for the House Republicans to stop saying ''no'' to everything and start saying ''yes'' to bipartisanship and ''yes'' to recovery.

The current economic crisis requires bold solutions that address the magnitude of our economic woes, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment plan will do just that.

We will blunt the effects of the recession for families by increasing food stamps benefits, expanding unemployment benefits, and preserving health care benefits.

The recovery plan also invests in America's school, roads, bridges, water systems that are in disrepair and creating a drag on our economy.

We have an historic opportunity to make the investments necessary to modernize our public infrastructure, transition to a clean energy economy, and make us more competitive in the future.

Our plan also supports working families by providing a tax cut for 95 percent of workers and their families.

By spreading job creation out over the next couple of years and across a variety of sectors, we will soften the downturn and foster a solid economic recovery.

It's time to get our economy back on track.

Furthermore Mr. Speaker, in writing about the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, the front page of the Wall Street Journal said it well.

This historic bill will spur road building, give businesses tax breaks, and expand broadband access.

Yes, it will do all that, and so much more. It will help our country avoid a recession so dark and deep that the pain and economic dislocation it would produce for the vast majority of people would be terrible to contemplate.

According to a broad consensus of the brightest minds in the field, this economic stimulus bill will help put Americans back to work now, and get us back to doing what we do best—lighting the way to the future.

It will provide more than $150 billion in public works projects for transportation, energy and technology.

We will begin to develop the clean energy sources and smart transmission lines that the whole world will demand tomorrow.

There is $10 billion for medical research to help America retain its vaunted leadership.

The bill also provides for the urgent needs of today, with $87 billion to help states meet rising Medicaid costs.

There is money to help state unemployment offices that are overwhelmed by the numbers and funds to help those who have been thrown out of a job through no fault of their own, and are struggling desperately to keep health insurance coverage for their families.

And it addresses the three most important issues facing us today. Jobs, jobs, and more jobs. This bill is expected to create about 3.5 million jobs.

The total impact on my state is expected to be the creation of 215,000 jobs with almost 8,000 jobs in my district alone.

Across the country the bill is expected to produce over a million jobs in construction and manufacturing, and 345,000 jobs in professional and business services. And 90 percent of these jobs will be in the private sector.

There is a tax cut for 95 percent of working American and the bill protects millions of middle income taxpayers from having to pay the Alternative Minimum tax in 2009.

The aid that will flow directly to states should also help to ease some of the most painful service cuts that were looming, and may even provide more tax relief.

According to Governor David Paterson, New York state might be able to use some of the federal stimulus funds to avoid some of the 137 business and consumer tax increases now planned for next year.

In the coming days, you will hear 1,001 different opinions about this bill. And I hope you will keep in mind that Congress listened to a wide range of opinions on just what to do to get America working again.

There were many, including Nobel Laureates in the field of Economics who felt we should be spending considerably more. There were some who said we should spend less. And even a few who said we should do nothing. But sitting still and doing nothing was never an option. Inaction is simply not in the American DNA.

Some made a case for spending more on infrastructure while others pushed for bigger tax cuts. But politics is the art of the possible—and tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans are what helped to pave the way to the hole we find ourselves in now.

And our critics must admit that tax cuts alone never built a school, fixed a bridge or paved a road.

With the passage of this bill, our crumbling infrastructure will be repaired, our dependence of foreign oil will begin to be addressed, our healthcare system improved, and our economic well-being restored. This is the plan. This is the time. And ''yes'' is the answer.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which addresses the unprecedented economic crisis we are currently facing. This measure will put our economy back on track and will also transform our economy for the 21st Century through much needed investments in our health care system, infrastructure, education, and energy independence, while saving and creating millions of jobs during the next two years.

We are facing dire economic times. Every week, we are faced with new reports on job losses across our country. In my home state of Rhode Island, we have the country's second highest unemployment rate at ten percent and last December, we were ranked sixth nationally in foreclosure rates. These harsh realities have made it increasingly clear that our economy will face an even sharper downturn if we do not act soon.

The compromise between the House, Senate and White House is not perfect, but it contains the right formula of spending and tax relief to stimulate our economy and increase new job opportunities. With that in mind, I support taking action to rebuild our nation's economy and put Rhode Island families first. H.R. 1 will appropriate spending for transportation and infrastructure upgrades and construction, health care programs, education assistance, housing assistance and energy efficiency upgrades, and includes personal and business tax breaks, tax provisions intended to assist state and local governments, and energy-related tax incentives for a total of $787 billion to be expended over Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010. This measure helps those hit hardest by the economic downturn by extending unemployment benefits, providing job training to get people back to work quickly, increasing food stamp benefits, and extending health benefits.

The recovery plan provides funding to modernize our crumbling roads and bridges, increase transit and rail funding to reduce traffic congestion and gas consumption, and invest in clean water and other environmental restoration projects. These investments will immediately create jobs in my state, as projects will only receive funding if they are ''ready to go'' within 90 days of the enactment of this bill. This legislation also includes additional infrastructure funding that will improve our national security by modernizing our electric grid, upgrading our airport, port, transit and rail security, and updating Department of Defense facilities.

One of the best ways to grow our economy is by investing in our future workforce. The inclusion of robust education initiatives that will build 21st Century classrooms, labs and libraries is also very important to me as we prepare the next generation of workers to support and strengthen our economy. I am pleased that funding to modernize, renovate and repair school buildings is included in the final language. It also contains funding for Title I programs, which serve disadvantaged children, and IDEA, which serves disabled children, ensuring that all children, regardless of where they live or their disability, receive a quality and equal education. Moreover, this level of funding for IDEA increases the Federal share

of special education services to its highest level ever and brings much needed relief to school systems. H.R. 1 also provides $15.6 billion for Pell grants, and it is estimated that Rhode Island will receive $97.5 million in aid for 28,217 recipients for an average award for the academic year 2009–10 of $3,456. Investing in our children's education not only has long-term benefits to our economy, but it also delivers on our nation's promise to ensure that all individuals have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Investments in American health care also represent a vital component of our nation's economic recovery and long term fiscal sustainability. This package contains several provisions that will stimulate job growth and improve health care quality and efficiency through $10 billion investments in biomedical research and $19 billion for the further development and implementation of health information technology.

This bill bolsters crucial safety net programs that provide invaluable health and social services to our nation's low-income and disabled citizens with the inclusion of $87 billion in enhanced funding for state Medicaid programs that have been stretched to the breaking point under increased unemployment and skyrocketing health costs. This package also includes a provision to assist recently unemployed individuals and their families by helping them maintain their health coverage through a 65% subsidy for health insurance premiums under COBRA for up to nine months.

One of the greatest challenges we face with this effort is ensuring that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. This bill makes great strides by investing in the transformation of our national energy policy, which will lead to greater technological advancements in renewable technologies, job creation, and energy independence. Now is the time to make the commitment to our children and our grandchildren that we will leave a safer, cleaner, and healthier environment than we have now. As a co-founder of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I fought for several provisions in H.R. 1 that promote energy efficiency and renewable energy production and development, including tax provisions for families and businesses, in addition to funding that will drive the creation of new, ''green-collar'' jobs. More importantly than tax incentives alone, this measure sets forth a long-term energy policy that puts our nation on the path towards energy independence.

Individuals and families will also receive relief through the ''Making work pay'' tax credit, which will provide up to $400 for an individual or $800 for married couples filing jointly. Parents will also benefit from an increase in the earned income tax credit for families with three or more children and the bill allows additional low-income families to receive the child tax credit. The measure will also provide a tax credit up to $8,000 for first time home buyers if they purchase a home between January 1st, 2009 and December 31st, 2009, injecting a much needed financial incentive into the housing market.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in my support for H.R. 1 because it includes unprecedented accountability and strong oversight by creating the Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board, which will coordinate and conduct oversight of federal spending under the bill. A public website will also contain the board's reports, show exactly how funds are spent and will list announcements of contract and grant competitions and awards.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand that this funding is not a silver bullet, but that our economy will continue to decline without this immediate action. The Recovery package will slow our downward economic trend and allow us to regain our footing as we begin to make much-needed long term investments to transform our economy for the 21st Century. American prosperity depends on individual economic security. It is only when Americans do not have to worry about losing their job, keeping their home or paying their bills that our economy will truly flourish. I am committed to improving the economic outlook for the millions who are struggling, and I will continue working with my colleagues in Congress on this vital and urgent goal.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we're responding with determination and bold action to combat the most severe economic crisis our country has faced since the Great Depression.

For years, as hardworking American families struggled to make ends meet and the economy shed millions of jobs, Republicans told us not to worry—we are in the midst of a ''jobless recovery'', they said. But ''jobless recovery'' is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife—it just doesn't exist!

The failed ''laissez-faire'' approach of the past 8 years has now been discredited by rising unemployment, loss of confidence in our financial markets and the economic hardships suffered by families across the country.

For millions of Americans, ''laissez-faire'' is just a fancy name for ''left behind.''

With this economic recovery package, we are taking the bold action that is needed by creating or saving 3-and-a-half million jobs, rebuilding America, making us more globally competitive and energy independent, and transforming our economy.

While our country is facing enormous challenges, we also have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create millions of new jobs, invest in vital priorities and position our economy for future growth. Today we are seizing this historic opportunity and setting our country on a new direction.

This urgently-needed economic recovery package funds infrastructure projects that are ''shovel-ready'', while also supporting future-oriented projects that are ''circuit-ready'': broadband, electronic medical records, smart grid, advanced battery technologies and other vital priorities.

The massive investments in weatherization, state energy efficiency grants, and federal building efficiency are some of the safest and smartest investments our country can make right now. They put money into the pockets of American workers and pay for themselves in the form of energy savings and lower energy prices. This energy efficiency ''double dividend'' is a proven, reliable phenomenon that our current weak economy must capitalize.

In addition, I am pleased that the conference report will provide $6 billion in new loan guarantees for renewable projects such as solar and wind and for upgrading our nation's transmission system to a smarter electricity grid. Section 1705 of the bill supports a program authorized in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act that permits the Department of Energy to issue grants for developing electric power transmission systems, including upgrading and reconductoring projects. This provision would allow for the development of a smart transmission and distribution grid, which would include support for technologies such as underground superconductor transmission cables that can increase the efficiency of our grid and facilitate the delivery of renewable power from the heartland of our country to the hearts of our cities.

The bill provides $19 billion for a new health IT infrastructure to improve care, lower costs and reduce medical errors. I am pleased that the conference report includes patient privacy safeguards that I have long advocated, including a provision that I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to ensure that patients' medical records are made unreadable to unauthorized individuals.

This balanced, well-thought out package provides tax relief for 95% of Americans and targets investments in key areas to turn around the American economy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, all across the country, Americans are hurting. I held three telephone town halls this week and I heard firsthand how difficult things are for people. These are people willing to work; people looking to keep their small business afloat; people looking to feed their families. But they are not looking for a handout and they know that we can not spend and borrow our way back to prosperity.

Unfortunately, Congressional Democrats have chosen to use this bill to achieve an eight year long wish list. How does billions of dollars for ACORN help a small business owner keep people employed? How will funding for the NEA grow our economy?

Instead of making health care more affordable, they are pushing policies that will quietly set the stage for government takeover of health care, resulting in bureaucrats making decisions for patients and doctors.

Congressional Democrats wrote much of this bill secretly, negotiated it behind closed doors, and released late last night, giving only a few hours to review it. And the reason that they are trying to ram this bill through is simple—it won't stimulate our economy.

That's why we should scrap this bill and pass the alternative measure proposed by House Republicans, one based on fast-acting tax relief for working families and small businesses. We need a bill that will get to the heart of the matter and put our economy back on its feet.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my thoughts about H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

While the final recovery bill is not perfect, nor does it address all my concerns, I strongly believe that we must take quick action to help Americans who are struggling and help spur job creation. We are in a time of crisis, and doing nothing is not an option. I agree with President Obama—time is of the essence, and we must act quickly to pass a recovery package. Though no bill is perfect, I have reconciled my problems with the initial bill for the sake of helping Americans and the economy.

Just last week, the U.S. Department of Labor announced recent increases in the number of unemployed Americans. These statistics

were incredibly troubling. Sadly, they showed a twenty-six year high in unemployment filings. Additionally, part of my own Congressional District in Northeastern Pennsylvania, faces a 7.7 percent unemployment rate, higher than the state and national averages. Clearly the increase in the number of people unemployed in the country and in Northeastern Pennsylvania reflects the need for the federal government to immediately provide greater assistance to those out of work and struggling.

While I wanted the recovery bill to focus more on job creation through infrastructure in the short term, which was the original focus of the bill, it does address these issues to an extent. The bill is estimated to create or save 3.5 million jobs throughout the country, including 143,000 jobs in Pennsylvania and 7,700 jobs in my Congressional District. The bill includes $64 billion for infrastructure development that is estimated to create or sustain 1.8 million jobs nationally and generate $322 billion of economic activity. Additionally, to help individuals get back to work in good jobs, almost $4 billion is allocated for job training programs.

I also previously expressed the need for the recovery package to focus on helping those who are out of work or retired. While many people are struggling, we must help those without jobs feed their families immediately. Though I encourage a larger focus on this for future legislation, this bill extends unemployment insurance through December 2009 and it increases benefit payments by $25 per week, so that jobless workers will now receive $325 per week in tax-free benefits. It also includes a one time $250 payment to retirees, disabled individuals, and for Supplemental Security Income to help more people without jobs.

Finally, I had strongly advocated for the inclusion of a General Revenue Sharing program through an amendment to the recovery package that would provide localities with a needed source of revenue for undertaking job-creating infrastructure projects and maintaining public safety networks. This would be critical to helping localities across the country that are facing significant funding shortfalls as a result of the ongoing economic downturn. While I was disappointed that this amendment was not included in the legislation, I applaud provisions in the current bill that will improve state and local government bonds, allowing states and localities to afford needed infrastructure projects. The recovery package also creates a competitive grant program exclusively for state and local surface transportation projects. Additionally, I will introduce a stand alone General Revenue Sharing bill in the near future.

My strongest objection to the initial recovery package dealt with the fact that many Members, both Democrats and Republicans, were not involved in the discussions on the bill. As I have continued to say, open door policies regarding Congress' legislation are essential. All Members of Congress must have a voice and the opportunity to debate bills, especially the recovery package which is the most significant and certainly the most expensive undertaking in our nation's history. I voiced my concerns to House leadership, and they were noted. I hope these actions will be changed in the future.

Additionally, the public must have an informed voice as well. In order to let the American public truly understand the need for the recovery bill, and other legislation going forward, we need to allow them to fully understand it. I am a firm believer in that we must determine the problem before addressing the possible solutions. We must effectively communicate to the public the full extent of the problems we face so that they also understand why we are taking such action.

I applaud President Obama for his determination and willingness to jump on such a daunting project in his first month in office. While this is not a final solution to our economic problems, as we will likely need another recovery package in the future, it is an important step forward. Fixing our economy will not happen overnight, but I have faith that we will emerge from these tough times stronger than ever.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is not a person in this country that is sheltered from the economic challenges we face. I agree steps should be taken to stabilize the economy and get people to work. However, I feel that the plan presented today is not the right one to boost our beleaguered financial condition.

Spending vast amounts of borrowed money does not work in our households and it does not work in government. These habits are what brought us to this current situation. Individuals, businesses, and especially government have simply borrowed too much. Living beyond our means has consequences. We cannot borrow our way out into prosperity. More importantly, we cannot spend our children's future. It will not work economically and it is wrong morally.

Bundling a large collection of spending projects and calling it a stimulus does not make it stimulative. The purpose of the stimulus should be to spend a dollar in a way that will create greater than a dollar's worth of economic benefits. Spending a dollar in certain ways that have stimulating effects or reducing tax burdens on workers and small businesses is what we need to be doing.

I will again vote "no." I do so as a taxpayer, a father and a public official entrusted to do the best he can for his fellow Kansans. Political posturing has no place in this debate. We need to get the country moving. Unfortunately, this is the wrong plan that will add billions of dollars of frivolous spending to our national debt without stimulating our economy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a concerted media campaign to spread misinformation about the Comparative Effectiveness Research (CER) provisions in H.R.1.

To set the record straight, I submit for the RECORD the following summary of the comparative effectiveness research provisions and a list of organizations that have written us in support.

This investment is an important first step in efforts to develop a robust CER program in this Congress. In the near future, I will introduce a comprehensive CER proposal, based on the provisions that previously passed the House in the CHAMP Act, H.R. 3162, in the 110th Congress.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009 (ARRA)

PROVISIONS ON COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH

The conference agreement on H.R. 1 includes provisions to promote and expand research that compares the effectiveness of alternative treatments or strategies for a medical condition.

Doctors today urgently need better evidence to improve the quality of health care that patients receive. Some estimates indicate that less than half of all therapies patients receive are actually supported by firm evidence of effectiveness.

There is widespread agreement on the need for better information on the comparative effectiveness of different interventions for health conditions. In an October 2008 joint editorial, Newt Gingrich, JOHN KERRY and Billy Beane said that "a health care system that is driven by robust comparative clinical evidence will save lives and money."

Some of the oldest and most important studies in medicine have been comparative effectiveness studies. For example, the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial revolutionized the treatment of patients with type 1 diabetes. This landmark trial found that aggressive use of insulin to control blood sugar was clearly better than standard care in preventing damage to the eyes, kidneys, and nerves of patients with diabetes.

But more must be done. In December 2008, the Institute of Medicine called for further comparative effectiveness efforts, stating that "this type of research would provide information that patients and physicians need to make choices that offer them the greatest value, as they define it." The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) both have planned to expand their research efforts, but these expansions have proceeded slowly due to a lack of funding.

An investment in this research infrastructure will provide doctors and patients with critically important information. Arming physicians with the best available evidence about treatment alternatives and their effects in different patient populations will help doctors and patients make better choices.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

The conference agreement provides $1.1 billion for comparative effectiveness research with $300 million to be administered by AHRQ, $400 million to be administered by NIH, and $400 million to be allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services. These funds are to be used to accelerate the development and dissemination of comparative effectiveness research. The agreement ensures that the use of these research dollars will be consistent with governmental policies relating to the inclusion of women and minorities in research.

The conference agreement also establishes a Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research. The purpose of the Council is to reduce duplication and coordinate these research activities within the federal government. Because its purpose is the coordination of federal research efforts, the Council is made up of representatives of a variety of experts from within the federal agencies. The conference agreement clearly states that the Council cannot mandate coverage, reimbursement, or other policies for any public or private payer.

SUPPORTERS FOR THESE PROVISIONS

Widespread Support for Provisions on Comparative Effectiveness Research. Experts, physicians, legislators, and advocates from across the political spectrum supported provisions in the stimulus package for comparative effectiveness research because this research is crucial.

"The current limited availability of valid data to supplement the physician's clinical experience and professional knowledge . . . makes it difficult to ensure that an effective treatment choice is made."—Letter to Congress from the American College of Physicians, January 29, 2009

''Opponents—like some drug companies and medical device makers—don't want this research. They fear it will cut the profits they make on ineffective drugs and equipment. But they won't tell you that this research could save your life by giving your doctors better information so they can prescribe the best treatments available to you.''—AARP CEO Bill Novelli, February 10, 2009

''Independent, objective comparative effectiveness research (CER) is urgently needed to improve health care quality and patient outcomes by ensuring consumers always receive the best care.''—Letter to Congress, signed by the Alliance for Better Health Care, (a broad coalition of over 30 organizations representing consumers, employers, health care providers, health plans, pharmacists, researchers, unions, pharmaceutical benefit managers, and others), February 11, 2009

''We are concerned that some believe that comparative effectiveness could lead to the rationing of health care. This is simply not true. The bill would fund independent, objective, comparative effectiveness research that would greatly benefit providers and patients in making informed health care decisions.''—Letter to Congress signed by AARP, AFL-CIO, American College of Physicians, America's Health Insurance Plans, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, Families USA, National Business Group on Health, National Partnership for Women and Families and joined by Consumers Union, February 12, 2009

''Strong federal support for comparative effectiveness research is vital to both public and private efforts to improve health care quality for patients and to give physicians and other health care providers the independent, objective information they need to identify the best treatments options for their patients.''—Letter to Congress from the National Business Group on Health, February 11, 2009.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH IN H.R. 1

Aetna, Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy, AFL-CIO, Alliance of Community Health Plans, Alliance for Better Healthcare, AARP, American College of Physicians, America's Health Insurance Plans, American Pharmacists Association, American Academy of Family Physicians, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, Blue Shield of California, Coalition for Health Services Research, Consumers Union, and CVS Caremark.

DiamlerChrysler Corporation, Families USA, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Company, Group Health Cooperative, Honeywell, Kaiser Permanente, Marshfield Clinic, Medco Health Solutions, National Business Group on Health, National Partnership for Women and Families, Pharmaceutical Care Management Association, Prime Therapeutics, Service Employees International Union, The Dow Chemical Company, The Joint Commission, UnitedHealth Group, and Wellpoint, Inc.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the largest spending bill in the history of the Congress. The price tag on this bill is $800 billion—over $1.1 trillion when you add in the interest needed to fund it. Sadly, this 1200-page bill was completed just a few hours ago in the darkness of night. No one knows what is in the bill. No one has read it. This bill is being rushed to the House floor and to the President before Members of Congress or the American people have an opportunity to even know what is in it.

Just how much is this bill going to cost? How much is a trillion dollars? One way to look at it is that it amounts to deficit spending of over $7,000 for every family in America. Looked at another way, this is enough money to pay for four years of college tuition to a private college for every senior graduating from high school this year and next and still have nearly $150 billion left over.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected a few weeks ago that the federal government will have a $1.2 trillion deficit this year. This amounts to 8.3 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is far higher than the previous record of 5.9 percent set in 1934 at the height of the Great Depression. In 2009, one out of every three dollars that the federal government will spend will be borrowed and our grandchildren will be stuck with the bill. Now, the bill before us—negotiated by Speaker PELOSI, Senate Democrat Leader REID and President Obama—will add another $1.1 trillion to this debt. No country has ever borrowed and spent its way into prosperity, which is what this bill proposes to do. Adding further to this deficit as this bill does is unthinkable.

The non-partisan CBO released an analysis earlier this week finding that the bill may provide a small increase in the nation's economy in the first few years, but then this bill will drag the economy down for the better part of the decade.

Less than 20 percent of the cost of this bill is associated with tax relief. There is virtually nothing in this bill to stimulate small businesses—the driving force in creating jobs in America. Furthermore, the signature item of the bill—working American tax cut—was the first tax cut put on the chopping block. The final bill will allow the average worker to keep an additional 20 cents an hour ($1.60 per day).

This bill also classifies as a tax cut billions of dollars in payments to those who do not pay federal income taxes. I thought a tax cut was a reduction in someone's taxes not simply a check from the government.

With regard to infrastructure spending, which is what we were all promised would be the focus at the outset of this process, only 17 percent of the funding in the bill is for infrastructure. Less than one of every five dollars will go to job-creating stimulus programs.

Rather than focus on job-creating stimulus and tax relief for small businesses that create new jobs, the final bill written by liberals in the Congress focuses on permanently expanding unaffordable entitlement programs and creating new federal programs under the guise of ''stimulating the economy.'' The bill creates 33 new federal programs at a cost of $90 billion. It also expands 73 existing federal programs at a cost of $92 billion. There will be tremendous pressures in future years to continue funding these $182 billion in new programs at these new higher levels. The bill also spends $123 billion for one-time infusion of spending for 98 existing programs.

This bill includes billions of dollars for the Public Housing Capital Fund. Yet, this fund already has an unspent balance of $7 billion. Also included is $1 billion for Community Development Block Grant program, yet this program currently has $23 billion in unspent funds. Why is the Congress adding spending to these cash rich accounts? If they were serious about stimulating the economy, Congress should simply make them spend the money they already have. Also, troubling is the fact that this bill opens up the federal Treasury coffers to groups like ACORN—a group charged with voter fraud.

Do the provisions relating to the creation of Federal Coordinating Council in health care research move us in the direction of a national health board that would encourage federal policies that determine what medical services Americans can and cannot have? What does that have to do with stimulating the economy? How many tens of billions of dollars more will the welfare law changes end up costing the taxpayers down the road? What will be the long-term unforeseen costs associated with this bill due to the unprecedented deficit spending. Over the coming weeks as the American people have more time to read this bill we will learn more about the provisions and intentions of this bill? Sadly, the bill has been rushed to the floor without giving the Congress or the American people a chance to know what is in it.

Let me also say that I appreciate all of the talk about the need to work together in a bipartisan fashion. While I was pleased that several Republican amendments were adopted when portions of this bill were considered in several Congressional Committees last month, I was deeply disappointed that most of these amendments disappeared from the bill between the time it was passed in committee and when it came to the House floor for a vote. Bipartisanship is supposed to be a two-way street, not simply a demand to show bipartisanship by accepting the Speaker's bill.

The only hand of bipartisanship that has been extended to Republicans in the House has been two opportunities to vote for a bill that we were given no hand in writing. Is that the type of bipartisanship that the American people want and expect? I thought bipartisanship meant working together, having an open deliberative legislative process and combining ideas. That simply was not permitted by the liberal majority.

If we really want to stimulate the economy, we should focus on what actually creates jobs—small businesses. Small businesses create 70 percent of the new jobs in America. Unfortunately, this bill does virtually nothing to help small businesses.

I have voted for and will continue to advocate for an alternative that would produce many more jobs for half the cost. The bill that I voted for lowers the 10 percent tax rate to 5 percent, and the 15 percent tax rate to 10 percent. This would give all taxpaying Americans a tax cut. It leaves money in their pockets that they can use to meet their own family expenses. We provide small business tax relief, including a provision allowing small businesses to write off up to $250,000 in capital expenditures. We extend unemployment benefits through 2009 and we exempt these payments from income taxes. We also include other job-creating provisions and we do so without raising anyone's taxes. I have also cosponsored legislation that would reduce the 28 percent tax rate to 23 percent. This will cut taxes for individual and job-creating small businesses.

Lower taxes, not higher borrowing, spending, and debt, will put our economy back on track. I urge my colleagues to vote for lower taxes and against higher spending and debt.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (H.R. 1). We are told that America is in the midst of the worst economic storm since the Great Depression. Millions of people are hurting across the United States and in my home state of New Jersey, New Jersey's unemployment rate has risen to 7.1 percent from 4.2 percent just a year ago. Our nation's economy is in recession, and we must respond with every tool in our toolbox to put Americans back to work and rebuild our struggling economy. Economists have predicted that the unemployment rate may exceed 12 percent this year.

What to do? We could let the free market continue to spiral downward or we could pass a bill with a smaller price tag, ignoring the lessons learned from Congress's previous attempt at stimulating the economy through rebate sent out in spring of 2008, last year's so-called check in the mail. The time has come for a bold, national response. Economists, business leaders, financial experts, almost everyone says that the federal government—and only the federal government—can inject into the economy a stimulus of sufficient size to make up for the frozen, collapsing economy. The package we are considering today has the potential to create 3.5 million much needed new jobs in the short term.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, is designed to help the United States climb out of the current recession through targeted, job-creating spending, responsible investments in the nation's social safety net to help Americans weather the difficult months ahead, and tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans. Importantly, this bill includes critical investments in research and development, which lay the ground work for innovation and sustainable, long-term economic growth. The political process to this point has been torturous. However, the President, the Speaker, and the Committee chairs have produced promptly what the President has called for and what the country needs. Agreed, not all parts of the bill are going to be equally stimulative. But we want a broad approach; we want our stimulative eggs in various baskets, This Act is huge and hugely important.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would help to put our economy on the right track by quickly creating up to 3.5 million new jobs for Americans suffering during this depression. Some of these jobs, more than 1.2 million, would be created in the construction industry through a strong investment in improving our nation's transportation and water infrastructure. The Act will inject $29 billion to repair our nation's crumbling roads and bridges, including funding for ready-to-go road and bridge modernization projects in my home state of New Jersey. This investment would create 835,000 jobs in the next two years. Additionally, this bill would invest $16.4 billion in public transportation, helping transit agencies such as NJ Transit that are struggling to meet increased demand and $18 billion for clean water, environmental restoration, and flood control projects creating another 375,000 jobs.

H.R. 1 would invest in additional projects that my Central New Jersey constituents refer to as "green stimulus." These investments would create good American jobs that cannot be outsourced, while reducing our reliance on fossil fuels and protecting our environment. These jobs will be the kind of jobs that will be in demand for many years, once the economy gets going again and as we make the transition to a sustainable energy system; as we must and as we surely will. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would provide $30 billion to transform the nation's energy transmission, distribution, and production system so they can handle decentralized renewable energy sources. This legislation includes more than $23.2 billion in incentives to promote renewable energy, help low and middle income Americans weatherize their homes, and decrease energy consumption by the federal government. It will also provide $20 billion in tax incentives such as the renewable energy production tax credit, the advanced energy manufacturing tax credit, and the consumer energy-efficiency tax credits.

Responding to the nation's rising unemployment rate, this bill would devote $4 billion to job training programs and would extend unemployment benefits through December 31, 2009, increasing benefits by $25 per week for individuals looking for work.

The current economic downturn has forced painful cuts in services. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan would make sound investments in public education. This legislation would provide $13 billion to help disadvantaged students reach high academic standards and $12 billion for special education. While the bill includes a $54 billion state stabilization fund to prevent teacher layoffs and cutbacks in education, I regret that it no longer contains the $20 billion provided in the House version to help states rebuild our nation's crumbling schools. Still, there is much here to cheer for our local school boards and the taxpayers who support the schools through our property taxes. These school bonds can be used for construction.

Additionally, to ensure that families can send their children to college, this bill would increase the maximum Pell Grant by $500, to $5,350 and would help 4 million more students attend college with a new $2,500 college tuition tax credit for families.

What pleases me most is the commitment in this legislation to science. I am deeply gratified that this bill reflects a profound commitment to renewing our nation's innovation infrastructure. Research not merely luxury to be undertaken only in times of economic prosperity. The truth is that scientific research is perhaps the most powerful economic engine, creating jobs in the short-term and building our economy for the long-term.

All together, the recovery package includes nearly $23 billion to support scientific research and facilities, including $3 billion for the National Science Foundation, $2 billion for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and $10 billion for the National Institutes of Health. There is no doubt that these funds will create jobs. Lab technicians will be hired to carry out projects that previously went unfunded. Electricians will be put to work wiring new laboratory work. And construction workers will begin refurbishing our neglected laboratories and building the facilities that will transform science for the twenty-first century.

Of course, the ideal project is one that keeps on giving, and that is exactly what scientific research does. The innovation and discoveries that come from research form the roots from which our economy grows and prospers. For too long, we have underinvested in science, and we will never know the resulting costs to our prosperity. But we know that science will be the foundation of our nation's future economic vitality. In his inaugural address, President Obama said, "We will restore science to its rightful place." That place is at the very heart of our nation's progress. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act acknowledges this fact and provides an important first step toward the sustained investment that will prevent the need for future recovery packages.

As American workers lose their jobs, more and more face losing their health insurance coverage as well. Job losses have caused Medicaid and SCHIP rolls rise by 1.0 million, further straining state budgets already stretched thin due to lower tax revenues. This bill would increase temporarily the federal government's contribution to Medicaid, giving New Jersey an additional $2 billion. For workers able to continue their health coverage through COBRA, the bill would subsidize COBRA premiums by 65 percent for nine months. This two-prong approach will provide health care for millions of newly unemployed workers and their families.

In addition to helping families maintain their health insurance coverage, this bill seeks to improve health care quality and its value. This bill would promote Health Information Technology systems, which could help reduce medical errors while lowering administrative costs by accelerating their adoption and usage among doctors and hospitals. This bill provides additional funding for prevention, which improves health at a good value by treating problems at the earliest stage before they become costly health care crises. Finally, this bill includes $1.1 billion for medical research to improve the value of health care spending by identifying the most effective treatments for given health conditions,

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would address the struggling economy by putting money back in the pockets of American families, workers, students and businesses through $276.5 billion worth of tax cuts. Ninety-five percent of working Americans would receive a tax cut through a refundable tax credit of up to $400 per worker that will be quickly distributed by reducing tax withholding from workers' paychecks. It would prevent 26 million Americans from getting hit by the Alternative Minimum Tax and lower the taxes of more than 16 million families by increasing the child tax credit and expanding the earned income tax credit.

This bill includes a number of provisions that would help businesses create new jobs in this difficult economy. It would allow businesses to improve cash flow by allowing businesses to write off 90 percent of losses incurred in 2008 and 2009 against taxes assessed over the previous five years. In addition, it would help businesses expand by extending the increased bonus depreciation for businesses making investments in new plants and equipment in 2009. Finally, this legislation would double the amount of money businesses can deduct on their taxes for capital investments and new equipment.

Through this comprehensive approach, we can begin to put the American economy back on the right track. We must approve the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the need to get the people of our country back

to work. Americans are hurting and they are looking to Washington for leadership.

Borrowing and spending got us into this problem, and more borrowing and spending will not solve it. Presidents Kennedy and Reagan cut taxes across-the-board, allowing families and small businesses to decide how to spend their money, instead of government. President Carter used this spending approach, and it didn't work.

This bill will cost every American household at least $7,000. Some constituents have told me, ''I might get a thousand dollars back.'' However, creating $7,000 in debt for $1,000 now is a bad deal at best.

This is twice as big as the New Deal, and that was over ten years. This is one bill. Every dollar in this bill is borrowed, adding more than a trillion dollars to our national debt at a time when we are already overloaded with the financial bailout and our long-term Social Security and Medicare obligations. This spending will ultimately be paid by our children and grandchildren, and that is generational theft.

I desperately wanted to support a bipartisan bill that will help put Americans back to work. But this bill has turned into a grab-bag that will not stimulate anything but government. There's $2 billion in this bill for a wasteful pro-foreclosure program, rewarding partisan action groups like ACORN. In the meantime, my governor, Bob Riley, told me yesterday that health and education programs in small states like Alabama are being shortchanged by billions. The American people deserve better.

The federal government has never been able to borrow and spend our way to prosperity. The strength of our country is the innovation and ingenuity of our people—not our government. When we put capital in their hands, they put it to use, supporting their families, building their businesses, and creating jobs. That is what has always kept our economy going through good times and bad. And I am confident we will be seeing good times again—most likely before much of this trillion dollar bill is actually spent.

The decisions we make today have long-term consequences. Today we are being rushed to make a trillion-dollar decision that will affect every American taxpayer for decades.

As a member of the Republican Economic Working Group, led by Whip CANTOR, we have offered a better plan to help struggling Americans immediately. Our alternative would create twice as many jobs at half the cost through across-the-board tax relief for working American families and small businesses.

We must remember that government has no money of its o to give away. It all comes from the taxpayer.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with today with great expectations and hope for a brighter economic future.

I rise in support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act also known as the ''Economic Stimulus.'' I want to especially thank our House and Senate conferees for coming together on one of the most important pieces of economic legislation of our time; Congressman OBEY, Congressman RANGEL, Congressman WAXMAN, Congressman LEWIS, Congressman CAMP, Senator REID, Senator INOUYE, Senator BAUCUS, Senator COCHRAN, and Senator GRASSLEY.

INTRODUCTION

Critical times call for critical measures. Over the last 13 months, our economy has lost a total of 3.6 million jobs—and continuing job losses in the next few months are predicted. The national unemployment rate is at 7.6 percent, with the great state of Texas seeing an unemployment rate of 6.0 percent and my district of Houston fairing only slightly better at approximately 6 percent. Right now, those unemployed, which represent over 1 million Texans, await with bated breath to see our pledge to enact change. That change is in the form of this stimulus measure.

''The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved'' as is stated in Jeremiah in the Bible. The summer has indeed ended. This stimulus provides a piece of America's salvation. Spring is on the horizon and today we will have a stimulus!

Our schoolhouses are badly in need of repair and modernization in order for our students to participate in, and be competitive in the global marketplace. Indeed in Texas the number of persons who have obtained graduate education trails the national average by one whole percentage point. It is critical that we encourage our students to attend graduate programs in important subjects such as mathematics, engineering, law, medicine, the building trades, and foreign languages.

The education provisions in this legislation are all about preparing our nation's children for the future. Our students in Houston are not competing with just students in Abilene, San Antonio, Houston and Grand Prairie; the competition is global which is why H.R. 1 must not be delayed!

Our healthcare system needs to be upgraded to allow for more Americans to receive coverage without going bankrupt. Our workforce needs to be retooled to keep up with innovative and new technologies; and our transportation systems need to be expanded. These are only a fraction of the many needs our nation is facing today.

I am proud to say that Congress heard the call of not only Main Street, but of mothers, and children, the working poor, the aged, and the sick. We heard your cry for help and we have done our best to answer that call.

This comprehensive legislation is designed to save and create jobs, get our economy moving again, and transform it for long-term growth and stability. The landmark legislation is the first dramatic new investment in the future since the creation of the interstate highway system a half century ago. It will spend nearly $800 billion and would provide billions in job creation and stimulus in city of Houston, the State of Texas, and the entire country.

HEALTHCARE

This legislation includes a number of provisions that will help aid in the nation's economic recovery, provide badly needed protections for people losing health coverage when they lose employment, and provide temporary assistance to states to preserve critical Medicaid coverage for low income families.

Specifically, in Texas Medicaid recipients will receive $5 million in assistance. Food Stamp Assistance in Texas will increase by $1,812 for each participant under the stimulus.

Other benefits include:

Premium Subsidies for COBRA Continuation Coverage for Unemployed Workers. To help people maintain coverage, the bill provides a 65 percent subsidy for COBRA continuation premiums for up to 9 months for workers and their families who have been involuntarily terminated. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this provision would help 7 million people maintain their health insurance by providing a vital bridge for workers who have been forced out of their jobs in this recession. (Estimated cost $24.7 billion.)

Medicare Payments for Teaching Hospitals. The bill blocks a FY09 Medicare payment reduction to teaching hospitals related to capital payments for indirect medical education (IME). (Estimated cost $191 million.)

Medicare Payments to Hospice. The bill blocks FY09 Medicare payment cut to Hospice providers related to a wage index payment add-on. (Estimated cost $134 million.)

Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP Payments to Long Term Care Hospitals. The bill makes technical corrections related to Medicare payments for long-term care hospitals. (Estimated cost $13 million.)

Temporary Federal Medical Assistance Percentage Increase. The bill increases FMAP funding for a 27-month period with an across-the-board increase to all states of 6.2 percent. (Estimated cost $86.6 billion.)

Temporary Increase in Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payments. (Estimated cost $460 million.)

Extension of Moratoria on Medicaid Regulations. The bill extends moratoria on Medicaid regulations for targeted case management, provider taxes, and school-based administration and transportation services through June 30, 2009. (Estimated cost $105 million.)

Extension of Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA). The bill extends TMA to December 31, 2010. (Estimated cost $1.3 billion.)

Extension of the Qualified Individual Program. The bill extends the QIP, which assists certain low-income individuals with Medicare Part B premiums, through December 31, 2010. (Estimated cost $550 million.)

Protections for American Indian Health Care. (Estimated cost $134 million.)

Prompt Payment Requirements for Nursing Facilities and Hospitals. The temporarily provides Medicaid prompt pay requirements to nursing facilities and hospitals. (Estimated cost $680 million.)

Promoting the adoption and use of health information technology. This bill promotes the use of health information technology (health IT), such as electronic health records, to protect identifiable health information from misuse and abuse as the health care sector increases use of health IT. (Estimated savings to the government more than $12 billion.)

$1 billion for prevention and wellness programs to fight preventable diseases and conditions with evidence-based strategies.

$10 billion to conduct biomedical research in areas such as cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease and stem cells, and to improve NIH facilities.

$1.1 billion to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, NIH and the HHS Office of the Secretary to evaluate the relative effectiveness of different health care services and treatment options.

EDUCATION

There are several key investments to education at the early childhood/Head Start, K–12, and higher education levels. On February 2, 2009, I met with eleven school superintendents and university presidents in my district of Houston, Texas. I convened this meeting to better understand the needs of the students, their families, and the schools administrators. Collectively, they arrived at five distinct priorities: maintaining and increasing Pell Grant

monies in order to keep access to higher education affordable; retention of funding for school construction, modernization, and repair; retention of formula funding on school construction; retention of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund; and no decrease in the amount of funding for Head Start and Early Childhood.

My school superintendents and administrators were concerned about Section 1413 in the Senate amendment which granted the Secretary of Education the authority to waive the maintenance of effort and ''supplement, not supplant'' requirements placed on Title I money. Since the purpose of Title I is to provide additional financial assistance to states and school districts to meet the needs of educating economically disadvantaged children, allowing the waiver of these requirements would have undermined the fundamental purpose of this funding.

In promoting this economic stimulus, President Obama indicated that the government's investments must not only create jobs in the short-term but must spur economic growth and competitiveness in the long-term. Investments in education can accomplish both ends. In fiscal year 2008, states spent over $424 billion on elementary, secondary, and higher education. Elementary, secondary, and higher education represent nearly 40 percent of total state spending and comprise the first, second, or third largest spending categories for almost all states. Federal investment in education is essential to creating a new and retooled workforce.

That is why I am pleased to see a heavy investment in education and workforce training including:

$53.6 billion for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, including $39.5 billion to local school districts using existing funding formulas, which can be used for preventing cutbacks, preventing layoffs, school modernization, or other purposes; $5 billion to states as bonus grants for meeting key performance measures in education; and $8.8 billion to states for high priority needs such as public safety and other critical services, which may include education and for modernization, renovation and repairs of public school facilities and institutions of higher education facilities.

$13 billion for Title 1 to help close the achievement gap and enable disadvantaged students to reach their potential.

$12.2 billion for Special Education/IDEA to improve educational outcomes for disabled children. This level of funding will increase the Federal share of special education services to its highest level ever.

$15.6 billion to increase the maximum Pell Grant by $500. This aid will help 7 million students pursue postsecondary education.

$3.95 billion for job training including State formula grants for adult, dislocated worker, and youth programs (including $1.2 billion to create up to 1 million summer jobs for youth).

JOBS/WORKFORCE

As we dive more deeply into a hard hit recession, it is important that this body take aggressive action, along with President Obama, to help right the ship. Our gross domestic product, (GDP) increased the United States budget deficit by 1 percent upon passage of the first stimulus measure in October. That is an astounding number when put into context. In a healthy year , the U.S. economy grows by 3 percent. Nothing resonates as loudly with the American people as being gainfully employed.

The unemployment rate in Texas is 6.0 percent. The National average is at 7.6 percent. The agreement does much in the way of helping Americans put food on their tables while reeling from the depressed economy and struggling to look for jobs.

Importantly, the agreement would continue to provide up to 33 weeks of extended unemployment benefits through the end of the year, as well as temporarily increase the amount of both regular and extended unemployment benefits by $25 a week. In addition, the legislation would provide up to a total of $7 billion to States modernizing their unemployment programs to provide improved coverage for low-wage, part-time and other workers. The measure would provide temporary emergency funds for States with rising caseloads in their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, and temporarily restore child support funding reduced in 2006. Finally, this section of the bill would provide a one-time payment of $250 to recipients of Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, Railroad Retirement benefits, VA disability and pension benefits, as well as to certain local, State and Federal government retirees.

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

The United States is facing its deepest recession and economic crisis since the Great Depression. Consequently, the goal of this legislation is to strengthen the economy and invest in America's future.

The legislation is intended to create and save jobs. Transportation and infrastructure development play a pivotal role in job creation.

The bill provides $1 billion for Community Development Block Grant programs for community and economic development projects including housing and services for those hit hard by tough economic times.

I am pleased that the Compromise Agreement that we are debating today retains significant amounts of funding for transportation. Specifically, it contains $27.5 billion for highway investments; $8.4 billion for investments in public transportation and $9.3 billion for investments in rail transportation, including Intercity Rail.

Indeed, this is good news for Houston. In the previous version of the bill, there was language that the Federal Transit Authority would give priority to transportation projects that were ready to go, meaning that they would be able to begin construction within 90 days of enactment or those projects would lose the money allowed under the stimulus.

I have been meeting with METRO since December 2008, and it has indicated that it can complete construction of the Northeast and South RAIL lines. METRO has indicated that it only requires $183 million to complete this rail line. I have worked to help METRO complete its rail line for over 20 years.

Houstonians need this infrastructure to relieve congestion and provide adequate public transportation, and an investment means jobs for our constituents through the transportation sector in our communities. Creating this critical infrastructure in Houston will allow Houstonians to work and will provide a tremendous boost to community development and mobility.

I have engaged Chairman OBERSTAR and his staff on the funds that might be made available to METRO. I was pleased that the Chairman indicated that METRO would be able to receive the funds it needs under this stimulus to complete its New Start transit project in Houston, Texas. Such funding is critical for the regional mobility of the citizens of the vast communities in and around the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

Cities around the country are struggling with a backlog of transportation projects and have difficulty in securing federal, state, and local resources in light of the struggling economy. At the same time, we are facing growing unemployment, particularly in our cities.

Houston has $1.5 billion in transit projects that could be under contract within 90 days of enactment of the legislation. Not only do we need this infrastructure to relieve congestion and provide adequate public transportation, but an investment in Houston's New Start Transit Project means jobs for our constituents through the transportation sector in our communities and around the nation.

Other salient provisions of the bill include the following:

Modernize Roads, Bridges, Transit and Waterways: To build a 21st century economy, we must create jobs rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges, modernizing public buildings, and putting people to work cleaning up our air, water and land.

Prioritizing Clean Water/Flood Control/Environmental Restoration

Provides $18 billion for clean water, flood control, and environmental restoration investments, which will create more than 375,000 jobs.

Experts note that $16 billion in water projects could be quickly obligated.

Modernizing Public Infrastructure, Including To Achieve Major Energy Cost Savings

Provides billions to modernize federal and other public infrastructure with investments that lead to long-term energy cost savings, including about $5 billion to make improvements in DOD facilities, including housing for our troops and about $4.5 billion to make federal office buildings more energy-efficient in order to achieve long-term savings for taxpayers.

INFRASTRUCTURAL IMPROVEMENTS

Modernizing Roads and Bridges

Provides $29 billion for modernizing roads and bridges, which will create 835,000 jobs. This investment creates jobs in the short term while saving commuters time and money in the long term.

Requires states to obligate at least half of the highway/bridge funding within 120 days.

States have over 6,100 projects totaling over $64 billion that could be under contract within 180 days.

Improving Public Transit and Rail

Provides $8.4 billion for investments in transit and $8 billion for investment in high-speed rail. These investments will reduce traffic congestion and our dependence on foreign oil.

Includes funds for new construction of commuter and light rail, modernizing existing transit systems, and purchasing buses and equipment to needed to increase public transportation and improve intermodal and transit facilities.

States have 787 ready-to-go transit projects totaling about $16 billion.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Provides a total of $6.3 billion for increasing energy efficiency in federally-supported housing programs.

Specifically, establishes a new program to upgrade HUD-sponsored low-income housing (elderly, disabled, and Section 8) to increase energy efficiency, including new insulation, windows, and frames.

Also invests in energy efficiency upgrades in public housing, including new windows, furnaces, and insulation to improve living conditions for residents and lower the cost of operating these facilities.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Tax Incentives to Spur Energy Savings and Green Jobs

Provides $20 billion in tax incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency over the next 10 years.

Includes a three-year extension of the production tax credit (PTC) for electricity derived from wind (through 2012) and for electricity derived from biomass, geothermal, hydropower, landfill gas, waste-to-energy, and marine facilities (through 2013).

Provides grants of up to 30 percent of the cost of building a new renewable energy facility to address current renewable energy credit market concerns.

Promotes energy-efficient investments in homes by extending and expanding tax credits through 2010 for purchases such as new furnaces, energy-efficient windows and doors, or insulation.

Provides a tax credit for families that purchase plug-in hybrid vehicles of up to $7,500 to spur the next generation of American cars.

Includes clean renewable energy bonds for State and local governments.

Establishes a new manufacturing investment tax credit for investment in advanced energy facilities, such as facilities that manufacture components for the production of renewable energy, advanced battery technology, and other innovative next-generation green technologies.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Restore science and innovation as the keys to new American-made technology, preventing and treating disease, and tackling urgent national challenges like climate change and dependence on foreign oil. The bill provides $600 million to NASA, including 4400 million to put more scientists to work doing climate change research including Earth science research recommended by the National Academies, satellite sensors that measure solar radiation critical to understanding climate change, and thermal infrared sensors necessary for water management. The bill also includes $150 million for research and development to improve air traffic control and $50 million to repair NASA centers damaged by hurricanes and floods in the last year.

TAX RELIEF

The economic stimulus legislation will help give $13 million more children access to the child tax credit. The use of this credit will likely provide the most immediate stimulus which is the ultimate goal of this package. Trends show that low-to-moderate income families are more likely to spend the stimulus monies and accelerate the much-needed rebound in our economy.

The city of Houston has over 73,000 families below the federal poverty level and a per capita income that is $1,500 dollars below the federal level. The extra boost that the child tax credit provides is in many cases critical to lower income families in my district. Any legislation that would help over 100,000 children in Texas has got to be labeled a winner. Based on estimates from the center on budget and policy priorities, there is a dollar-for-dollar reduction in poverty levels.

OTHER PROVISIONS FOR WORKERS AND FAMILIES

The earned income tax credit provides a tax incentive for families to continue working hard. Because it is refundable, it helps the lower bracket taxpayer, often the ones most in need. The credit has also been modified to be more ''family-friendly.''

The dreaded marriage-penalty has been modified substantially, thereby acknowledging the institution of marriage as opposed to making it a fiscal encumbrance.

TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT OF FUNDS

The compromise bill beforeus today provides unprecedented oversight, accountability, and transparency to ensure that taxpayer dollars are invested effectively, efficiently, and as quickly as possible to infuse the economy with the strongest stimulus.

Funds are distributed through existing formulas and numerous provisions provide for expedited relief so that much needed funds are invested as quickly as possible into the economy.

The Government Accountability Office and the Inspector General are provided with additional funding for auditing and investigating recovery spending. Moreover, a new Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board will coordinate and conduct oversight of recovery spending and provide early warning signs of problems.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

The act retains significant whistleblower protections. This is something that I care a tremendous amount about and is something that I actively fought to ensure that the language protecting whistleblowers was retained.

As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, I urged the conferees to retain the whistleblower language in the bill. This language was included in the bill to encourage government and contract workers to come forward in the face of wrongdoing, fraud and corruption.

Specifically, the language in H.R. 1 provides: ''. . . an employee of any non-federal employee receiving funds made available in this Act may not be discharged, demoted or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing to the Board, an inspector general, the Comptroller General, a member of Congress, or a federal agency head, or their representatives, information that the employee reasonably believes is evidence of . . . a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety . . .''

This language is important because public safety is at stake and the American people need to be reassured that they will be safe and secure while traveling. The function of the whistleblower is in many respects similar to that of a canary in a coal mine. They are there to warn of us of impending dangers.

An historic level of transparency, oversight and accountability will help guarantee taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and ensure that Americans can see the results of their investment. No wasteful spending will be tolerated in this.

In many cases, funds are distributed to existing initiatives with proven track records and with tough accountability measures already in place.

How funds are spent, all announcements of contract and grant competitions and awards, and formula grant allocations must be posted on a special website created by the President. It must also include the names of agency personnel to contact with concerns about infrastructure projects.

Public notice of funding must include a description of the investment funded, the purpose, the total cost, and why recovery dollars should be used. Governors, mayors, or others making funding decisions must personally certify that the investment has been fully vetted and is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. This information will also be placed on the internet.

The Council of Economic Advisors must report quarterly on the results for the American economy.

A Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board will be created to review management of recovery dollars and provide early warning of problems. The board is made up largely of Inspectors General.

The Government Accountability Office and the Inspectors General are provided additional funding and access for special review of recovery funding.

IN CONCLUSION

As Thomas Wolfe once wrote in his book You Can't Go Home Again, ''We have been lost during the past here in America, but I believe that we shall be found.'' I believe this bill allows America to return to its rightful place and put our economy back on track.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1, ''The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009'' and get this country moving again. I firmly believe that this bill creates jobs, stimulates the economy, and provides the oil, grease, and machinery to get the economic engine in this great country, operating and churning again. I have faith in our economic system and our country. I know that a brighter day is upon the horizon. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to real change and direction in this country.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the stimulus bill we're voting on today is supposed to stimulate business and create jobs. However, one provision of the bill will do just the opposite. Title II of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, under the Office of Justice Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance, provides $2 billion in Byrne Justice Assistance Grants (JAG). This funding is frequently used by local government agencies to fund pretrial release for criminal defendants. The problem is that it's at taxpayer expense.

When a defendant is given a pre-trial release bond or personal recognizance bond, he is released on his own recognizance. For example, a bond may be set at $10,000, and the defendant is released on his promise to return based on his ''word'' alone. If the defendant does not return, the sheriff has to go find him. The taxpayers are usually out $10,000 because judgments are seldom obtained from defendants for failure to appear.

On the other hand, when a surety bond is used, the court enters into a contractual agreement with a bonding company. The defendant also makes an agreement with the bonding company, and pays the company 10

percent. Then the defendant is released with the understanding that the bonding company will pay the court $10,000 if the defendant does not show up. Plus the bonding company is obligated to go and look for the defendant if the defendant does not appear in court. This form of free enterprise takes taxpayers off the financial hook.

Mr. Speaker, by allowing taxpayer money to go to pretrial release, the free enterprise system is greatly hindered. Instead of providing jobs, jobs are taken away from the private sector—namely the bonding and insurance community.

As a former judge, I found that defendants released on pretrial bonds seldom reappeared in court. With surety bonds, however, they were much more likely to show up because they had a vested financial interest in appearing. Plus, the bondsman looks for defendants who fail to appear.

During my 22 years as a criminal court judge, I saw how if left alone, the free enterprise system guarantees the best result. By allowing private enterprise to take part in the process, people are held accountable, and taxpayers are protected.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called ''stimulus'' bill will not stimulate the economy with jobs. It will only further stifle the free enterprise system, take jobs, and will leave taxpayers with the bill. This is just one of many examples of flaws in this bill.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, 8 years of the Bush Administration's failed policies have left our economy in a deep and cavernous hole. The climb out will be steep. With the strength and courage of President Obama, this Congress and the American people it will be steady. Today we are voting on one bold and historic step out of this hole. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act offers the short term help and long term solutions that this country needs. It invests quickly in our economy to create or save at least 3.5 million jobs nationally—41,000 in my home state of Connecticut, and provide tax cuts for the middle class. And, it puts us on a path towards economic strength and stability for the future with bold reforms and new priorities.

This legislation makes a critical investment in our country's greatest resource: our children. We are helping local school districts in the short-term with over $53 billion in aid, to keep our teachers in the classroom. We are also making a down-payment on our country's future. With this legislation, we are helping to build the workforce of the future with funding for Head Start programs and Pell Grants, and modernizing our schools to give our students the tools they need to succeed.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act recognizes the important role our infrastructure will play in our economic recovery. Our roads and bridges are in serious need of repair and our public transportation desperately needs modernization. The funding provided in this legislation for infrastructure will create good paying jobs—many within the next few months. It also invests in the transportation of tomorrow with over $8 billion in funding for high speed rail—taking cars off the road, and improving our environment.

With this legislation we will begin to make the tough choices to create a new American energy industry that will create jobs now and decrease our dependence on foreign oil. This investment will help families reduce their energy bills and create ''green jobs'' while advancing American ingenuity and innovation.

Our work will not end when this bill is signed into law. As President Obama has said, it will take time and a lot of hard work to get this economy moving. This President, this Congress and the American people have the courage and fortitude to rebuild and recover. Today we begin that journey.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Conference Report.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the House floor and listed the top ten reasons to support this bill. Here we are today and the only thing that has changed is that more Americans are losing their jobs, homes and healthcare. We have to stop the economy from continuing to spiral out of control before it is too late.

Our country is facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression—we lost 2.6 million jobs last year—the largest job loss since 1945. In Illinois, the unemployment rate increased by 40 percent in one year. We are seeing job losses at iconic American companies like Kodak and Ford, and at major Illinois companies like Caterpillar.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will help get our economy back on track and put America back to work. The bill will create 3.5 million jobs, cut taxes for working families, rebuild our infrastructure, prevent state and local cuts to crucial services and programs, and invest in the long-term health of our economy.

Under this bill, Illinois will receive billions of dollars and it is estimated that this bill would save or create over 148,000 jobs in Illinois. This bill isn't a hand out to Wall Street fat cats and corporate CEOs; this is a hand up for the American people. The bill helps working families in Illinois, and across the country, by providing income tax credits, making college and health insurance more affordable, giving first-time homebuyers a tax credit and providing assistance to low-income families to make their homes more energy efficient and lower their energy costs.

As President Obama has said, this bill is not perfect, but it provides immediate and targeted relief to American families and will help lead our country out of the greatest economic crisis we have faced since the Great Depression. American families are depending on us to act—not tomorrow, not next week—but today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

When we return home for our district work period, we do not have to look far to see the impact this recession has had—workers are being laid off, consumer confidence is down, and people are spending less because they have less to spend. Despite my opposition, we voted last year to give $750 billion to Wall Street to try to slow this recession; that did not work. I supported the House version of the American Recovery and Investment Act, and I am supporting the Conference Report because it is time we invest in Main Street, not just Wall Street.

The White House Council of Economic Advisers, along with the Departments of Labor and Commerce have estimated this bill will create nearly 270,000 jobs in my home state of Texas—more than in any other state besides California—and 7,400 of those jobs will be in our 29th Congressional District.

Unlike the $750 billion Troubled Asset Relief Program, this isn't just a bill for white collar workers—the H.R. 1 is a bill for teachers, construction workers, medical professionals, electrical workers and engineers, police and firefighters, as well as those who may not be working because of the dire state of our economy. This bill will create and save jobs by reinvesting in roads, highways, public transportation, schools, education, the electrical grid, health technology and services, communications infrastructure, and numerous other areas of our economy. For the last eight years, too many of these areas have been neglected. Today, we have the opportunity to invest in these areas to stimulate the economy and create jobs to get our economy started back in the right direction.

The bedrock of America's competitiveness is a well-educated and skilled workforce and we must prepare our students for our globalized economy. This bill takes key steps towards ensuring that we do just that. Starting with our youngest generation, H.R. 1 provides $2.1 billion for Head Start and Early Head Start to allow an additional 124,000 children to participate in these programs.

Harris County, where our district lies, serves a combined total of 6,649 Head Start children per year through four direct Head Start grantees. In fact, Houston in 2003 served the lowest percentage of eligible children compared to other cities in Texas.

Harris County is the third most populous county in the nation and in review of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Biennial Reports to Congress on Head Start, Los Angeles County served 29,703 eligible children, Cook County served 20,406 children, and the New York boroughs served 24,260. Funding Head Start grantees is based on the number of children under the age of 5 years whose family income is below the federal poverty line.

According to U.S. Census figures for 2005, not only is the poverty rate for Harris County's population under age 5 higher than the national average in 2005 of 21 percent, but Harris County represented the highest percentage of children below the poverty line for all above listed counties. The poverty rates for 2005 are: Los Angeles County 23.8 percent, Cook County 22.5 percent, NYC boroughs 27.3 percent and Harris County 28.7 percent. I look forward to working with the Department of Health and Human Services to address this disparity in funding now that new monies will be available to serve more eligible children.

Additionally, this bill will provide much-needed investments in our elementary and secondary schools including $13 billion for Title I grants to help disadvantaged kids reach high academic standards and $39.5 billion to local school districts that can be used for preventing teacher cutbacks and layoffs and make key investments in things like modernizing our schools.

Finally, this bill will invest in preparing our younger generations for our globalized economy by providing $15.6 billion to increase the maximum Pell Grant by $500. By doing this, we will help seven million students pursue postsecondary education and take the steps they need to get the certification or degree necessary to pursue and keep a job in these difficult times. Additionally, H.R. 1 provides students with a new ''American Opportunity'' tax credit of up to $2,500 of the cost of tuition

and related expenses paid during the taxable year. Combined with the increase in the Pell Grant, this tax credit will give our lower and middle income students additional peace of mind in taking on the financial costs of pursuing a college degree or certificate.

Another way to build a 21st century economy is to engage contractors across the nation to create jobs rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges and building transit and rail lines. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will do this by providing funds to modernize our roads and bridges and invest in transit and rail projects to reduce traffic congestion and gas consumption. I strongly supported the inclusion of these funds as this investment would create or sustain more than 2.4 million jobs and $439 billion of economic activity.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 1 provides for $1.5 billion in supplemental discretionary grants that will be awarded to state or local governments or transit agencies on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the country, metropolitan area, or region. This bill reads that this money includes in investing in projects already participating in New Starts or those ready for entry into revenue service. While I would like to have seen a lot more money dedicated to these type projects, I am glad that transit agencies will be able to compete for entry into revenue service.

We have two critical transit projects in the greater Houston area, the North and Southeast light rail corridors. Both projects are near completion of the New Starts process in the Federal Transit Administration. While the final details on the projects are being addressed to prepare the projects for entry into Final Design and for Full Funding Grant Agreements, the projects are ready to begin construction in less than 90 days, have environmental clearances, and have received favorable cost effectiveness ratings. By investing in these two projects, work can begin quickly, creating thousands of jobs in a region that suffers not only from the current economic conditions but also from the lasting effects of Hurricane Ike. I look forward to working with the Department of Transportation to see that these two projects receive the attention they deserve.

I am also pleased H.R. 1 includes valuable health related provisions including COBRA subsidies, health IT funding, an FMAP increase, temporary DSH allotments, a temporary extension of transitional Medical Assistance, and funding for community health centers.

However, the final version of the bill does not include the temporary option for states to provide Medicaid coverage to unemployed or uninsured individuals. Instead, H.R. 1 relies on COBRA subsidies to provide health insurance coverage to the unemployed. The House passed version of H.R. 1 gave states the option to provide Medicaid coverage to the unemployed or uninsured and this provision should be in the final version of the bill.

In our district, most individuals work low wage jobs that often do not provide health insurance and therefore they are not eligible for COBRA coverage. This leaves a large portion of individuals without health insurance or access to Medicaid. More and more lower wage individuals, who never had health insurance, are losing their jobs. They are delaying their health care because they cannot afford to go to the doctor and often end up in the emergency room with more costly medical problems because they delay medical care. It makes sense to give states the option to extend Medicaid coverage to these individuals because it saves money in the long run and provides these individuals with health care coverage.

The legislation also makes critical improvements to the smart grid provisions established in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 by eliminating the cap on the allowable number of smart grid demonstration projects and increasing the grant funding available for these efforts. Houston is a leader in moving toward smart grid solutions. Center Point Energy, a leading energy delivery company in Texas, will invest over $600 million in automatic metering systems, or AMS, over the next five years to support smart grid infrastructure. AMS technology is the first step in moving towards an automatic grid which will allow consumers to manage and monitor the electric use in real-time, reduce energy consumption, and improve grid reliability.

I am also pleased with the changes to the Weatherization Assistance Program which will help low-income families make their homes more energy efficient. This will decrease the amount of fossil fuels needed to heat and cool homes, reduce home energy bills and create jobs in the home weatherization industry: a win-win for everyone.

It creates a temporary $6 billion Department of Energy loan guarantee program for renewable energy and electric transmission projects, up to $500 million of which can be used for the development of leading edge biofuels, including biodiesel.

I applaud the inclusion of $4.6 billion in funding for the Army Corps of Engineers, although the Corps needs much more funding to address its backlog of critical projects. While the funding is not distributed to specific projects, it is my hope the Corps will fund worthy projects by the Port of Houston and the Harris County Flood Control District. I also support the $1.2 billion for EPA's nationwide environmental cleanup programs, including Superfund, which I hope can be utilized to clean up the San Jacinto River Waste Pits.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is crumbling, workers are being laid off, people are losing their health insurance, and families are finding it harder and harder to make ends meet. This legislation will start us back on the right track by looking out for those who have been most affected, and by broadly investing is multiple sectors of our economy. We cannot stand by and do nothing, and for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report to the economic stimulus legislation.

I understand that Americans are hurting. Many have lost their jobs, are unable to pay their mortgage, don't have health insurance and are struggling to make ends meet. Small businesses have especially felt the brunt of the recession.

Congress needs to come together with the president to restore confidence in the economy and create a climate conducive to job growth. But instead of a narrowly focused effort to stimulate the economy through targeted programs to put more money in the hands of taxpayers and create jobs, this massive spending bill—the largest in our Nation's history—creates new programs and bolsters others, many of which have nothing to do with economic recovery. I don't question the urgency of congressional action to stimulate the economy, but I do question the priorities in this package and its price tag.

I have never been more concerned about the future of our country. The unprecedented amount of borrowing and spending in this package will place a tremendous burden of debt on present and future generations. This economic stimulus package was not only an opportunity to look at short-term solutions to help jump-start the economy and assist struggling taxpayers and homeowners, but also a historic opportunity for Congress to address the long-term financial plan for our country.

I have been speaking out for several years about getting mandatory spending under control. Congressman JIM COOPER and I have authored bipartisan legislation, which I first introduced in 2006, to set up a national commission to review our nation's long-term economy, including entitlement spending, discretionary spending and tax policy, and recommend a plan to Congress to get America on a sustainable financial path. The Securing America's Future Economy (SAFE) Act would address this financial crisis and solve it with bipartisanship. The SAFE effort differs from others because it requires an up or down vote in Congress on the commission's proposal, similar to the process for closing military bases enacted in 1988.

As the piece of the budget pie continues to grow to pay for entitlements, spending for discretionary programs shrinks. That means fewer dollars for education, for medical research, for investment in technology, for national security, for transportation, and a myriad of other programs on which Americans rely. Not only is it unacceptable to shoulder our children and grandchildren with a crushing debt burden, I believe it raises serious moral questions. Is it right for one generation to live very well knowing that its debts will be left to be paid for by others?

I reached out to both Democrats and Republicans to push for a bipartisan entitlement reform commission to be considered as part of the stimulus package. The SAFE idea has garnered growing support. I offered the SAFE Commission as an amendment when the stimulus legislation was marked up in the House Appropriations Committee, and again when the Rules Committee decided which amendments would be made in order for consideration on the House floor as a part of House legislative package. I was disappointed that my amendment was not even allowed to be debated by the House.

I am deeply concerned about the divisiveness in Congress and believe that a bipartisan commission may well be the only way to mandate action on long-term budget controls. President Obama has indicated his willingness to reach across the aisle to find bipartisan solutions. I have always believed that working together in a bipartisan manner is what the American people expect of their leaders.

The Congress had the chance in this measure to take a bold step for America's future financial security and instead we are going down the same road of adding to the deficit and national debt with questionable programs that are touted to create jobs and stimulate the economy. We can do better and we must

do better—for our children and our grandchildren's future.

Mr. Speaker, I insert with my statement an op-ed from yesterday's Washington Times by Stuart Butler of the Heritage Foundation who understands the urgency of Congress and the administration coming together to stop the financial tsunami that threatens the financial future of our country.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 12, 2009]

BUTLER: CONGRESS NEEDS COVER TO REFORM ENTITLEMENTS

(By Stuart Butler)

The price tag is stunning. Pegged at nearly $800 billion—a figure that doesn't even include interest payments—the so-called ''stimulus'' bill sets an all-time record for deficit spending by a single bill.

Congress has gotten away with deficit spending in the past, because foreign investors were willing to buy U.S. bonds to cover the debt. But the size of this bill will send our deficits sky-rocketing, to the point where overseas investors may have second thoughts about lending us more.

And that's the good news!

The bad news is there's a far bigger problem threatening to undermine overseas confidence in America's finances. That's the looming fiscal tsunami due to wash over us as baby boomers start retiring in ever-growing numbers and start claiming Social Security and Medicare benefits Congress has promised them. They are promises even the most robust economy could not afford to keep.

Some lawmakers fear that Congress is incapable of addressing this problem, given the way it currently does business. They say the entitlement tsunami needs a very different approach. They are right.

Let's understand the situation. Over the next 10 years, Congress says the stimulus will cost about $800 billion we don't have. In its single most expensive year—2010—Congress will borrow just over $350 billion to create ''energy-efficient visitors centers'' and otherwise ''stimulate'' the economy. That's a lot of money.

But let's look at what Medicare alone must borrow—every year—to cover the gap between what it spends and takes in through premiums and payroll taxes. It's already costing taxpayers almost $200 billion this year. Within 10 years, yearly borrowing will hit the equivalent of $285 billion in today's economy. In 20 years it will be close to $600 billion, with hundreds of billions more from red-ink saturated Social Security and Medicaid spending.

And we are worrying about a peak of $350 billion for the stimulus?!

Two congressmen, Rep. Frank R. Wolf, Virginia Republican, and Rep. Jim Cooper, Tennessee Democrat, don't believe Congress has the stomach to rein in such staggering shortfalls in these politically sensitive programs.

To give weak-kneed politicians the cover they need, Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper propose a bipartisan commission to recommend long-term structural changes in entitlement programs. Commission proposals would be sent to Congress for an up-or-down vote.

Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper reckon their commission would get members off the hook of voting line-by-line for unpopular changes. And a bipartisan commission means both parties get the political pain and gain of taking tough action.

Now, we've had budget commissions before. Sometimes they consist of top congressional leaders who meet behind closed doors and produce few real program changes but more real taxes. Or they produce a report that goes nowhere.

But the Wolf-Cooper plan has two stages that may change the political dynamic.

Before the commission even meets to talk turkey, for several months it would hold a national conversation across the country, with town meetings and other ways to gauge public sentiment. Only then would the commission begin its work. Armed with this public support, Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper reason, lawmakers could vote ''aye'' with political protection.

This ''public mandate'' stage is modeled after something called the Fiscal Wake-Up Tour. The tour consists of representatives from the Concord Coalition, a budget watchdog group, as well as the Heritage Foundation and the Brookings Institution, together with former U.S. Comptroller General David Walker.

This left-right panel has held dozens of large meetings around the country, talking with tens of thousands of Americans. As a ''made member'' of the tour, I can tell you how Americans are likely to react to a commission seeking their views:

People want the truth about our fiscal future. If they get the facts in a nonpartisan way, first they are stunned and then they want action.

The elderly, as well as young Americans, are willing to support tough steps on Medicare and other programs—if they are first brought into a serious conversation.

And they doubt that more money sent to Washington would be used to avoid future deficits. They are sure it will be spent.

Here's a thought. Let's say President Obama were to back the Wolf-Cooper two-stage commission. Imagine if he and congressional leaders from both parties were to hold their own tour. They would jointly give Americans the full picture of the future tsunami and an honest description of the major options from all sides. And imagine they asked the American people what to do. Then, say, a commission put together a package of reforms based on the people's mandate and sent it to Congress for a vote.

That's the kind of commission report that could work. The kind of change you can believe in.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report for H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. This legislation will start to address the most critical needs of our flagging economy by providing relief to struggling individuals and small businesses, while creating and saving 3.5 million jobs across America.

These are challenging times for families in North Carolina and across the nation. Each month it seems that we get more bad news, or hit a new record on an economic indicator. On Friday, the U.S. Department of Labor announced the unemployment rate was at a 34-year high of 7.6 percent. The increase in the last quarter is the largest since the end of World War II. This increase in the jobless rate is hitting every region, and every state, but North Carolina is particularly hard-hit. We are one of the top five states in terms of month-over-month increases, and one of the top three in increases since last year. Here in North Carolina, unemployment is 8.7 percent. In addition to the unemployed, there are many more workers who are seeing their hours and wages cut.

I have heard from North Carolinians from across the Second District about the need for swift action. H.R. 1 addresses the need by making investments in our economy that will produce new jobs while providing tax relief for 95 percent of Americans. With 3.6 million jobs lost in the past year, the 3.5 million jobs created by this bill will put us on track to an economic recovery.

Some of these jobs will be created, and created quickly, by the $25 billion in school construction bond tax credits in this bill which I have worked on with Ways and Means Chairman CHARLIE RANGEL for more than 12 years. The tax credits will create more than 11,000 jobs in North Carolina alone. This funding will allow work to start on stalled and delayed school building projects and address overcrowding and deteriorating schools. The jobs created by making these investments in our future will invigorate our economy today, and provide a strong foundation for the working families of the future. I am proud that the tax credits in this bill will give local school districts support to improve their schools and the education they provide.

As the former Superintendant of Schools in North Carolina, I have a special understanding of the needs of our students, and I am pleased that H.R. 1 includes significant investments in education. In addition to the ABCs Act tax credits, the bill includes $39.5 billion to help schools modernize their facilities and prevent layoffs or cutbacks to essential educational services. It provides $25 billion to support our most vulnerable students through Title I and IDEA, and $4 billion for early childhood education to ensure that kids have the right start on the path to learning. This package also invests in higher education with a new tax credit for individuals seeking a college education and a $500 increase to Pell Grants. We must give the next generation the tools to support learning throughout their lives, to enable them to compete in our 21st Century economy.

To jump start our economy and turn the tide on unemployment, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 makes investments to create or save 3.5 million jobs. At the same time, it provides a down payment on our most important national priorities. H.R. 1 will also get the stagnant economy moving again supporting targeted infrastructure investments to improve bridges and roads, modernize public buildings, and expand mass transit. H.R. 1 also strategically invests in America's ''green sector,'' supporting alternative and environmentally-friendly energy, like the biofuels we grow and produce in North Carolina, and new technology that creates energy from waste products. It also expands energy tax provisions like the Production Tax Credit and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds while providing the funds we need to transform our energy distribution system and weatherize and modernize our homes and public buildings to increase efficiency.

Millions of Americans will see their taxes reduced by H.R. 1, and others will receive support in making purchases that help our economy. More than 95 percent of the nation's taxpayers will see an increase in their take-home pay through the ''Making Work Pay'' tax credit, $400 for individuals and $800 for working families. H.R. 1 will prevent 26 million families from being subjected to the Alternative Minimum Tax. It also includes relief for Americans that will spur our economy by providing an $8,000 tax credit for first-time home-buyers.

In addition, the small businesses that form the backbone of our economy will get relief under the recovery package. H.R. 1 includes bonus depreciation to help them invest in new equipment, loss carry back to help them weather reduced sales, a delay of the 3% withholding tax on payments to businesses

that sell goods or services to governments, and a cut in the capital gains tax cut for investors in small businesses who hold stock for more than five years. It also provides incentives for businesses that create new jobs.

For those suffering in the economic downturn, this bill provides temporary support to help struggling families make ends meet and help workers train and find jobs. It extends and improves unemployment benefits, increases food stamps and food support, and provides aid to seniors, disabled veterans, and Social Security recipients. It extends Trade Adjustment Assistance for displaced workers, and extends and improves local job training, job placement, and vocational rehabilitation initiatives. This spending quickly makes its way into the economy, and will help those most in need.

Our country is facing difficult times, and though we have many challenges to meet, this package is a bold step in the right direction. I support H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Economic Recovery bill that will put America back to work and throw a life-line to the millions of people that are struggling to support their families.

In the last four months alone, the economy has lost over 2 million jobs. By the end of 2009, an additional 3–5 million Americans could lose their jobs and without this package, the unemployment rate is likely to rise to 12 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation and housing investments in this bill will create jobs, generate economic growth, and significantly improve our transportation and housing infrastructure.

The bill appropriates over $48 billion for surface transportation and aviation and over $13 billion for housing investment.

Within the $48 billion for transportation over 75 percent of that money will quickly go to the states through existing authorized formula programs for ready to go highway and transit projects. This funding will create over 1 million new jobs.

Among discretionary transportation initiatives, $8 billion is provided for high-speed and intercity passenger rail which is an historic investment in America's future.

The bill invests in the nation's public housing, provides funding to communities hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis to purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed housing, and includes money to fill financing gaps in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit caused by the collapse of the credit market. Together these housing appropriations will yield about 250,000 jobs.

While I believe more must still be done to adequately invest in public transit and to help communities with the growing number of foreclosures, we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

This is a good bill Mr. Speaker and I urge a yes vote.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of transparency, because Republicans, the media and the American public were shut out of negotiations, I am suggesting a new name for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, this so-called stimulus bill.

Based on what we know, I propose that we call it the Emergency Massive Expansion of Federal Spending to Double Our Budget Deficit by Circumventing the Legislative Process to Roll Back Welfare Reform, Intrude on Individual's Healthcare Decisions, Buy Green Golf Carts When We Don't Know How They Will be Used, Bail Out Fiscally Irresponsible States, But We'll Give People an Average Whopping $13 per week of Tax Relief, So We Hope They Won't Mind, Non-Stimulus, Non-Recovery Act of 2009.

There, I think that does a much better job of describing this bill.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we need a stimulus bill that will put people back to work and create jobs. We don't need a big government spending bill that has become a grab bag of special interest spending.

I have several concerns about the bill, but I would like to speak today about a specific issue involving special education funding.

Like most of my colleagues I'm sure, I hear all the time from educators—teachers, parents, superintendents—about special education funding. When the federal government enacted the special ed mandate back in 1974, it promised to provide 40 percent of the funds.

But it has only provided about 17 percent annually, which means local school districts have to make up this shortfall. This is patently unfair to our local school districts.

But now this bill contains a particularly troubling provision that would further exacerbate the problem. The stimulus bill contains restrictions on special education funding that would not provide the needed relief to local schools because it would only allow them to use the funds for specified programs and services—not give local school districts the flexibility they need to make up for the current shortfall in funding. Even worse, the ''maintenance of effort'' provision in the stimulus would force states and local schools to sustain spending in these tight budget times or lose their federal funding.

And the conference report extends this mandate from two years to three years—through 2011.

Mr. Speaker, our teachers play an exceptionally integral role in shaping our children and our Nation's future. They understand the needs of each student—far better than Washington bureaucrats ever will. We need to ensure that our educators are properly equipped and given the proper decision rights in how to make each child succeed.

I believe we should allow local schools more flexibility, and I urge the Secretary of Education to keep that important principle in mind as he implements the ''maintenance of effort'' provision.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report to H.R. 1, the so-called economic stimulus package.

Congressional Democrats crafted this bill behind closed doors and only released all the details to us at midnight last night.

Their plan makes a bad bill worse by reducing tax relief for working families in order to fund more wasteful spending.

Our economy needs a shot of adrenaline, not a load of long-term pet projects.

I believe we need to act now; but we must get it right.

Much of this spending is for worthy projects, but they're not stimulative and should go through the regular appropriations process.

I joined my Republican colleagues and proposed a plan that focuses on letting individuals, families, and small businesses keep more of their hard-earned money through tax relief. It would create 6.2 million jobs at half the cost, and that's using the Obama Administration's own statistical models.

Only 18 percent of conference report is dedicated to lowering federal income taxes. In fact, it provides for even less tax relief than the original House-passed bill. Infrastructure spending, similarly comprises only 17 percent of the discretionary spending in this package—down from $1 billion in the original House bill.

Shovel-ready infrastructure projects and individual tax relief for small businesses should be part of our efforts to boost the economy. But that doesn't mean Congress should use this crisis as an excuse to spend hundreds of billions in taxpayer dollars on 33 new programs that won't have any economic impact in the near-term.

Mr. TANNER. I rise today in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I do so with a strong sense of responsibility and a heavy heart.

Throughout my career in this body, I have stood up to champion the cause of fiscal restraint. I have seen the majority in this House change two times; presidents of both parties come and go. In all that time, I have called on the powers that be not to spend more than we can afford, whether it be in the form of excessive spending or unaffordable tax cuts.

This is truly an economic and financial crisis unlike any we have ever seen, and it is forcing tough decisions unlike any we have ever faced. Economists from across the ideological spectrum believe that our nation is in the midst of an economic catastrophe that requires government action. The papers are filled with sobering stories: small and large businesses on the verge of collapse, massive layoffs, historic levels of unemployment and families unable to afford their homes. The numbers are grim: 3.6 million people out of work since this downturn started; in my district alone nearly 6,000 citizens have been laid off in the last 13 months. Eight counties in my district have an unemployment rate of over 10 percent, and all but one county's unemployment rate is considerably above the current national average of 7.2 percent.

Blame for this crisis can be found far and wide: greedy Wall Street giants, irresponsible lenders and consumers, and regulators that were asleep at the switch. I truly believe that without action our economy will get much worse, and our nation will enter a period of hardship not known since the Great Depression. Inaction is simply not an option.

The bill before us is not perfect. It contains spending measures that I believe may have merit but should be vetted through the regular appropriation process. But the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good in these serious times.

This legislation contains critical infrastructure spending that invests in communities, roads, waterways and needed technology upgrades in West Tennessee and across this great country. The stimulus package contains tax provisions that will provide relief for families living on the margins and businesses struggling to meet payroll. Under this legislation, in fact, 95 percent of Tennessean and American taxpayers will receive a tax cut. Most importantly though, it will help create and save 7,900 private sector jobs in my district. By putting people to work, we will put money

in the pockets of all Americans to reenergize the economy.

There is no doubt that this bill comes at a cost, one greater than the $787 billion price tag associated with it. Money will be borrowed and interest will have to be paid. Madam Speaker, as a fiscal conservative, that gives me great pause; I would not support this package if I did not believe that our country's future hung in the balance.

So I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I know that the recovery will not be immediate, but without this package recovery may not be possible at all.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that legislating is the ''art of compromise.'' Today, the House is considering a carefully negotiated economic recovery bill that represents a good balance of tax cuts and spending stimulus to help get our economy back on track and help get people in this country working again.

As a representative of small town Missouri and Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly pleased that the legislation directs needed resources to rural parts of the country and further addresses an economic downturn that has become a national security threat to the United States.

Over the past year, the Government has taken steps to help reduce the impact of the recession on the American people. Some of those actions have proven helpful, while others must be reviewed and improved. But, economists from across the political spectrum have indicated that further economic stimulus is necessary to help reduce layoffs and create jobs.

Since January, bipartisan consensus has been built around a $789 billion economic recovery bill designed to boost employment and invest in the health, education, and safety of the American people.

This legislation invests heavily in rural priorities, such as boosting funds for rural water programs; for rural highway and infrastructure projects, for school modernization initiatives; for Corps of Engineers projects; for agricultural-based alternative energy development; and for expanding Internet broadband technology. It directs additional funds toward military and VA construction projects and toward streamlining the VA claims process. And, it provides individual and small business tax relief, helps turn our country toward greener energy solutions, and strengthens the safety net for workers who have fallen on hard times.

The economic recovery bill is not perfect. But, sitting on the sidelines, simply watching our economy deteriorate, is simply not an option. Inaction on our part would undercut America's national security and would imperil jobs, savings, farms, and small businesses. We must do what we can to prevent such a tragedy, which is why enacting this legislation is in the best interest of our country.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this wasteful, unfocused, and massive government-spending bill. It is true that our country is in the middle of a severe economic downturn and economists on both sides of the financial debate agree that the current housing market and lack of available credit are at the root of this problem. Yet, Democrat leaders in the House and Senate decided to strip this legislation of an obviously stimulative $15,000 homebuyer tax credit, in favor of a $5 billion earmark to make federal buildings ''green.'' This is one of many glaring examples that this bill is not about stimulating the economy; it is about expanding the Federal Government in a time of crisis.

I believe White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel characterized this democrat-spending bill best when he said, ''You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. And what I mean by that is an opportunity to do things you think you could not do before.'' In a rush to capitalize on our country's economic situation the other side of the aisle has used fear and pronouncements of imminent catastrophe to fulfill their wants and achieve their goals of government expansion, longstanding liberal spending policies, and political payback.

Many have looked to our economic history to provide guidance during this difficult time, particularly to the New Deal instituted by President Franklin Roosevelt. Looking to the past we discover that Henry Morgenthau, Jr., FDR's Treasury Secretary, gave this quote in May of 1939 during the Great Depression.

''We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work. And I have just one interest, and now if I am wrong somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosper. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say after eight years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started. And enormous debt to boot.''

Unfortunately, what many economists have found at present and in the past is that New Deal principles are stale ideas that do not translate into economic stimulus in the 21st century. To find further confirmation that unfocused infrastructure and public works projects fail to stimulate a recessive economy one need only look to Japan during the 1990s.

Like this country's current situation, Japan in the late 1980s experienced the bursting of a real estate bubble. To combat the economic situation, the Japanese government embarked on a colossal spending spree pouring trillions of taxpayer dollars into wasteful roads, bridges and infrastructure projects. Japan finally came out of its economic tailspin, but many economists contend that it was not infrastructure spending that caused the economy to recover, but rather an intensive cleanup of the banks, and a growing export sector that boosted the country. According to a February 5, 2009, New York Times article, ''Among Japanese citizens, the spending is widely disparaged for having turned the nation into a public-works-based welfare state and making regional economies dependent on Tokyo for jobs. Much of the blame has fallen on the Liberal Democratic Party, which has long used government spending to grease rural vote-buying machines that help keep the party in power.''

For these, and many other reasons, I regret that I cannot support this unprecedented big government grab for citizen reliance on the federal government. History shows that the best way to encourage an economic turnaround, preserve jobs, and spur widespread economic growth, is to ensure that job-creators face a lower tax burden. It is evident that this country needs to lower its corporate and small business tax rates, and provide tax relief to middle-class families. What this country does not need is a scatter shot approach of federal spending that will only increase the debt burden on future generations and create government dependence, while doing nothing to stimulate or create meaningful long-term job growth.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the stimulus package that our colleagues behind closed doors because of the lack of stimulus.

The American people are hurting. Too many jobs have been lost, and too many hard working Americans are worried about their future. Every day I receive calls from Arkansans opposed to Congress recklessly throwing around billions of dollars in an attempt to spend our way out of this crisis by getting more into debt.

The American people do need action; but responsible, focused action that will create jobs and return tax dollars to working Americans immediately. This is the time-proven and fastest way to truly stimulate our economy. We cannot afford nor can our children afford—an $800 billion mistake which gives too little attention to creating and saving jobs and securing our retirement savings. I can't says to the average Arkansan who is fearful he or she will lose their job that this stimulus will save their jobs and help their lives it—so it does not deserve our support.

I urge Congress to work harder and together for a focused, responsible bill that will save and create jobs and protect pensions.

Mr. TERRY, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

I come to the floor to oppose this bill reluctantly. When I am home in my District I talk to my neighbors, old school friends, and folks in the coffee shop, they share with me the economic problems they are facing—fellow workers being laid off, difficulty in meeting the house payment because there is now only one wage earner. Small business owners are laying off people due to slow sales especially at car dealerships, retail stores, and restaurants.

The slow down of the U.S. economy has not missed my community—folks are hurting and Congress needs to act in ways that will jump start the housing markets, get credit and lending flowing, increase U.S. exports and provide tax relief so families have more money in their pocket to pay for daily household expenses.

But Mr. Speaker, I have many worries about the massive bill that we have before us today.

I worry there is too much spending in this so-called ''Stimulus'' package. The cost of this bill today is $791 billion. Over time the bill will cost $1.138 trillion. There is too much spending on government programs that should be funded through the normal appropriations process, not in this bill. Under the guise of stimulus, the huge increase in these government programs significantly raises the baseline on which future spending cannot be sustained without large tax increases. This policy could be devastating to our economy and prolong the current economic recession.

I worry that too little of the package goes toward the most effective tools for creating jobs for small business owners, like lower taxes and tax credits. In fact, the only help directed to small business, net operating loss, carryback was reduced by this bill from $1 billion to $2 billion. The home buyer tax credit was reduced from $35 billion to $2 billion; the car tax credit to purchase a new car was reduced from $11.5 billion to $2 billion.

Infrastructure money for roads and bridges was $67 billion, which I appreciate, although my request to add $13 billion for combined

sewer operations funds in the infrastructure section fell on deaf ears. Compare this to Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID $8 billion for a high speed train from Las Vegas to Disneyland. The priorities in this bill are wrong.

The small business tax breaks and infrastructure spending make up about $100 billion of the total $791 billion in the bill, but accounts for 2.5 million jobs of the 3.5 million jobs the White House has estimated will be retained or created by H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, to state it another way, $691 billion of the spending may retain or create just one million jobs, most of which will be government bureaucrats that populate the big gray buildings in Washington, DC. That does little or nothing for job creation in my District.

I worry that printing nearly a trillion dollars of new money will result in inflation that will create economic problems over the next several years that will negate any short term gains that might be achieved by this package.

I worry that this additional trillion dollars of new money will create new economic problems by ''crowding out'' private investment dollars that otherwise might be available to stimulate our private sector economy, create new jobs, and grow the economy. Instead, the U.S. government will be sucking up those dollars to pay off its debt. Not to mention the burden this places on our children and grandchildren who will be saddled with the responsibility of paying off that debt.

I am also very frustrated with the non-stimulus liberal policies that found their way into this bill. Two of these policies have earned a lot of attention. First, there is more than $1 billion for ''comparative medical treatment research'' that will be spent by a new panel of non-physicians that reviews the medical treatment decisions of physicians and healthcare professionals. Many feel that this treatment review committee could result in the rationing of treatments of drugs for patients, or even deny medical care to some people, especially seniors. Some have labeled this a form of ''euthanasia.'' While I don't foresee that any time soon, it is very scary.

Another liberal policy that was put in this bill is the reversing of welfare reform, which was the ''Welfare to Work'' program that was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 1996. This legislation will encourage individuals to remain on welfare who would otherwise be given two years to develop skills and training to get a job and move off of the welfare rolls. The roll-back of this program will end up costing the taxpayers more money and reduce a job pool that many employers looked to for entry level hires.

Mr. Speaker, this 1,100 page bill was made available to Members at 10:30 p.m. last night. I suspect the majority of my colleagues, like me, have not had time to read through this bill line for line. We do not know what other policy shenanigans have been tucked into this massive bill.

I am also frustrated that a viable alternative, at least half the cost, was not even considered. The Republican alternative focused on small business owners and manufacturers, tax relief, consumer incentives to purchase new homes and cars and truck, along with infrastructure funding. Economists estimate this alternative would have created over 6 million jobs, twice the jobs at half the cost of the measure before us. But this alternative bill was stiff-armed by the Majority.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of all these worries and frustrations that I am not able to support this package. We could have worked on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that we could all support. But we were not given a chance to do that. This bill was written behind closed doors by a small group of House Democrats. The American people deserve better from us. I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, the ''American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.''

The economic challenges we are confronted with are as serious as any we've faced since the Great Depression. There is no doubt that we are paying the price for eight years of unregulated markets, regressive tax breaks, and a lack of investment in the needs of the American people. Now is the time to act boldly to create jobs, strengthen the frayed safety net, begin to fix our health care system, and make long-overdue investments in education, scientific innovation, and infrastructure that will spur our economy forward in the years to come. This legislation achieves all of these goals.

As Chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, I am most proud of the health provisions in this legislation.

It is no overstatement to say that the development of an interoperable health information technology system in America will revolutionize medicine. H.R. 1 does just that. In addition to increasing efficiency and reducing unnecessary spending in our medical system, electronic health records will enable doctors to have the information they need—at their fingertips—to best treat their patients.

By building financial incentives into Medicare and Medicaid, and developing new grant programs, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill will encourage 90 percent of physicians in America to adopt standardized health IT and that 70 percent of America's hospitals will do the same. They also calculate that the improvements from this legislation will generate more than $12 billion in savings from federal health programs and reduce health insurance premiums in the private sector as well.

H.R. 1 also makes a substantial investment to expand comparative effectiveness research. Right now, patients with the same diagnosis often receive dramatically different treatment. Medicine is an art, but also must be guided by science. By investing in this research, doctors and other health care providers will be able to obtain unbiased information regarding which procedures, pharmaceuticals, devices and other treatments work best for particular conditions. That way, they can choose the right treatment from options that have been independently evaluated.

If you've heard any controversy about this provision, it's because the pharmaceutical and medical device industries are spending millions of dollars to drum up opposition. They don't want doctors or patients to be able to objectively evaluate the value of their products. The smear campaign of disinformation has also been advanced by conservative ideologues in a cynical effort to foment distrust and discord prior to beginning a national conversation on health care reform. In fact, this research is broadly supported by a wide range of groups representing patients, physicians, health care organizations, unions and others.

H.R. 1 also protects the health care coverage for millions of workers who are losing their jobs because of our economic crisis. COBRA health continuation coverage provides a vital bridge for people to maintain their health benefits when they are between jobs. However, an average family COBRA premium is more than $1000 a month—a financial commitment most unemployed workers can't afford on top of their mortgages and other costs of daily living. By providing a 65 percent subsidy for these premiums for up to 9 months, H.R. 1 will help more than seven million people maintain their health coverage while they seek new employment.

When H.R. 1 is signed into law, the 111th Congress and President Obama will have done more to advance health care in America in less than two months, than was done over the entire two terms of the Bush Administration. We will also have set forth a solid road to move into the debate to guarantee that each and every person in America has affordable, quality health care that can't be taken away.

In addition to the vital health care provisions, H.R. 1 includes essential provisions that will stimulate our economy in the short-term and build a foundation for long-term prosperity. By funding ''shovel-ready'' road, rail, water, school, and energy infrastructure projects we will create millions of new jobs, including more than 7,500 in my district. By bolstering safety net programs such as Unemployment Insurance and Food Stamps we are giving assistance to those hardest hit by the downturn. By investing in all levels of education, science, and clean energy we are setting the stage for economic renewal and the innovation that will drive our economy.

As President Obama has said, we will not get out of this economic mess overnight. But we can take the bold action that the current crisis demands and start the process of rebuilding our economy by passing the legislation before us today.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2009, a measure with far-reaching consequences for businesses throughout our nation.

Traditionally, states and localities have levied corporate income, franchise and other taxes only on those businesses that have a physical presence in the taxing jurisdiction. The growth of the Internet and interstate business transactions has made it possible for businesses to conduct transactions without the constraints of geopolitical boundaries. As a result, recently some states have attempted to expand their tax base by assessing business activity taxes against out-of-state companies that have customers but no property or employees in the taxing state. Both large and small companies are facing an increasingly unpredictable tax environment for businesses, which hinders business expansion and threatens the continued development of e-commerce.

The legislation we are introducing today, which I am pleased to champion with my colleague and good friend Mr. GOODLATTE—as well as Mr. ARTUR DAVIS, Ms. BACHMANN, Ms. HERSETH-SANDLIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PENCE and Mr. JOE WILSON—will bring certainty to today's increasingly chaotic tax environment for businesses by clarifying that the states cannot

attempt to tax the income of a company that has no physical presence within the taxing state's borders.

Our legislation sets forth clear, specific standards to govern when businesses should be obliged to pay business activity taxes to a state. Generally, a business must use employees or services in a state for more than 15 days in a calendar year before it is liable to pay business activity taxes to that jurisdiction.

The Business Activity Tax Simplification Act also modernizes legislation which Congress enacted 50 years ago that set clear, uniform standards for when states could tax out-of-state businesses for the solicitation of orders for sales. Like the economy of its time, the scope of Public Law 86–272 was limited to income taxes on tangible personal property. Our nation's economy has changed dramatically over the past half-century, and this outdated statute needs to be modernized to apply equally to the sale of intangible property and services, and to other business activity taxes.

I want to emphasize that the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act does not diminish the ability of states and localities to collect tax revenue. Rather, it rationalizes and makes more predictable the process of doing so.

The lack of clarity in current law has led to sometimes absurd results. A collection agent with the New Jersey Department of Taxation stopped a refrigerated truck on the New Jersey turnpike, loaded with product belonging to Smithfield Foods, a company headquartered in my state of Virginia. The agent held the truck and its driver for several hours and demanded that, to release the truck, Smithfield had to wire $150,000 immediately to the New Jersey Department of Taxation. The agent claimed that he had the right to hold the truck and its contents because Smithfield had failed properly to file New Jersey tax returns.

Smithfield informed the New Jersey agent that his claim was unfounded. It explained that Public Law 86–272 protected it from New Jersey income taxation because it only engaged in solicitation in New Jersey and had no physical operations in the state. The agent refused to accept this explanation; however, he finally agreed to release the truck and its driver in return for $8,000.

Smithfield appealed this aggressive and incorrect application of Public Law 86–272 to the New Jersey State tax commissioner. Ultimately, New Jersey accepted Smithfield's contention that it has no physical presence in the state and is not subject to New Jersey income tax. It issued Smithfield a refund and an apology for its roadside justice system, but not before Smithfield had invested much time and expense in resolving a situation which should not have arisen under current law. Our measure will help avoid such scenarios in the future by clarifying the physical presence standard embodied in Public Law 86–272.

New Jersey has used similar tactics against out-of-state companies selling intangible goods to its residents, a situation not covered by 86–272. It has argued that a mom-and-pop South Carolina software company with no physical presence in any states other than South Carolina and Georgia, owes a minimum of $600 per year in corporate income taxes and fees based only on the sale of licensed software to a New Jersey entity, and that the company would owe such tax every year that its software was in use in the state, even for those years in which the company had no income from any customer in New Jersey.

The Louisiana Department of Revenue has threatened to assess business activity taxes on several out-of-state companies based merely on the fact that they broadcast programming into the state, arguing that the companies are exploiting the Louisiana market because the programming is seen or heard by individuals in Louisiana.

Several states attempt to assess business activity taxes on out-of-state credit card companies based on the fact that their customers reside in the taxing jurisdiction and on arguments that the credit card company has engaged in the "substantial privilege of carrying on business" in the state.

The Business Activity Tax Simplification Act offers Members the opportunity to put an end to nonsensical situations like these. In doing so, we will provide certainty to both U.S. businesses and to states, thereby fostering economic growth and development. I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and the original cosponsors of the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act for their support, and I urge each of my colleagues to assist us in enacting this much needed bipartisan legislation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

American families, increasingly out of work and burdened by debt, are spending less, and businesses have drastically reduced their spending as a result.

That leaves only the federal government as the spender of last resort.

This bill is not perfect: it is not nearly large enough to replace the losses in Gross Domestic Product that characterize the current recession. But it lays a foundation of targeted government spending that will create millions of jobs.

It will also strengthen the social safety net so that families who have been hit hard by the economic downturn have the basic levels of resources they need.

The bill also addresses a component crisis of this recession: the spillover effects of large concentrations of foreclosed vacant and abandoned houses on our communities. Neighborhoods are the innocent bystanders in the foreclosure crisis.

As foreclosures and the vacant houses they can create continue at a record pace, the bill provides an additional $2 billion to help our neighborhoods prevent the increased crime and deflated property values that come along with abandoned foreclosed properties.

It will also create jobs, and those jobs will be located in some of the hardest hit areas of the country. Fortunately, those funds are there, after being taken out by the Senate. I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI and conferees for including $2 billion for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are being asked to say to vote for a so-called stimulus package. This comes after having only 10 hours in the dark of night to read the final language of the 1,000 page report, which itemizes how we are to spend nearly a trillion taxpayer dollars.

Our economy is struggling right now and Kansans are well aware of that fact. Yet, by overwhelming majorities, they are asking me to vote against this package today. Kansans are pleading with Congress to look beyond just tomorrow and look toward what is best for long-term economic recovery. Even the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office predicted that over the next decade, the extra debt created by this bill will "crowd out" private investment and lead to lower GDP. We are about to pass what will be the largest burden that one generation has ever passed on to another. And the non-partisan CBO says it won't even work! This hampers our economy in the long run and burdens our children with even more debt.

My constituents in Kansas are asking for real economic relief, not funding for pet-projects. While the majority continues to claim that this bill contains no earmarks, it still has billions in it to fund "green" golf carts, mouse habitats, and other such projects the majority evidently believes is a good use of Kansans' hard-earned tax dollars.

The conference committee, behind closed doors, decided $8 billion for a high-speed railway between Las Vegas and Los Angeles will better stimulate the economy than an additional $200 in the pockets of hard-working families all across our nation. My constituents are the folks who know best how to spend a dollar and stimulate the economy, not a distant federal bureaucracy in Washington.

A real stimulus needs to have a balance of tax relief and targeted investment. The majority is exploiting the current economic downturn to jam through a bill full of irresponsible spending and government expansion.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this non-stimulus package because it is selfish and irresponsible.

It is selfish—because it will burden future generations for years to come with unbelievable debt; trillions of dollars stolen from our children and grandchildren.

It is irresponsible—because it won't work! It will not stimulate the economy. It will not create jobs. It has been shown to be misguided by over 300 prominent economists, including three Nobel Prize winners.

In addition, the process has been an affront to all Americans. Less than 15 hours to read a bill over 1000 pages in length. Less than 2 hours of debate on the floor of the House on the most expensive spending bill in the history of mankind!

This is simply wrong.

Attached are three articles from papers today revealing the folly of this process and product.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 2009]

DESPITE PLEDGES, PACKAGE HAS SOME PORK

(By Dan Eggen and Ellen Nakashima)

The compromise stimulus bill adopted by House and Senate negotiators this week is not free of spending that benefits specific communities, industries or groups, despite vows by President Obama that the legislation would be kept clear of pet projects, according to lawmakers, legislative aides and anti-tax groups.

The deal provides $8 billion for high-speed rail projects, for example, including money that could benefit a controversial proposal for a magnetic-levitation rail line between Disneyland, in California, and Las Vegas, a project favored by Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D–Nev.). The 311–mph train could make the trip from Sin City to Tomorrowland in less than two hours, according to backers.

A new alliance of battery companies won $2 billion in grants and loans in the stimulus package to jump-start the domestic lithium

ion industry. Filipino veterans, most of whom do not live in the United States, will get $200 million in long-awaited compensation for service in World War II.

The nation's small shipyards also made out well, with $100 million in grant money—a tenfold increase in funding from last year, when the federal Maritime Administration launched the program to benefit yards in places such as Ketchikan, Alaska, and Bayou La Bate, Ala.

None of the items in the sprawling $789 billion package are traditional earmarks—funding for a project inserted by a lawmaker bypassing the normal budgeting process—according to the White House and Democratic leaders. Republicans also killed or reduced a number of projects they considered objectionable, such as $200 million to re-sod the Mall in Washington and money for a new Coast Guard polar icebreaker.

But many Republicans, anti-tax advocates and other critics argue that the final version of the bill is still larded with wasteful spending and dubious initiatives that will do little to create jobs or spur financial markets. The legislation's sheer size and complexity set off a lobbying spectacle over the past few weeks, as diverse interests including pharmaceutical companies, cement firms and manufacturers of energy-saving light bulbs converged on Washington to elbow for their share.

''You have a moving vehicle, and people are trying to pile on and influence it in any way they can,'' said David Merritt, a health policy adviser to the presidential campaign of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) who is now a project director with Newt Gingrich's Center for Health Transformation.

Stimulus advocates say the GOP complaints are overheated and generally focus on projects that Republicans dislike for ideological reasons. Chad Stone, chief economist at the liberal-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, defended the bill. ''The overwhelming bulk of what is in the package is effective and well-designed stimulus,'' he said.

Money for high-speed rail ballooned during the stimulus debate, from nothing in the House bill to $2 billion in the Senate version and finally $8 billion in the conference report, which was put together by Reid and other Democratic leaders.

Reid spokesman Jon Summers said in a statement that the transportation secretary ''will have complete flexibility as to which program he uses to allocate the funds,'' but he acknowledged that ''the proposed Los Angeles-Las Vegas rail project would be eligible.'' Summers said the rail funding ''was a major priority for President Obama, and Sen. Reid as a conferee supported it.''

One of the biggest targets of GOP complaints was a measure in the Senate version of the bill that did not name a recipient but would have provided $2 billion for ''one or more near zero emissions power plant(s).'' Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.) and other Republicans say the provision was clearly directed at reviving the FutureGen Alliance project, a proposed ''clean coal'' plant in Illinois.

Coburn called the item the ''largest earmark in American history,'' but in the end he was able to claim only a partial victory, as the conference bill still contains $1 billion that could be spent on FutureGen.

Another $800 million is set aside for other carbon-capture projects, and a clause allows the money to go to projects that use petroleum coke instead of coal. That would probably benefit a company called Hydrogen Energy, which is jointly owned by British Petroleum and the multinational mining company Rio Tinto and has plans to build a power plant in California.

A provision introduced by freshman Rep. Larry Kissell (D–N.C.), a former textile industry employee, will require the Transportation Security Administration to purchase uniforms manufactured in the United States; most TSA clothing is currently assembled in Mexico and Honduras from U.S.-made fabric. The cost of the requirement is unclear—the agency spends about $3 million on 12,000 new uniforms each year—but labor and trade groups argue that it will create 21,000 U.S. jobs.

''We view this as a very inexpensive way to create jobs and also stabilize jobs in place,'' said Lloyd Wood of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

[From Indystar, Feb. 13, 2009]

ANALYSIS: STIMULUS WON'T JUMP-START ECONOMY

(By Jeannine Aversa)

WASHINGTON.—No, the big stimulus plan won't ''save or create 3.5 million jobs,'' as the president and congressional Democrats claim—at least not this year.

The economy will remain feeble through 2009, analysts warn, and businesses will keep shedding jobs, though not as many as they would have without the $789 billion boost.

The stimulus agreement, heading for final votes in the next day or so, goes to the heart of President Barack Obama's strategy to revive the economy and will go far in shaping how Americans view his economic leadership.

What it won't do is quickly snap the country out of the painful recession, now in its second year.

It should provide some relief, economists say, though some argue it won't plow enough money into the economy to prop it up.

Tax cuts will spur at least some spending by consumers and businesses, and that should help save or create jobs. Aid flowing to cash-squeezed states will prevent some layoffs.

And money for big public works projects, such as bridge and road repairs, and longer-term ventures, such as networks for more high-speed Internet connections, eventually will generate jobs and stir economic activity.

But even with the stimulus, many economists predict a net loss of 2 million, 3 million or even more jobs this year. The recession already had cost 3.6 million jobs through January. The unemployment rate, now at 7.6 percent, the highest in more than 16 years, will probably hit at least 9 percent by next year.

''The stimulus package is not going to turn the economy around right now,'' said William Gale, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution.

''The best-case scenario is that it mitigates the depth and the severity of the downturn. That's not a bad thing. It's just not the magic bullet that fixes everything.''

Some analysts say the job market won't return to normal health—with unemployment hovering around 5 percent—until as late as 2013.

And the broader economy? No sudden revival there either.

The economy is expected to slide backward for all of 2009—a decline in gross domestic product of more than 1 percent. That may not sound like much, but it would be the first yearly decline since 1991.

''Congress put the minimum charge into the stimulus battery,'' said Brian Bethune, economist at IHS Global Insight. ''We're taking this big chance, turning the key and praying there is enough juice to turn over the economy. We should have juiced it up so much that we are guaranteed that this engine will start'' through a bigger package of tax reductions.

This recession has proved especially stubborn and dangerous. The root causes—housing, credit and financial crises—are the worst since the 1930s and don't lend themselves to quick fixes.

The package includes Obama's signature ''Making Work Pay'' tax credit for 95 percent of workers. But negotiators scaled it back from Obama's campaign promise: to $400 a year for individuals, instead of his $500, and $800 for couples, down from his $1,000.

That equals around an extra $13 a week in most paychecks, and it should show up very quickly after Obama signs the bill. The hope is Americans will then feel more inclined to go out and buy, which would help bolster the economy.

But will recession-shocked consumers, spooked by vanishing jobs, shattered nest eggs, tanking home values and surging foreclosures, actually spend money?

''Chances are people are going to save much or most of the tax cuts because of the climate of uncertainty and doom and gloom,'' Gale said.

Given the severity of the problems, economists said, the bigger the economic revival package the better. Some said it needed to be $1 trillion to make a noticeable difference this year.

Others argued that the package should have been front-loaded with a lot more money—at least $500 billion—in tax cuts, which tend to act more quickly to boost economic activity.

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Economy.com, estimates the bill will create just more than 2 million jobs by the end of 2010. The problem is, the recession will probably wipe out many more jobs than that. Zandi's prediction: 6.5 million jobs will disappear.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 13, 2009]

CBO PREDICTS LOWER GDP IN A DECADE

(Stephen Dinan and S.A. Miller)

The Congressional Budget Office says President Obama's giant economic recovery bill will actually hurt Americans' paychecks in the long run, even if the plan's tax cuts start out putting an extra $13 a week in most worker's pockets.

Building on a report issued last week, the Congressional Budget Office, Congress's official scorekeeper, said the flood of spending will boost the economy in the short term and will create new jobs. But over 10 years, extra debt will ''crowd out'' private investment, leading to a lower gross domestic product, which would hurt workers' wages.

''The reduction in GDP is therefore estimated to be reflected in lower wages rather than lower employment, as workers will be less productive because the capital stock is smaller,'' CBO said in a report issued Wednesday night, although it did not say how much damage would be done.

But for now, Alyson Jacobson, 42, said she'll take the $13. She said she'd spur the economy buying haircuts for her four young children when the tax cut kicks in this spring.

''I'll have to save up for two weeks,'' the social worker in Bowie said of the anticipated spending spree. ''It could go into more fruits because fruits are getting so expensive.''

Her husband's pay is expected to get a $13 boost, and the couple could pocket expanded child tax credits under the bill that leaders of the Democrat-led Congress scrambled to finalize Thursday.

The child tax credit will put about $1,000 more in tax credits in the pockets of qualifying families with at least three children. The bill would expand the 15 percent credit to every dollar earned over $3,000 from the current $10,000 threshold.

As for the economy as a whole, CBO said in the short term, it will be better off with

spending; but over 10 years, the economy would at best break even and could actually be two-tenths of a percent lower than if Congress did not act.

Republicans, who have fought Mr. Obama's stimulus plan, said numbers confirm their fears.

''This is what happens when one party negotiates behind closed doors—you end up with bad legislation,'' said Rep. Dave Camp of Michigan, the top Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, which writes tax laws. ''What the Democrats are asking the American people to do is buy a $1.1 trillion-dollar plane that barely gets off the ground before crashing. The ones left inside that wreckage will be the American worker and taxpayer.''

Drew Hammill, spokesman for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, blamed the bulk of the debt problems on former President George W. Bush and said they know they'll need to take more action to produce good-paying jobs.

''We know the deficits created by the previous administration are going to continue to have an impact on the economy,'' Mr. Hammill said. ''We know that we can't afford not to act with the legislation that has been finalized, and we know there's going to have to be other pieces of legislation to address other economic concerns.''

The CBO report said the new spending would create or save between 800,000 and 2.3 million jobs in 2009 and by 2010 would account for between 1.2 million and 3.6 million jobs.

The White House did not comment on the report. Mr. Obama has predicted that his plan could create or save up to 4 million jobs.

The extra $13 a week will show up in pay this spring when the withholding formula is adjusted. Starting next year, the credit will add about $7.70 per week to individual paychecks.

''It's almost pocket change,'' said Cindy Hockenberry, an accountant and research coordinator with the National Association of Tax Professionals. ''To be quite honest, amounts that small I don't think [taxpayers] are going to feel it.''

The tax relief, including business tax breaks, adds up to $275 billion, or about a third of the $789 billion package. The rest of the money—$515 billion—is spending.

The Jacobsons also could be among the 23 million middle-class families to benefit from a suspension of the alternative minimum tax (AMT), which would otherwise wallop families making as little as $50,000 a year with a 26 percent or 28 percent income tax rate.

The AMT was adopted in 1969 to make tax-sheltered wealthy Americans pay at least some income taxes. But it was not indexed for inflation and, over time, hit middle-income taxpayers if not forestalled by temporary ''patches'' passed annually by Congress. This year's patch was included in the stimulus.

The tax cut—which is supposed to help 95 percent of Americans, including low-income workers who do not earn enough to pay income taxes—would give single workers up to $400 a year and families up to $800.

The tax credit phases out completely for workers earning more than $100,000 a year and couple earning more than $200,000.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, at about 10:00 p.m. last nite, the text of the $792-billion so-called ''stimulus'' package was finally made available to Republicans. At 11:00 p.m., this 1073-page package was finally posted online for the public to see it. And, votes are expected by 2:00 p.m. today.

Are Republican legislators really supposed to digest and comprehend the single most transformational piece of legislation that has come through Congress in 16 hours? We do a great disservice to the American people today by rushing this package through.

But, the level of disrespect we show the taxpayers today by this perversion of process is far exceeded by the level of disrespect we show the taxpayer by the substance of this package. As the Los Angeles Times stated in an editorial today, this bill ''serves as a case study for the timeworn notion that haste makes waste.''

Whether by design (The Washington Post did report that ''House Speaker Nancy Pelosi . . . called the legislation 'historic and transformational' for its investments in Democratic social priorities.'') or as a byproduct of the political wrangling to get the bill to the floor, this bill is chock-full of the pet projects and political priorities that lobbyists and lawmakers insisted upon.

But, the bill is supposed to have a single purpose: to stimulate the economy. Congress' one and only criterion for any project or program should have been its ability to help grow the economy and help create jobs. Again, the Los Angeles Times noted that scattered throughout the bill ''are proposals that advance a political agenda more than an economic one.''

Targeted investment in transportation construction is proven to grow the economy and create jobs. The U.S. Department of Transportation reported last year that every $1 billion in federal highway investment, when combined with the required state matching funds, supports 34,779 American jobs. Of that, only about 12,000 are actual construction jobs. The rest are in supplier industries or related economic sectors. That's why Republicans in the House had moved to reprioritize spending in the House bill and triple investments in transportation construction—a motion the majority flatly rejected.

There is a substantial and tangible ripple effect to these investments. Yet, it gets lip service in this bill: $27.5 billion of the $792 billion bill (a mere 3.4% of the total bill) is invested in this proven stimulator.

Tax relief is similarly stimulative. The Republican alternative that was rejected by the majority would have created twice the jobs at half the cost. It would have done so by putting money back into the pockets of those who would use it to create jobs and to keep money cycling through the economy.

Amongst other things, this alternative, which I did support would have:

Reduced the lowest individual tax rates from 15% to 10% and from 10% to 5%. In Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, 272,306 filers would benefit from the reduction in the 10% bracket alone and 228,926 filers would also benefit from the other rate reduction.

Allowed small businesses to take a tax deduction equal to 20% of their income. Nearly half a million Minnesota small businesses—each employing 500 or fewer employees—would benefit from this.

And, provided a home-buyers credit of $7500 for those who can make a minimum down-payment of 5%.

What's more, Mr. Speaker, this package sets upon the shoulders of generations of Americans a debt that I don't think we can even comprehend. With this so-called stimulus, we raise the government's commitment to addressing this economic downturn over the past year to $9.7 trillion. From the first set of rebate checks passed last February to the bill before us now, $9.7 trillion has been spent or pledged to addressing this recession.

And, all reports indicate that there is more to come. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner talked about another $2 trillion for financial service sector bailouts just this week. President Obama's economic advisor, Larry Summers, has talked about additional stimulus and financial service bailouts that will be needed in the months to come. President Obama noted that this is just a leg in a stool when he came before the Republican Conference only a couple of weeks ago.

That's just for what's actually in the bill. A long history of expanding federal budgets has made it clear to the American people that no increase in spending is ever temporary. As the Los Angeles Times noted the $191 billion in increased benefit spending in this package ''expand programs that may be hard to trim after the crisis passes. . . . What's worse, there are no accountability measures attached to those funds. . . .''

An analysis by staff at the House Budget Committee looked at what happens if Congress continues to fund just 19 of the most politically popular programs at their new stimulus levels—programs like Pell Grants, Head Start, food stamps. Over the ten-year period ending in 2019, ''these 19 programs alone would increase federal outlays and tax entitlements by $1.59 trillion.'' (Wall Street Journal, February 12, 2009)

Even before we add in the financial service sector bailout and this ''stimulus'' bill, the American people were looking at the largest budget deficit in modern history for 2009—8.3% of the economy. According to an analysis by the Strategas Group, if you add in this bill and the bailout, ''the deficit could hit nearly $2 trillion, or 13.5% of the U.S. economy.'' The Wall Street Journal rightly calls this ''uncharted territory'' and reminds us that the consequences could mean ''new federal debt in the trillions of dollars over the next few years, which could test the limits America's creditworthiness,'' and could mean that ''the U.S. will become less desirable as a destination for the world's capital.''

With this bill today, Congress isn't helping America to dig itself out of the recessionary hole, we're merely digging it deeper. I cannot support this new direction for the American economy, Mr. Speaker. I stand today on the side of the American taxpayer and will vote to oppose this bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following letters relate to a matter of jurisdiction with respect to a provision included in the conference agreement to H.R. 1

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2009.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RANGEL: I write regarding the section entitled ''Grants for Specified Energy Property in Lieu of Tax Credits'' in H.R. 1. Although originally passed by the House of Representatives as a program administered by the Department of Energy, under the conference agreement on this bill, this program will reside at the Department of the Treasury.

I am pleased that the consultation process between our Committees has resulted in an

understanding that this grant program will be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce despite its administration through the Department of the Treasury.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to this program. I would also ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the conference report on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2009.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WAXMAN: I write in response to your letter regarding the section entitled ''Grants for Specified Energy Property in Lieu of Tax Credits'' in H.R. 1. Although originally passed by the House of Representatives as a program administered by the Department of Energy, under the conference agreement on this bill, this program will reside at the Department of the Treasury.

I am pleased to confirm that the consultation process between our Committees has resulted in an understanding that this grant program will be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce despite its administration through the Department of the Treasury.

I will submit a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter for inclusion in the Congressional Record during consideration of the conference report on the House floor.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, the economy is in crisis—my constituents in Southeastern Pennsylvania and I see it every day.

Our families are struggling with lost income and lost health insurance—even as the demands on household budgets grow.

Our businesses are struggling with lost consumers, increased costs, and difficulties in accessing capital.

Our state, cities and towns are struggling with shrinking revenues in the face of increased demand for services, aging infrastructure and other obligations.

Today we will take the action essential to provide relief, create jobs, and lay the groundwork for future economic growth.

We will: cut taxes for 95% of American workers; reduce the cost of COBRA health coverage for the unemployed; improve access to capital and stimulate growth; repair infrastructure; invest in new energy sources and energy efficiencies; and drive the innovation that will keep America competitive in the global market place.

I am particularly proud of the major new investment in health information technology that will lead to near universal use of electronic medical records within 10 years—improving the quality and coordination of care, saving lives, and saving costs for patients, employers, and taxpayers.

This recovery package is a smart, timely investment to meet today's challenges and fulfill America's promise.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my Chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Chairman OBEY for elevating the importance of Obey infrastructure investment towards the economic recovery of our Nation.

I strongly support the Conference Report to H.R. 1, particularly the infrastructure components, which direct desperately needed funds into our Nation's roads, bridges, transit systems, airports, and water-related infrastructure.

Each $1 billion of Federal funds invested in infrastructure creates or sustains approximately thirty-four thousand jobs and $6.2 billion in economic activity.

The $64 billion dollars for infrastructure investments outlined in the bill will provide a real, tangible benefit to the seven hundred thousand individuals currently unemployed in my state—whether as a paycheck for those responsible for constructing these vital projects, or through increased productivity for small businesses that produce the materials needed for infrastructure projects.

However, unlike other economic recovery proposals, infrastructure investment provides not only a short-term benefit to American families, it also provides a long-term benefit in terms of sustainable and reliable infrastructure, as well as the potential for increased productivity for the Nation's economy through the efficient movement of goods and services.

Finally, infrastructure investment provides one of the only benefits that cannot be shipped off to foreign lands. The direct beneficiaries of domestic infrastructure projects are our towns, our local communities, our constituents.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the American economy is in dire straits and our constituents are looking to us to act. This is a moment when we should be coming together, putting party differences aside, and crafting responsible legislation that will both solve the problem and unite the country. I do not believe H.R. 1 is this legislation.

I am also disappointed that this conference was so small—with only five Members from the House—that it could have been conducted around the dining room table of my house in Cape Girardeau. It was so brief that it could have been over before I had the chance to make coffee for everyone.

Despite the promises of bipartisanship made at the outset, this legislation has been constructed and finished behind closed doors. The motion to instruct conferees we passed here unanimously gave members of this House 48 hours to review the bill before we vote. We got 14.

The American economy is hurting, families in my district in Southern Missouri are hurting, and we are applying a code of priorities here that doesn't fit the crisis we're facing. These funds should go to the people and places with the greatest potential to create jobs and improve the economy. This bill deviates from that mission while better solutions have been largely ignored.

Regarding the contents of the Financial Services portion of the conference report, I am pleased it reduces funding below both the House and Senate levels. However, $6.9 billion for the Financial Services Subcommittee is still too much.

GSA will get $5.5 billion to build and renovate new Federal buildings and ports of entry. However, in fiscal year 2008, GSA received a total appropriation of only $1.4 billion for construction and renovations. This is a huge windfall for an agency that, in my opinion, already has a hard time managing its regular budget.

The Accountability and Transparency Board created by this bill was provided $14 million in the House bill, and $7 million in the Senate bill. The funding for the Board in this conference report mysteriously increases to $84 million. Even though this is called a ''transparency'' board, as the Ranking Member, I do not know how or why the funding increases by 600 percent over the House bill. Maybe these funds are needed, but no one on my side of the aisle knows who asked for this funding or how it will be spent.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and I congratulate President Obama, our leadership, all of the committee chairs, and the staffs for crafting this legislation under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, this country is facing the worst recession in its history. Economists across the globe have confirmed this fact stating ''the U.S. recession will be the longest and will worsen without heavy government spending.'' Just last month nearly 600,000 jobs were lost which is the deepest cut in payrolls in 34 years and the jobless rate of 7.6 percent is at its highest level in more than 16 years. Moreover of the top 20 monthly job losses in the history of this country 5 have happened in the last seven months.

Mr. Speaker as a student of history, I have tried to find a moment when our country faced such economic and political uncertainty. And as fate would have it, that moment was yesterday, as we marked the 200 year anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln's birthday and the 100 year anniversary of the NAACP.

As President Lincoln focused his efforts on keeping the Union whole, a great economic and social question loomed. What should the country do with its slaves? President Lincoln felt so strongly about maintaining the Union that he emancipated the slaves but the question of their economic and social well-being remained largely unaddressed.

It took a civil rights movement, Mr. Speaker, led by organizations like the NAACP to highlight the deplorable and inequitable economic conditions freed blacks faced. These conditions lay bare for the world to see in areas like: education, employment, housing, nutrition, and health. And it is these issues, Mr. Speaker, which are addressed in this bill.

For history has taught us that, you cannot pull a country out of recession or move a country forward unless you address these inequities. So while many of my colleagues will talk about all the new technologies and great ideas in this bill, I prefer to focus on the check Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke about in 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial. Where he stated the following:

> In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
>
> It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America

has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked insufficient funds. But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check—a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quick sands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

Mr. Speaker, we have to act now, so that the families in Sumter, South Carolina will have clean water, so that children at J.V. Martin Junior High School in Dillon, South Carolina will no longer have to learn in a 150 year old school, so that a mother in Charleston, South Carolina will not be homeless, so that kids in Columbia, South Carolina will have a summer job, so that a teacher in Anderson Primary School in Williamsburg, South Carolina will not lose their job, and so that family in Florence, South Carolina looking for a way out of this economic recession will not suffer under a Governor's political ideology.

Mr. Speaker, America works when all of America is working and today we are ensuring that this promise of work in America will not be marked ''insufficient funds.''

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. While this legislation is not perfect, it marks a strong response to the economic challenges faced by Oregon's hard-working families and it deserves support. In particular, I would like to highlight several elements of the legislation that are important to Oregonians and to the nation.

This legislation will create 3.5 million jobs and will give 95 percent of American workers an immediate tax cut. The bill also offers significant tax relief to homebuyers, manufacturers, and small businesses.

The legislation provides a significant extension of unemployment benefits, provides aid to Oregon to modernize our unemployment system and expand its coverage, and helps unemployed workers maintain their healthcare coverage.

This legislation puts a down payment on a much-needed investment in roads, bridges, mass transit, energy efficient buildings, flood control, clean water projects, and other infrastructure projects. These efforts will begin rebuilding and renewing America.

The legislation invests in health information technology to modernize our health care system and improve health outcomes. This investment will put people to work and will create a more efficient, effective health care system with fewer deaths, fewer complications, and lower health care costs.

The economic recovery package also represents a leap forward for the nation's clean energy economy. It includes about $37.5 billion in funding for energy programs, almost double the Energy Department's typical entire annual budget, and more than 10 times the amount normally spent on conservation and renewable energy. It also includes about $20 billion in tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable programs, which I helped design as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Oregon is known for the progress that we have made developing a new energy future and for the innovative ways that we approach healthcare, sustainability, and transportation. This legislation will buttress those endeavors, while creating jobs and easing the economic impacts on those already hard hit. So, while I retain concerns about elements of the legislation, I feel strongly that we must seize this opportunity to rescue our economy and transform it to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees restored some of the state stabilization dollars previously approved by the House to help soften the financial crunch on local governments and schools. Having just come from the local government ranks—representing Fairfax County, Virginia, which if it were a city would be the nation's 13th largest city with the nation's 12th largest school system—I can tell you our local governments are hemorrhaging in the current economic crisis and are facing steep reductions in staff and services. You see, our state and local government partners do not have the luxury of printing money or enacting continuing resolutions. By statute they must balance their budgets annually.

While the final number for local and state aid is not as much as we wanted—and significantly less than what is needed—this investment is nonetheless critical to ensuring that our state and local partners are in a position to quickly advance on the investments and initiatives as the dollars begin to flow from this stimulus package. The aid we provide will help prevent layoffs for the very workers who will be carrying out the mission of this historic recovery package.

With respect to education, I and many of my colleagues, continue to be disappointed that the House's original proposal for school construction was not maintained. Some argued that school construction is not a federal responsibility when, in fact, the federal government has supported school renovation and construction in the past expressly for the purpose of creating jobs. During the Great Depression, the Works Progress Administration created hundreds of thousands of new jobs through the construction of 4,383 new schools and the renovation of thousands more in response to the greatest economic crisis of the 20th Century. Thankfully, some flexibility remains within the bill to allow school districts a means to address their growing capital needs and create new jobs.

Current data indicate our economy may contract by as much as $2 trillion during this global crisis. With our action today, the Congress is investing $789 billion to provide some cushion for workers, families and employers. We must do something. We must act. This bill is not the perfect solution, but, in the worst economic meltdown in 80 years, it is about stimulating economic activity, restoring credit flow to consumers and small businesses, financing critical investments that will have continuing returns for generations to come, and restoring the confidence of consumers and investors in our economy.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 168, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. In its current form, yes, I do oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Miller of Michigan moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to—

(1) accept section 1008 of subtitle A of division B of the Senate amendment (relating to above-the-line deduction for interest on indebtedness with respect to the purchases of certain motor vehicles), and

(2) accept section 1009 of subtitle A of division B of the Senate amendment (relating to above-the-line deduction for State sales tax and excise tax on the purchase of certain motor vehicles).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the conference report; and suspending the rules with regard to House Resolution 139, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 244, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—186

Aderholt	Broun (GA)	Cuellar
Akin	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Alexander	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Davis (KY)
Arcuri	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Austria	Burton (IN)	Dent
Bachmann	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrett (SC)	Camp	Dreier
Barrow	Cantor	Duncan
Bartlett	Cao	Ehlers
Barton (TX)	Capito	Emerson
Biggert	Carney	Fallin
Bilbray	Carter	Fleming
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Castle	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Foxx
Blunt	Chandler	Franks (AZ)
Boehner	Childers	Frelinghuysen
Bonner	Coble	Gallegly
Bono Mack	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Boozman	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Conaway	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bright		Granger

Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—244

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

NOT VOTING—3

Campbell
Clyburn
Lee (NY)

□ 1415

Messrs. SERRANO, ADLER of New Jersey, LARSEN of Washington, Ms. WATSON, Messrs. HINCHEY, PASCRELL, CARDOZA, RUSH, and ELLSWORTH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. McKEON, SOUDER, CARNEY, MORAN of Kansas, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 183, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—246

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

NAYS—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Simpson	Tiberi
Royce	Smith (NE)	Turner
Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Scalise	Smith (TX)	Walden
Schmidt	Souder	Wamp
Schock	Stearns	Westmoreland
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Whitfield
Sessions	Taylor	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Terry	Wittman
Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Shuler	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Shuster	Tiahrt	Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—3

Campbell	Clyburn	Lee (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1424

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS AND GRATITUDE TO THE RESCUE WORKERS OF CONTINENTAL CONNECTION FLIGHT 3407

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I am certain that everyone knows by now approximately 50 people lost their lives in a tragic plane crash last night in western New York. This crash occurred in the hometown of our colleague, CHRIS LEE, who has left Washington to assist in efforts ongoing in western New York.

I know that the whole House joins Mr. LEE, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MASSA, and me in offering our deepest condolences to the loved ones of those killed in this tragic event and in offering tremendous gratitude to the firefighters, emergency personnel, and other first responders who bravely worked through the night and are still working today to deal with this accident.

I would now yield to my western New York colleague, Mrs. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I appreciate very much your yielding to me.

We have suffered a terrible blow in western New York. I got home last night about midnight to turn on the television to see the suffering of my people, and my heart breaks for Upstate New York. Our worst fears were confirmed when we learned that no one survived that crash, and that one person on the ground was lost. They were less than 5 minutes away from the runway at the airport that might have saved their lives.

It is always a tragedy; and just this week we stood with our colleague Mr. COLE to worry and concern with him for the loss that he had in his district due to the tornado. We appreciate that in western New York we take care of each other, and in the House of Representatives we care very much for each other as well.

The first responders and all the citizens of western New York who rushed to help and all the officials of New York and Washington and the local officials have our thanks and our good wishes. We will do everything that we can to try to ease the pain and to ease the suffering, and hope to God that this does not happen to us again.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I ask the House observe a moment of silence for the families and the victims of this tragic event.

□ 1430

RECOGNIZING DALE OAK

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time that Dale Oak will be on this floor serving us as a member of the staff of the Appropriations Committee. He has been serving as the chief clerk for the Financial Services Subcommittee. He has served the Appropriations Committee in this House for 14 years, working for both the Republicans and Democrats, as has often been the tradition on the Appropriations Committee. He is leaving, and I simply want to thank him for the service he has given to the Committee and to the House, and wish him all the best in his new endeavor. He has been an incredibly hard worker, and we are all lucky to have public servants like him helping us.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate our chairman yielding. I, too, want to express our deepest gratitude to Dale Oak and his family for the years and years of work and sacrifice they have put in on our behalf.

As the chairman indicated, Dale has worked on both sides of the aisle in the front office, was very helpful to BILL YOUNG, I know, and to myself, and now to DAVID OBEY.

The people who really deserve our recognition and thanks, however, involve first and foremost Dale's wife, Janet, and their children, Eric and Anna.

Thank you all for your great service. Godspeed.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. With the indulgence of the Members, I know we all want to leave and catch a plane or train, but I have been fortunate during the 2 years that I have been chairman of this committee to have Dale Oak as the committee clerk. And I want to wish him all the best and tell the Members that those individuals who work 24/7 into late at night are people like Dale Oak who make us look good and who serve the American people although their name and their work sometimes is not seen on a daily basis.

And so I thank you, Dale, for your service to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATING ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF HIS BIRTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 139.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 139.

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. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Braley (IA)	Crenshaw
Aderholt	Bright	Crowley
Adler (NJ)	Broun (GA)	Cuellar
Akin	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Alexander	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Altmire	Buchanan	Dahlkemper
Andrews	Burgess	Davis (AL)
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Austria	Butterfield	Davis (IL)
Baca	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Bachus	Camp	DeFazio
Baird	Cantor	DeGette
Baldwin	Cao	Delahunt
Barrett (SC)	Capito	DeLauro
Barrow	Capps	Dent
Bartlett	Capuano	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barton (TX)	Cardoza	Dicks
Bean	Carnahan	Dingell
Becerra	Carney	Donnelly (IN)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Dreier
Berry	Carter	Driehaus
Biggert	Cassidy	Duncan
Bilbray	Castle	Edwards (MD)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Edwards (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Ehlers
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Ellison
Blackburn	Childers	Ellsworth
Blumenauer	Clarke	Emerson
Boccieri	Cleaver	Engel
Boehner	Coble	Eshoo
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Etheridge
Bono Mack	Cohen	Fallin
Boozman	Cole	Farr
Boren	Conaway	Fattah
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Filner
Boucher	Conyers	Flake
Boyd	Cooper	Fleming
Brady (PA)	Costa	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Courtney	Fortenberry

Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Oberstar
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis (CA)
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boustany
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Costello
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doyle
Gohmert
Hinchey
Johnson, E. B.
Lee (NY)
Marchant
Murphy, Tim
Nunes
Obey
Paul
Petri
Ryan (OH)
Shadegg
Smith (TX)
Sullivan
Taylor

□ 1440

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 71, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 71, the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 139—Commemorating the life and legacy of President Abraham Lincoln on the bicentennial of his birth, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

CONGRATULATING THE PITTSBURGH STEELERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 110.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 110.

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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 112.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 112.

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.

YVONNE INGRAM-EPHRAIM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 663.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 663.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2009

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet 10 a.m. on Tuesday, February 17, 2009, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 47, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

TAXPAYER FUNDED GET-OUT-OF-JAIL-FREE CARD

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight one component of the so-called stimulus package that is particularly egregious. There is a pile of money for grants for ''pretrial release and pretrial release agencies'' in the stimulus. This is an unacceptable use of taxpayer dollars. Why? Because this program is a criminal bailout. Expanding the budgets of taxpayer-funded pretrial release programs is fiscally irresponsible when the private surety bail industry can be utilized to a greater degree with no expense to taxpayers.

In fact, this provision not only puts taxpayers on the hook for bailing out criminals, it also would squeeze out private-sector solutions, in effect, killing jobs. So much for job creation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a taxpayer-funded get-out-of-jail-free card that will end up costing our economy jobs. It's no wonder we were given only 12 hours to analyze this 1,000-page bill.

□ 1445

OUR COMMITMENT TO SCIENCE

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, what pleases me most about the economic recovery bill that we just passed is the commitment in this legislation to science. I'm deeply gratified that the bill reflects a profound commitment to renewing our Nation's innovation infrastructure. Research is not merely a luxury to be undertaken only in times of prosperity. The truth is that scientific research is perhaps the most powerful economic engine, creating jobs in the short-term and building our economy for the long-term.

Altogether, the recovery package includes nearly $23 billion to support scientific research and facilities, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, the National Institutes of Health. There is no doubt that these funds will create jobs. Lab technicians will be hired to carry out projects previously that went unfunded. Electricians will be put to work wiring new laboratory experiments, and construction workers will begin refurbishing our neglected laboratories and building the facilities that will transform science for the 21st century.

A TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT JASON E. BURKHOLDER

(Mr. JORDAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Staff Sergeant Jason Burkholder, an American hero and a native son of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District who at the age of 27 made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation on February 8, 2009, in Afghanistan.

Jason graduated from Elida High School in 2000 and joined the United States Marine Corps where he served for 4 years. In December 2004 he enlisted in the Ohio Army National Guard, with whom he served as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He later joined the Illinois National Guard in 2008.

Jason was an athlete, a leader, a trusted colleague and a loyal friend. He brought energy and excitement to the lives of others. He was a good son and a loving husband. It was a great privilege to speak with Jason's wife, Amanda, as well as his parents, Bruce and Diane. I pray that they will know the fullness of God's peace.

I was moved by the outpouring of affection for Jason from his friends in Allen County, Ohio and beyond. He had a dramatic impact on the lives of many people.

A marine and a soldier, he fought to promote freedom. He gave his life in defense of his family, community, State and Nation. He made our world safer. He made his family and every American proud. For this, each and every American owes him and his family a great debt of gratitude.

Jason will be deeply missed, but the strength of his character and the courage he demonstrated through his service will live on.

WHY WE VOTED FOR THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we explain the actions that took place on the floor of the House today.

I'd like to, first of all, indicate that I'm glad to have heard that tribute to a very fine individual's sacrifice for this country. And I want you to know that when we think about economic stimulus, we're not leaving out people, we're putting them in.

I think the American people understand that when we lose 598,000 jobs, we need to do something. And so you can imagine my friends on the other side of the aisle, their criticism represents this little red spot. But there has to be much agreement, because the criticism is very narrow.

How can you criticize $4 billion for our veterans? How can you criticize encouraging businesses to invest through working to ensure businesses, increasing capital flows for business through a 5-year NOL; encouraging hiring of veterans and disconnected youth through the work opportunity tax grant. That's what's happening with the stimulus. Encouraging businesses to invest through a bonus depreciation and small business expensing, that's what's in this bill. We believe in small businesses and minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses. And, yes, we believe that the majority of the American people are for this.

We're going home to take money to our constituency. That's why we voted for the economic stimulus plan.

AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the stimulus bill that was just passed this afternoon, a bill of wasteful spending, a bill that does not directly deal with the economic crisis. Tax cuts for individuals and families have been sacrificed and businesses will not be given the help they need.

But the good news is we're going to buy new cars for government employees, doorbells in Mississippi, and mice protection in San Francisco.

The bill also includes a very scary marker for universal health care, foreshadowing the policy of letting the government decide whether people are too old or too sick to receive treatment.

Americans need a bill that directly affects families and small businesses now. But it won't come. Even liberal economists predict that the unemployment rate will remain around 8 percent over the next couple of years, and that is a near 25-year high. The nonpartisan CBO is predicting that this plan will hurt the economy. The majority of Americans do not agree with this plan. They deserve better and we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that God will help America after Congress has passed such an expensive, expansionary and socialist legislation today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, 111TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the House Rules, I am submitting the Rules of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming as well as our list of Members for the 111th Congress.

RULES FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 111TH CONGRESS

Rule 1. General Provisions. The Rules of the House are the rules of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming (hereinafter ''Committee'') so far as they are applicable.

Rule 2. Time and Place of Meetings.

(a) Regular Meeting Days. The Committee shall meet on the first Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of any pending business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The Chairman may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(b) Additional Meetings. The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) Vice Chairman; Presiding Member. The Chairman may designate a member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chairman of the Committee. The Vice Chairman shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chairman. If the Chairman and Vice Chairman are not present at any meeting or hearing, the most senior present member of the majority party shall preside at the meeting or hearing.

(d) Open Meetings and Hearings. Each meeting and hearing of the Committee for the transaction of business shall be open to the public, including to radio, television and still photography coverage, consistent with

the provisions of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

Rule 3. Agenda. The agenda for each Committee meeting other than a hearing, setting out the date, time, place, and all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of such meeting.

Rule 4. Procedure.

(a) Hearings. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner. In such cases, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Meetings. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting (other than a hearing) scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House is scheduled to be in session shall be announced at least 24 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(c) Motions. Pursuant to clause 1(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, privileged motions to recess from day to day, or recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), shall be decided without debate.

(d)(1) Requirements for Testimony. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman, of a written statement of his or her proposed testimony to provide to members and staff of the Committee, the news media, and the general public. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the Chairman. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of the testimony. The Chairman, or the presiding member, may waive the requirements of this paragraph or any part thereof.

(2) Additional Requirements for Testimony. To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any federal grant (or sub grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(A) Questioning Witnesses. The right to question witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate a witness until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. While the Committee is operating under the 5-minute rule for the interrogation of witnesses, the Chairman shall recognize, in order of appearance, members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee.

(B) Questions for the Record. Subject to the Rules of the House, each member may submit to the Chairman additional questions for the record, to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the clerk of the Committee no later than ten business days following a hearing. The Chairman shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witness and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record.

(C) Opening Statements. (1) All written opening statements at hearings conducted by the Committee shall be made part of the permanent hearing record.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member (or their respective designees) are entitled to deliver a 5 minute opening statement prior to the recognition of the first witness for testimony. Opening statements by other members of the Committee are subject to the discretion of the Chairman.

Rule 5. Waiver of Agenda, Notice, and Opening Statement Requirements. Requirements of rules 3, 4(a)(1), 4(a)(2), and 4(d) may be waived for good cause by the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

Rule 6. Quorum. Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the Committee. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum when otherwise required by the Rules of the House. For the purposes of taking any action other than those specified in the preceding sentences, one third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 7. Journal. The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, show those present at each meeting and hearing, and shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded, a description of the motion, order, or other proposition voted, and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members voting present. A copy of the journal shall be furnished to the Ranking Minority Member and made available to the public in a timely fashion.

Rule 8. Committee Professional and Clerical Staff.

(a) Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X, as well as any written personnel policies the Committee may from time to time adopt. The Chairman shall determine the remuneration of legislative and administrative employees of the Committee.

(b) The Chairman shall appoint, and may remove, the legislative and administrative employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority.

(c) Minority Professional Staff. Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the Ranking Minority Member, and not to the Chairman, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the Ranking Minority Member considers advisable.

(d) Additional Staff Appointments. In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the Chairman shall be entitled to make such appointments to the clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointees shall be assigned to such business of the Committee as the Chairman considers advisable.

Rule 9. Supervision, Duties of Staff.

(a) Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9(b) of Rule X.

(b) Supervision of Majority Staff. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(c) Supervision of Minority Staff. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

Rule 10. Committee Expenditures. Copies of each monthly report (prepared by the Chairman of the Committee on House Administration and showing expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee), anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel, shall be available to each member.

Rule 11. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings. Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the Chairman and may be terminated in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Rule 12. Subpoenas. The Committee may authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the House.

Rule 13. Travel of Members and Staff.

(a) Approval of Travel. Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, the following: (1) the purpose of the travel; (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff. In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in paragraph (a), the prior approval, not only of the Chairman but also of the Ranking Minority Member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the Ranking Minority Member, in writing, setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

Rule 14. Reports.

(a) Committee reports. Any report printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office that purports to express the views, findings, conclusions or recommendations of the Select Committee must be approved, in a meeting, by a majority of the members in attendance of the Select Committee. Members shall have three days from the time of the approval to submit supplemental, minority or additional views, which will be included as part of the printed report.

(b) Other reports. Any report printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office to be published as a Committee print other than a document described in paragraph (a) of this Rule: (A) shall include on its cover the following statement: ''this document has been printed for informational purposes only and does not represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee.''; and (B) shall not be published following sine die adjournment of Congress, unless approved by the Chairman of the Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

THE FUTURE FOR AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shine a light on U.S. foreign policy, specifically our military presence in Afghanistan.

President Obama did not ask for this war. He inherited it, along with Iraq, a destabilized Middle East and a weakened American reputation overseas.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama is doing exactly what he said he would. He has called on his top military and diplomatic leaders to develop a plan for the future of Afghanistan. Already he has reached out to Congress to get our input.

That's why this week Congresswomen BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS and I sent a letter to the President outlining congressional priorities regarding Afghanistan. We applauded the President for his strong leadership on an intelligent foreign policy and national security strategy, particularly his emphasis on diplomacy and international partnerships.

We pledged to work with him and work with his administration to implement a foreign policy that stresses cooperation, conflict resolution and humanitarian assistance.

We expressed our support and pleasure over his commitment to bring our troops home from Iraq in 16 months.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has called Afghanistan the central front in the fight against terrorism. So, in an effort to promote better cooperation in our Nation's diplomatic development and military involvement in Afghanistan, our letter to President Obama outlined policy benchmarks which many of us in Congress support and, by the way, most Americans. These benchmarks include a clear authorization of the use of military force be established. Defined goals and objectives and benefits of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan.

We asked that he determine the human and financial resources necessary to carry out the administration's plan and provide us with a time line for the redeployment of troops and military contractors.

The role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO; the United Nations, the U.N.; and other international partners must also be clearly delineated.

The immediate humanitary and economic needs of Afghan people must also be met, we told him.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as our national policy for Afghanistan is established, Members of Congress and all Americans anticipate an honest and open discussion about the challenges that lie ahead. And with that, we look forward to working with this administration to advance a responsible and a smart strategy through the Middle East and Central Asia, a path to real peace, and a path to economic security worldwide.

KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF MEDICAL TREATMENT DECISIONS

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we just voted on this so-called stimulus bill that wasn't even available for us to see until late last night. It should come as no surprise that in this monumental piece of legislation, there are items in it that could not have survived careful scrutiny in the light of day.

Many of my colleagues have pointed out the wildly extravagant spending and the lack of real job creation and economic recovery in this bill. I fully share those concerns, but I also want to call to attention a little-known provision tucked six pages deep inside this 1,100 page bill. The Democrats are spending $1.1 billion on a new Federal board to conduct health care research. Sounds innocent enough, right?

Unfortunately, this provision is the camel's nose under the tent in the Democrats' quest to have the Federal Government push doctors aside and put Washington in charge of patients' health treatment options. This board, the Federal coordinating Council on Comparative Effectiveness Research, will be comprised of 15 Federal bureaucrats, all appointed by the President. Not a single practicing physician or patient advocate will be allowed to sit on this board.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step of government-run health care. Despite numerous requests from patient groups, this bill does not include a single protection to ensure that this research will not be used by Medicare, Medicaid, VA, DOD or private health insurance to deny access to needed treatments. The goal of this board is to conduct research that will allow the Federal Government to deny needed health care. Physician groups are very concerned that this board and its research will significantly harm the patient/doctor relationship.

Other governments have been using this research to deny medically necessary care for years. The British Government currently uses similar research to restrict treatment using a formula that divides the cost of the treatment by the number of years the patient is likely to live. Treatments for younger patients are more often approved than treatments for diseases that affect the elderly. For example, in 2006, the British Government used comparative effective research to say that elderly patients with macular degeneration had to wait until they went blind in one eye before they could get a new drug to save the other eye. It took almost 3 years of public protest before the board reversed its decision.

Mr. Speaker, Americans expect better and deserve more. Physicians and patients, not faceless Federal bureaucrats, should be in charge of health care decisions.

Republicans will continue to fight to keep this Federal Government out of our American's medicine cabinets. In the very near future I'll be introducing legislation to protect patients from the misuse of comparative effective research and ensure that seniors continue to have access to medically necessary treatments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to join me in this effort.

□ 1500

THE STIMULUS BILL—A LOST OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. There has been a lot of talk in Washington, D.C. over the last few years about the bridge to nowhere in the last highway bill, an anomaly from a lot of good investment that was in that bill.

But what we have with the passage of this bill today are a lot of tax cuts to nowhere. I never met a tax cut that could build a bridge or that could rebuild 160,000 bridges in our National Highway System that need rebuilding. They are crumbling or falling or they are functionally obsolete. I never met a tax cut that could even fill in a pothole. I never met a tax cut that could build a school.

I went to elementary school in a new post-World War II school. It is still there today, serving future generations of kids. That was money borrowed and money well spent. Money borrowed for tax cuts, ephemeral tax cuts—very small tax cuts—for the average family are not going to rebuild our economy, put us on the path to prosperity and put people back to work.

Three Republican Senators insisted on a lot more tax cuts. They hijacked the bill because of the arcane, obsolete and, in fact, discretionary rules of the Senate. It did not need to be that way. Let's just look at a couple of things they cut.

We had an amendment here on the floor of the House to add $3 billion back to transit. That would have provided for thousands of jobs. Twelve thousand buses are obsolete. There are backlogs of orders for buses sitting on the shelf. There are options that are not funded. That would have put American workers to work in building the

buses, and it would have put American workers to work by driving the buses, taking Americans to work and to school. $3 billion was cut from there to make room for tax cuts. There was money cut from highways to go to tax cuts. All of the money to build schools was cut from the bill for tax cuts. The list goes on and on and on. We could have done so much more to rebuild our infrastructure with this bill. We could have done so much more to help our kids get a good education and get safe and new schools and facilities, but they went out the door to tax cuts.

Now, there was one tax cut, actually, that would have helped a business in my district that employs 1,300 people. That tax cut was taken out of the bill. The CEO called me yesterday, saying, ''We'll probably be closing our doors because we're not going to be getting that tax relief.''

Then there is money to help the States with the deficit and with the school budgets—that's great—except it cannot be spent until July. My schools are in crisis now. They're talking about lopping a month off of the school year, and we are being told we cannot spend that money now, that you'll need it for next year. Well, we're in the last 3 months of a 9-month year. That means our cuts are going to be twice as big as they would need to be on an annual basis. We need to have access to that money now, but we won't have access to that money now under this bill.

This bill ultimately is a lost opportunity, and I fear that, when it comes time to do further investments, the borrowing well may have run dry. Who is going to lend us this $800 billion to spend on these sorts of things like tax cuts?

They might lend us money to build a bridge because they know it makes us more productive, and it puts people to work, and it provides returns. They might lend us money for other substantial things. They might lend us money for education, but they're going to lend us money so we can cut taxes.

If they'll lend it to us, we're probably going to borrow it from China or from Japan. We'll think there are not going to be any consequences, and we'll think that maybe we can go back to the well again later when we want to meet real needs and when we want to make real investments. I fear that the well will have run dry. So I voted ''no'' today, and I am proud of that vote.

THE STIMULUS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today we passed the largest spending bill in the history of the United States. When you add the interest and everything into it, it is going to cost over $1 trillion. I don't think the American people really understand how much $1 trillion is, but it is an awful lot of money.

I want to congratulate my Democrat colleagues on getting this passed. I certainly did not vote for this bill. I think it is going to be very detrimental to the future economy of these United States, and I think it is going to hurt our economy instead of creating the jobs that it was intended to create. So I think we made a big mistake today, but the Democrats got their bill passed, and they're going to get it passed in the Senate. It is going to become law, and every American is going to have to live with it.

One of the things that concerns me is not only the $1 trillion we have spent today but that Mr. Geithner, the Secretary of the Treasury, said the other day that we would have to spend another $1 trillion, $2 trillion or maybe even more to help the financial institutions of this country stay afloat. So we're looking at $2-, $3-, $4-, maybe $5 trillion.

If you will look at this chart, Mr. Speaker, it shows the amount of money that is in circulation. You will see it was pretty consistent at around $1 trillion-plus over the last couple of decades. Then just recently, it shot up like a rocket, and that was before all of this spending that we put through the House today or the amount of money that Mr. Geithner is going to spend. So we are looking at a tremendous increase in the amount of money that is going to be in circulation.

Now, one of the things that helps stave off this inflationary problem is that we have people around the world, other countries, that loan us money. For instance, China right now has loaned us $682 billion. That is what we owe them. We owe Japan $577 billion. We owe the United Kingdom $360 billion. We owe Brazil $120 billion to $130 billion.

China said just the other day that they were very concerned about loaning us money because they said that they did not think that the currency in the United States would be stable, so the value of their currency would go down. They were calling Mr. Geithner, Secretary Geithner, to say, ''Hey, we want some stability here because the value of the currency in our country is going to be depreciated because of what you're doing.''

Well, a day later, after it was brought up on this floor, they changed their minds and said, ''Well, the only place to loan this money where we have any kind of security is the United States. We are going to continue to loan money.'' So they are going to loan money to us in the billions and in the trillions of dollars, but the kicker is: How much is the interest going to be that they're going to charge? Because that interest is added to the loan that they are giving us on a month-to-month basis. I believe they kicked that interest rate up, so we are going to see an inflationary trend not only in the money they are loaning to us but in the interest that is going to be accumulating.

I know this is an awful lot for my colleagues to digest and for the people across this country who might be paying attention to digest, but let me just say this, Mr. Speaker: It is going to cause an inflationary trend at some point in the future. I think it is going to be earlier rather than later. When that inflationary trend starts, this chart is going to be minuscule to what we are going to see. We are going to see inflation shoot up at a very rapid rate, which means that the value of the dollar that every American has in their bank or in their home is going to be devalued.

That means, if you buy a car for $30,000, it may cost $60,000 or $90,000. If you buy a loaf of bread, it may cost 2 or 3 times as much or more. That is called hyperinflation. This happened back in the 1970s when we had a very similar situation to what we have today. We had double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment, and they raised the interest rates to 21 percent to stop all of this. That may happen again. If it does, it will put a real hammer on the economy, and it will put more and more and more, thousands and millions of people out of work.

But the problem early on is the inflation that we are going to have to deal with. This is a problem that is very real, and I hope my Democrat colleagues will think ahead and will realize that we have to do something to stifle the growth in government and the spending because we are not going to be able to deal with this inflation as we should, and our kids and our grandkids and the future generations of this country are going to have to pay, not only with inflation, but with higher taxes and with a lower quality of life. That is something we should not have to deal with, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TURKEY'S GENOCIDE HYPOCRISY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. On Saturday, February 7, The Washington Post reported that a Turkish Islamic-oriented human rights group, the Association of Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed Peoples, known as Mazlum-Der, initiated a probe to investigate if war crimes and genocide were committed by Israel during the recent Gaza conflict.

I was startled to read that Mazlum-Der plans to investigate 19 Israelis, including Prime Minister Olmert, President Peres, Foreign Minister Tzipi

Livni, and Defense Minister Ehud Barak, for orchestrating genocide. For a Nation that for 94 years has practiced widespread genocide denial of the killing of 1.5 million Armenians, hypocrisy runs deep today in Ankara.

Last week, I expressed my concerns regarding Turkey's recent rash of anti-Semitism, but this probe is going too far. Israel did not commit genocide, but this has not stopped Ankara's chief prosecutor from launching this war crimes probe.

The probe out of Turkey will investigate Israel's actions in the Gaza conflict to see if they amount to ''genocide, torture and crimes against humanity.'' If the prosecutor finds evidence against the Israeli leaders, under Turkish law, they can be detained if they enter Turkey.

The absurdity of this probe and of the fact that Turkey is issuing that it must be exposed. Israel did not commit genocide. Israel was not attempting to eliminate the Palestinian people. Israel was protecting itself from the hundreds of bombs Hamas has been shooting into its cities.

Mazlum-Der has no ground to stand on, and Turkey has no ground to stand on. Neither this NGO nor the Turkish Government has ever attempted to discuss the truth of the Armenian genocide, nor has Turkey or Mazlum-Der taken action against the present genocide that continues to rage in Darfur.

While Israelis are defending themselves against constant attacks from Hamas, Mazlum-Der insists this is genocide. How can this organization accuse Israel of committing genocide when it has yet to categorize the thousands of killings in Darfur as genocide?

The Turkish people need to step back and question their skewed understanding of genocide. Look in the mirror. Look at your own history. Come to terms with the fact that 1.5 million Armenians died and that, when contemporary genocides, like Darfur, take place, they should be denounced.

Instead of denouncing it, Turkey's relationship with Sudan is strong. Last year, Turkish President Abdullah Gul warmly welcomed Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to Ankara. Yet al-Bashir continues to preside over a genocidal regime responsible for the deaths of 300,000 Sudanese people in the Darfur region of the country.

Today, 2.7 million Darfuris have lost their homes since the conflict and now live in internally displaced persons' camps. While all of this happens, President Gul of Turkey has said that the situation in Darfur adds up to a ''humanitarian tragedy'' caused by economic difficulties.

Now, this watering down of state-sponsored government killing is an affront to the thousands who have perished in Darfur. Yet a Turkish organization is investigating genocide in Israel? What hypocrisy.

President Gul greeted the Sudanese leader with a military guard of honor only bestowed on Turkey's closest allies. While the international community fiercely works to contain al-Bashir's government, Turkey embraces it. Both governments have a long history of genocide denial.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Turkey has had 94 years to recognize the Armenian genocide perpetrated on their soil in 1915. Like the Sudanese Government, the Turkish Government's state-sponsored ethnic cleansing of the Armenians in the early 20th century left 1.5 million Armenians tortured, murdered and displaced. Yet, to this day, the Republic of Turkey continues to deny the slaughter of the Armenians—instead, launching an absurd investigation into Israel.

If Turkey and its NGOs want to take a stand against genocide, they should not be pointing at Israel, nor should Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan be threatening Israel with comments like these:

''Allah will sooner or later punish those who transgress the rights of innocents.''

Well, if Turkey wants to move closer to the West, it should practice some self-reflection on its own history regarding the Armenian genocide and help to end the genocide in Darfur.

□ 1515

DOES CONGRESS KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. You know, the Chamber is empty, the voting is over. But as regards to the stimulus bill that was in front of us today, I had a request from Greg, who lives in Milford in my district, if I could read a part of his letter to me regarding that bill.

''Dear Congressman McCotter, I spoke with you on WJR Friday morning. I couldn't get out everything I wanted to say because of my frustration. I would love to talk before Congress and the Senate. I would like to talk to them about the deplorable, reprehensible, and egregious waste they are considering with our tax dollars. I'm sorry this is long, but I want them to see what I see. And I want to ask them a few questions.

''You see, I just lost my job. The company I worked for is eliminating 700 sales positions nationwide, about 15 will be affected in Michigan.

''I would like to ask the Congress and Senate if they know what it's like to sit at the dinner table and tell your 11-year-old daughter that she can't get a school yearbook because we need the money to buy groceries. Do they know what it's like to see the tears in your wife's eyes when you tell her the conference call you were just on eliminated your position?

''Do they know what it feels like to tell your father-in-law that the daughter I married and promised to provide for that you just lost your job?

''Do they know what it feels like to return the shirts you just bought for work on clearance, because you really needed new shirts, and now you don't even have a job?

''Do they know that when I told my 7-year-old son we just had to make cuts, and he responded, 'Can we still have our donut on Sunday morning before church?' That's all he said he wanted. I had to tell him we'd try our best.

''Do they know we've made sacrifices but you haven't?

''Do they know what it's like to speak with someone who was in tears over losing their job because they think they will lose their house? How about the always upbeat guy who sounded depressed that he could lose his house because he had just lost his job?

''Do they know what it's like to have another coworker lose their job and are worried their spouse's job could be next?

''Do they know how fearful it is to turn your heat down at night to 59 degrees and 65 in the day when your child is asthmatic and it can flare up from the cold?

''Do they know about the guy I just met whose entire company just took a 20-percent pay cut so they wouldn't have to lay off employees?

''Congressman McCotter, why doesn't the Senate have the guts to reject the pork spending portions of this bill and start over? Why don't you get off your ivory tower, pork barrel, earmarked, pet project behinds and do what we need you to do?''

And Greg finished, ''The wasteful spending they are considering is unconscionable to me. What jobs in the U.S. does that create?''

Earlier today we heard the Speaker ask Members of this body to remember the people at home and feel their hand upon theirs as they cast their vote upon this bill. I did not need to feel the hand upon mine. I felt their pain in my heart because I saw it every day in our Michigan neighborhood, our Michigan community.

And the reality was that the bill before us was a trillion-dollar mistake that will harm working families like Greg, deprive them of hope, and damage our already recessed economy.

So before today's vote, I called Greg and I talked to him. He was as set in his position as he was when he wrote me this letter. And Greg thanked me for voting against it. And the fundamental reason was this: I live in Lavonia, Michigan. I live with people who are suffering. And they sent me here to work for them to try to make things better.

And when I go home, after a vote, to my wife and children, I go home to the people who are suffering as well; and I will have to look them in the eye and tell them whether this trillion-dollar bill helped them or not. And with God as my witness, I will at least be able to tell them the truth that it will not.

And I will tell them that we will keep trying until we do right by them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INDIVIDUALS ARE SUFFERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Following up on the very thoughtful remarks of my friend, Mr. MCCOTTER, I'd like to say that we all have instance after instance of individuals who have been suffering greatly.

I, this morning, as we opened this debate, talked about a great tragedy, that being the fact that a man called my office saying that his young son's best friend had just informed him that his father had committed suicide. That's clearly the most painful story you can hear of the impact of what we're feeling now with this economic downturn.

It has been absolutely devastating. Friends who've lost their homes, lost their jobs, lost their savings; we are dealing with what obviously is a very, very difficult time. That's the reason that there is such passion on this debate.

Now, I quoted earlier during the debate the words of Henry Morgenthau who was the Secretary of the Treasury under Franklin Delano Roosevelt who, in 1939 after going years through the New Deal, said the following before the House Ways and Means Committee in testimony. He said, ''We have tried spending money. We're spending more than we have ever spent, and it does not work. I say after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.''

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that we feel that we can't just say ''no.'' We know that that is not the panacea that many people believe that it is, and instead we need to focus on what works. And instance after instance, Mr. Speaker, has shown what does work.

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy—and this underscores this great quest for bipartisanship—delivered a speech to the Economic Club of New York—actually it was a year later in 1962. And in that speech, he said ''to increase demand and lift the economy, the federal government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures.''

Now, those are the words, Mr. Speaker, of Democratic President John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s. He had just brought about broad, across-the-board, marginal rate reduction.

Let me tell you what that brought about, too. It brought about an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. In fact, the top income tax rate was cut from the 90 percent to 70 percent, and revenues to the Federal Government increased by 62 percent. It actually grew revenues to the Treasury by reducing those rates.

Also at that same period of time, tax collections from the top bracket, those in the top bracket, grew by 57 percent, meaning those who had marginal rate reduction at the top end actually paid more in taxes because of the economic growth and that was juxtaposed to tax collections all the way across the board from the Kennedy tax cuts which only grew revenues by only 11 percent.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I was very privileged to come here following the 1980 election, and we had the last serious economic downturn that we faced as a Nation, nearly three decades ago, and Ronald Reagan pursued the same policies that were pursued by John F. Kennedy. He brought about sweeping marginal rate reduction; and Mr. Speaker, that grew the flow of revenues to the flow of Treasury nearly doubling that flow of revenues.

And the share of tax payments by the top ten percent—again, the top 10 percent of wage earners in this country grew from had 48 percent to more than 57 percent. That means those in the top ten percent of income levels actually had an increase of nearly 10 percentage points, nearly 10 percentage points in the flow of revenues that came in from the Federal Treasury—or actually they were paying more in taxes, from 48 percent to 57 percent while the share that was borne by the top 1 percent—the very rich—grew even more dramatically, 17 percent to nearly 28 percent, thus, the flow of tax payments that came from those people who were the very richest in this country.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, we are arguing that the economic stimulus working group that was put together by Leader BOEHNER and shared by our distinguished whip Mr. CANTOR used these models of proven examples, not the failed policies that were pointed to by Secretary Morgenthau in 1939, but the success following the 1961 cut and the 1981 cut. That's why we're not simply saying ''no,'' Mr. Speaker. We are saying, let's put a positive economic growth package together. We're going to continue to fight on behalf of that.

IF WE WORK TOGETHER, WE CAN PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today we took a historic step toward economic recovery, and four financial giants took another important step in announcing that they will impose a moratorium on mortgage foreclosures.

In response to a request from Congress during hearings chaired by Chairman FRANK, CitiGroup, Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan, and Bank of America today announced plans to suspend foreclosures for the next few weeks or until the President's new plan is in place.

These actions create breathing space to allow the new administration to develop and the private sector to implement a new plan to reduce foreclosures and to help Americans stay in their homes.

We cannot solve our economic crisis until we solve our housing crisis. And leaders of our financial sector have the ability and responsibility to help lead our recovery.

As a representative from the State of New York, I applaud these New York financial institutions for being the first to step forward and take up this challenge. And I urge all other mortgage institutions to follow their example, to take similar steps to help Americans stay in their home.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to really underscore the importance of the vote, the historic vote that we had a chance to vote on today. And I cast a ballot to help create 3.5 million new jobs and give tax credits to 95 percent of working Americans. This was a chance to begin to move our country forward by investing in and modernizing our health and education systems, and we can do it in a way that is accountable and transparent, as the legislation required. And as I noted, the private sector is also playing a crucial and important role.

If we work together, we can put America back to work.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASSIDY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SCHOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHOCK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLEMING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RUSH TO JUDGMENT ON STIMULUS BILL VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence this afternoon.

Earlier this afternoon, this House passed the single largest spending bill that has ever come across the work activity of this body. There was tepid applause on the other side of the aisle for the passage of this bill, I think in recognition that none of us really know if it will work. Most of us on our side of the aisle don't believe it will work, believe it was the wrong issue to do, the wrong way to address a very serious issue.

Americans all across this country are suffering: people losing their jobs, losing their homes, struggling to make ends meet. All of the things that go on during a recession. These are serious times.

My colleagues have been up here all day stating over and over ad nauseam the lack of consideration given to our ideas on how we could have made this better, the overall lack of consideration considering the substantial size of this particular bill that was given over the last 2 weeks. You hate to use a phrase that's been worn out, but ''rush to judgment'' comes to mind when you look at the activity that went on.

This House voted earlier this week—it was a unanimous vote—which doesn't happen except on post office namings—a unanimous vote that we would have 48 hours to look at this bill, that our constituents would have 48 hours to look at this bill, that America would have a chance to see what we were voting on, and that was unanimous.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's totally within your prerogatives as to when things come to the House. That's one of the wonderful things about being Speaker, and it is great to be Speaker. But I'm disappointed that you didn't honor the wishes, the unanimous wishes of 403 of us, that thought we needed 48 hours to look at this bill.

□ 1530

The real losers in this bill—and there are lots of losers—but the real losers in this bill are our future children, future generations of Americans who will be forever saddled with the debt that is going to be borrowed to pay for this bill. Tucked away in the corner of one of these bills is an increase in the debt limit to $12 trillion. That debt will never get paid back.

I had an interesting exchange with a young fifth grader in Fredericksburg, Texas, last October who asked me the single best question I've ever been asked during a town hall meeting. He said, Mr. Congressman, what's the plan to pay off the national debt? And I was rocked back on my heels because I had never been asked anything that straightforward important, and I had to say, well, young man, there is no plan to pay off the national debt. The money we borrow today is permanent debt. In order to pay debt off, you have to run a surplus. This Federal Government rarely ever runs a surplus, certainly never to the tune of $12 trillion

And so future generations will be paying interest not only on this $800 billion but also the $12 trillion that we've accumulated—and there's plenty of blame to go around for that—for the rest of their lives and the lives of their children and the lives of their children because this debt will not get paid off.

It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, for the taxpayers and future generations of taxpayers that my generation, the one just ahead of me and the one just behind me, believe in our core that it is an appropriate way to address problems that we're having by taking money that we haven't earned, that has not even yet been earned by our grandkids and working on problems that we need to solve that are important to us. If the problems are important enough that we need to spend money on them, then we clearly ought to be spending our own money on them and not future generations of Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, just before I yield back, I appreciate the time. I just wanted to express how disappointed I am in the action of the House today in passing a monster of a bill that does not address the jobs that it was supposed to. It simply spends more money and is a legacy, generates higher spending on an annual year-after-year basis because of some of the floors that we've put under many of these problems that we couldn't afford before we did this, and we simply can't afford on a going-forward basis as well.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO U.S. GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. TANNER, Tennessee, Chairman

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to have the hour—I probably won't take a full hour—but to have the opportunity to speak to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and, in particular, follow my colleague from Texas, the gentleman who just spoke, the words of wisdom that he expressed, the gentleman, Mr. CONAWAY, who is a certified public accountant, as he described the problems with this bill that was passed on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt will be passed by the Senate tomorrow and probably signed into law by President Obama on Monday.

The thing that I want to express, and I think that Mr. CONAWAY and some other speakers on our side of the aisle said as they spoke about this bill, was not that we on the Republican side are opposed to doing something. I mean, we don't want to just do nothing. Although, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that doing nothing would be better than the harm that's likely to be inflicted on our economy and, as Mr. CONAWAY said, on our children and grandchildren by the enactment of this legislation where we're spending almost $1.2 trillion when you include the interest on the debt, that putting that burden on the backs of our future generations without an absolute assurance, without an absolute assurance, Mr. Speaker, that those 4 million jobs would be created and that this would

jump-start our economy and get us out of this deep recession.

Even with that, I would have some concerns, but Vice President BIDEN just said the other day that he thought that this bill had about a 30 percent chance of failure. Now, you think about that. We're going to take money, Federal money, that we really don't have in the Treasury. We hope that we can sell these bonds and this Federal paper, Treasury notes to people on the open market. Probably some foreign governments like China and others might buy some of this. But if they don't, then it's just simply a matter of running the printing press to come up with this money, and of course, as we all know that weakens our dollar. It leads to inflation. And so I'm not surprised when Vice President JOE BIDEN said, well, look, there was no guarantee, we're doing the best we can. We hope it works, but it's probably got about a 30 percent chance of failure.

For my money, Mr. Speaker, that is too great a chance of failure. It is just not worth that, and that's why I say that, in fact, doing nothing probably would be better. And although we would go through some tough times economically, as we are now, indeed people are suffering, and it may take 2 or 3 years to get out of this recession, but the Republican minority has a plan. We're not just standing in the doorway blocking any kind of meaningful, good legislation. We want something to work. We don't want it to take 3 or 4 years. We want to try to stimulate this.

And that's what our leader said on the floor this afternoon as we debated this issue, and finally, Madam Speaker spoke and our leader BOEHNER spoke, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the majority side, Mr. OBEY, spoke. But it's really the words of Mr. BOEHNER I think I would want my colleagues and anybody within shouting distance to remember what he said.

We who voted ''no'' on this bill are fully aware, fully cognizant of the fact that people in every single district in this country, all 435 of them, my 11th of Georgia absolutely—the State of Georgia is facing a $3 billion deficit, and like most States, they have to balance their budget. So times are tough, and as JOHN BOEHNER said, and I would repeat here now, Mr. Speaker, we want to do something.

Unfortunately, the plan that the minority Republican party had was given no opportunity to be presented. There was no subcommittee hearings. There were no full committee hearings. There was no opportunity for amendments to be presented on the floor, so-called at least a modified open rule, where both Republicans and Democrats would have an opportunity to say, you know, we need to change this. There are some good in this bill. I think it's a 1,000-page bill. We had it on the floor earlier. Remember, it was about that high. It's probably six or eight Bibles thick. And within that, yeah, there were some good things but a whole lot of things that are not good, and I will try to speak to some of that as we proceed.

But the idea of shutting out the minority and not letting them speak on behalf of the constituents that they represent, every one of us, 178 Republicans represent about 675,000 people in their respective districts. And quite honestly, 50 very conservative Democrats, they call themselves the Blue Dogs. Many of them are from Southern States, good Members, also representing 675,000 people, and fiscally conservative. They were shut out. They didn't get an opportunity. That's why this vote ended up being—even though the Democratic majority prevailed, the bipartisanship on the vote was on the ''no'' side. That means that every single Republican in this body, Mr. Speaker, all 178 of us voted no, and we were joined by six or eight Democrats who all voted ''no,'' and all for the same reason.

The Republican Members are not all the same on every issue. We have conservative Members on social issues, like myself, and we have some Members who are socially moderate. But what you saw today is the coming together of the Republican minority on one thing that we absolutely always agree on and that we will always stand for and what I think defines us from the majority party. There's a difference. There's no question about it, and that difference is, we on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, believe in limited Federal Government, and we believe in reduced spending and let the States do what they can for themselves and the people do what they can for themselves. Let them keep more of their own hard-earned money. That means individual employees. It also means employer—these small, mom-and-pop companies.

Most of the jobs in this country, as we all know, are created by those small, mom-and-pop companies, less than, far less than 50 employees. We're not talking about the Microsofts and the Home Depots and the Coca-Colas and the huge companies. We're talking about these small companies that would, if you gave them an opportunity to keep more of their own money—and that's basically what the Republican plan was, Mr. Speaker, as you know, that we felt like in this bill, that there should be some spending, and the amount of spending should be significant on infrastructure projects. After all, that's what was talked about for a month or 6 weeks ahead of time: we are going to put people back to work in this country on repairing bridges, rebuilding roads, putting more money into rapid transit across all 50 of the States.

And each State, Mr. Speaker, was asked to submit a list of projects called shovel ready—shovel-ready projects so that they could start turning dirt within 90 days. I think the bill finally extended to 120 days. We were in favor of that. We are in favor of that. But in this final bill that was passed on the floor of this House today, about 7 percent of the money, about 7, not 70, Mr. Speaker, but 7 percent of the money goes to those infrastructure projects within our States. And I do believe that more money spent on those projects would indeed put people back to work and get the economy going, and I was very much in favor of that.

But the other thing that we felt very strongly about, though, was the opportunity to let people keep more of their own money, and that's why the Republican alternative had a 5 percent cut in the tax rate of everybody who pays taxes, no matter what your income. If you're paying at the 36 percent bracket, you'd pay 31 percent. If you're paying at the 28 percent bracket, you'd pay 23 percent. If you're paying at the 15 percent, 10, and the 10, 5. You get it. Everybody, across-the-board 5 percent cut in their Federal tax burden, and immediately start seeing that money in their paycheck, not going to Uncle Sam.

And also, you know, that the Republican alternative felt very strongly the way to create jobs in this country or to preserve jobs—President Obama said create 4 million or save 4 million. He's a little vague on that. But if you cut the corporate income tax rate from 35 to 25, and that's in the Republican alternative, the small businessmen and -women who usually pay as individuals, they're not S corporations or C corporations or LLCs or whatever you call it. But that would give them an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make more profit, to be able to expand their product line, add on to the size of their building, bring in more people, hire more people and get more people who are earning a paycheck and indeed paying taxes but at a lower rate.

□ 1545

And the final analysis, as we have proven under Presidents Kennedy in 1960, Reagan in 1980, and during the Bush administration in the early 2001, 2000, when you cut taxes and you let people keep more of their money, you do grow jobs. And we did that. Nobody can deny that. They could be critical of a lot of things. And mistakes are always made. And it's easy to be Monday morning quarterbacking.

But, without question, that type of economic philosophy and approach is what increases the Federal revenue because it grows jobs, it expands the job base.

So, these were some of the things that we had proposed but yet never saw the light of day. And it's sad because I truly believe that that would work.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the tax cuts, the other things of significance in the Republican alternative was to pledge—indeed, it's law, had we passed it—1 percent reduction. One percent. I know that doesn't sound like a lot but, believe me, up here inside the Beltway it's pretty hard to cut anything. But

we were talking about cutting 1 percent of spending across the board, except for our national defense. Preserve the spending on our national defense. Continue to keep this country safe and not pull the rug out from under the men and women who are doing the fighting and the suffering and the dying to keep us safe. But, across the board, every other spending category, 1 percent cut.

These are the kind of things that I wanted to talk about to my colleagues and make sure, on both sides of the aisle, but I am particularly talking to my friends on the majority side so that they do understand and your constituents understand that we're not in the minority hoping for failure, we're not hoping that President Obama is unsuccessful. Nothing could be further from the truth. We want President Obama to be successful. And I hope that he is successful.

But I don't want for some socialized program to be so successful that all of a sudden we get away from a market-driven economy and the democracy that we have all enjoyed and loved and what makes this country unique and wonderful. We don't want a European-type socialism.

And so if you hear someone say, Well, I hope this thing fails, please don't get the idea, my colleagues, that it's directed toward our new President. Of course not. Of course not. But we just want to make sure that our country succeeds in the right way. And this is for our children and our grandchildren.

I wanted to take a moment to paraphrase an article that I read in the newspaper today when I got up early this morning that I was looking at, Mr. Speaker. The Hill, the newspaper that we get daily when we're in session. And Hill and Roll Call and Politico, we all reads these things. There's some fine, fine writers on these newspapers. And this was an article penned by Cheri Jacobus. And here's what she said. I think it really cuts right to the chase in regard to $1 trillion worth of spending. And I'm going to quote just parts of her article:

''Congress should throw this greasy pile of pork into the grinder. Instead,'' instead, ''give every American household a $10,000 stimulus check to spend as we please. With approximately 100 million households nationwide, we hit that magic number of $1 trillion.''

So you give $10,000 to every one of 100 million households, that is spending the $1 trillion. So you spend it in a different way. You give it, Mr. Speaker, to the families. And, along with that, we have a 2-year moratorium on capital gains taxes, and then we will get this economy off life support.''

And I want to point out in the Republican alternative this idea of giving $10,000 to each of 100 million families was not part of it, but the suspension of capital gains tax definitely was. And then you would see the stock market not go down 350 points when something like this passes, you would see it go up 350 points.

So, doing this now, instead of letting the government decide how we spend the $1 trillion. Let the families decide how the $1 trillion are spent. ''Instead of condoms, green golf carts, mouse habitats, and government-run health care, Americans would spend based on individual priorities, thus spurring competition, resulting in higher-quality goods and services. Good banks succeed; bad banks fail. Well-priced, quality automobiles hit the streets; lemons fade away. Capitalism lives to fight another day and the greatest country on earth narrowly survives its near-death experience with socialism.''

She goes on to say, ''So here's a challenge for every Member of Congress.'' Mr. Speaker, that is us, me and you and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. ''So here's a challenge to every Member of Congress or, more accurately, a dare. Ask your constituents what they would do with $10,000. Compare their list to what is in the stimulus bill. Then see who has the best ideas for spending $1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use a couple of posters to help my colleagues understand and put in perspective the amount of money we're spending because, you know, $1,000 is a heck of a lot of money to me. You get up to a million, a billion, and a trillion, I don't even know how many zeroes we're talking about. But let's just use this poster to help us.

Sizing up the stimulus. Well, this proposed stimulus, as I said to my colleagues, is $1.2 trillion, if we can focus on this first poster. $1.2 trillion. Now, let's put that in perspective.

Back in the late sixties, and that terrible, terrible time of the Vietnam War. We lost almost 60,000 of our precious men and women in that battle, and $111 billion was spent. Now if you adjust that for inflation in today's dollars, it's $698 billion, compared to $1.2 trillion. That is a few more zeroes.

The invasion of Iraq, inflation adjusted, $597 billion. The money has gone up a little bit now, but it's certainly under $1 trillion. Well under.

Now, let's go back. Let's back to the 1932 to the 1939, 1940 era. The era of the New Deal. $32 billion adjusted for inflation—it's been a long time ago. $500 billion. In comparison, this is the largest spending bill not just in the history, Mr. Speaker, of the United States. I believe, if I am not wrong on this, and I don't think I am, this is the largest spending bill that any government has enacted in the history of the world. In the history of the world.

We're talking about increasing our national debt, not the deficit, but the national debt, which today is about $10.7 trillion, with a T. We're talking about increasing that by 10 percent in one snap of your finger. As soon as President Obama signs this bill into law Monday, all of a sudden we have increased the national debt 10 percent. Up to $12.5 trillion.

How in the world, Mr. Speaker, are we ever going to pay that off? I mean, it's downright depressing, is what it is. Not just scary, but it's downright depressing.

And speaking of that money that was spent on the New Deal, and I know people love to say, Well, FDR was one of our greatest Presidents, and no doubt he was a man of great courage; great personal courage. Overcame tremendous adversity physically and was our President during very difficult times of World War II, and did some wonderful things. And I commend him for that.

But I am not so sure the New Deal was such a good deal. In fact, it may very well have been a raw deal. Let me quote someone who should know better than I, because he was there. He lived through it. He advised President Roosevelt. He was President Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury, and his name was Henry Morgenthau.

And listen to what the Secretary of the Treasury under President Roosevelt said to a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of this House in 1939. And I will quote, ''We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work. I want to see this country prosperous. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say, after 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.''

Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, under President Roosevelt, 1939, some 7 years into the New Deal. That is probably why Vice President BIDEN, Mr. Speaker, said that, Look, this thing has got a 30 percent chance of not being successful. And allowing this recession to be deeper and more prolonged than if we indeed did nothing.

Well, let me ask my colleagues to join with me in looking at a few more posters to just, again, put this spending in perspective. With this amount of money, the $789 billion—and when I say $1.2 trillion, that's the interest over 10 years on the debt. But when you do the math, fairly simple, and you say that you're going to create 4 million jobs, 4 million jobs with this, that means you're spending $275,000 for every job.

That's $275,000 for every job. That's what it's going to cost. And a lot of these jobs are going to pay $30,000, $35,000, maybe even $20,000, $25,000 a year. That is shocking when you think about it. That that much money to create one job, $275,000 worth of spending.

Here's another chart that I think is real instructive that I wanted my colleagues to also look at. Those of you in the back of the Chamber, you may not be able to see this, or the far left or far right, but this says, Can you afford to pay for the Democratic spending bill? At $825 billion, or $789 billion, the economic stimulus plan sailing through Congress would cost each American family, each American family, more than $10,000 on average.

□ 1600

Here is how that price tag compares with the typical family expenses in a year:

Stimulus spending: $10,500.

What the family spends on food, clothing, and health care: $10,400. What the family spends on shelter, whether they are renting or owning their own home: $11,657.

So one-third of their expenditure in a year, that is what it is going to cost them in the final analysis, $10,500, every year, every family, to pay for this $1.1 trillion, $1.2 trillion.

That is why, going back, remember when I said or read the article about, literally, why doesn't the Federal Government just write a $10,000 check and give it to every family, and say: Look, I don't know your situation. You may have a mortgage past due, a car payment past due. You may need to pay down a credit card debt. You may have a child that wants to go back to college and you don't have the tuition for the next semester. Indeed, you may even have a family member that needs an operation or some dental work or something and you can't pay for it, and you can take money out of that $10,000. Or maybe you just simply want to save it for a rainy day. Lord knows, we have got a rainy day now. Or you might, if your situation is such and you think the old clinker of a car is falling apart and we want to buy American, and General Motors or Ford Motor Company has got a great new car that gets good gas mileage and we will go ahead and buy a car, or whatever, a washing machine. And all of a sudden, the economy starts moving. And so this shows it, I think, Mr. Speaker, in a very vivid, vivid way.

Before I finish up, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't want to take the entire hour, but I wanted to talk just a little bit about some of the health care things that are in this bill.

There is money toward moving us as a Nation for complete electronic medical records. I am for that, Mr. Speaker. I think that would be a good thing. I think that would save lives and save money, and I clearly feel that that is something that we want to do. But there are a number of provisions, and I will just mention one that really, really concerns me, and that is this comparative effectiveness commission. Comparative effectiveness, where the Federal Government, and I think $1 billion, if I am not mistaken, I think $1 billion goes into creating this other layer of government bureaucracy called comparative effectiveness that would decide which medical procedures or medications were cost effective and in certain instances will just simply say that, ''Well, we don't think that is cost effective,'' that MRI that mom had in the emergency room last week or the CAT scan or electroencephalogram because a child had a seizure.

To say that it is not effective, who are these bureaucrats that would have the ability to do that? Have they ever had a stethoscope around their neck? Have they ever had a white lab coat on? No. They are just number crunchers, and all of a sudden they are going to come in between you, our constituents, men and women, and your health care provider, your physician, whether it is a pediatrician or obstetrician or general surgeon or a family doctor.

So as we look at this massive bill, what we are seeing is a lot of things in there, Mr. Speaker, that really don't have anything to do with putting people back to work. That 7 percent spending on infrastructure, that ought to be 25 percent of the spending. It ought to be much more than it is. But yet, there are things in there, and I could go through a list of them and it is almost appalling.

I mention that about that health care. It is just trying to set policy in this bill, moving us in a direction that I don't think, I do not think, the American people want. And I think, the American people, my colleagues, remember back in 1993, 1992, under President Clinton, when current Secretary of State Clinton now but first lady at that time was sort of put in charge of trying to develop a single payor national health care system just like they have in the United Kingdom or in Canada or other countries where it doesn't work so well and care is rationed.

My fear, and as you read this bill and you try to read through, the devil is in the details, and you see these things and you see what is happening in the health care provision, it is definitely trying to move us in that direction once again.

So again, our opposition to the bill is not that we don't want to help people and help them right now, that we don't have compassion. Indeed, there is no one more compassionate in this Chamber than the minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER. In fact, many times he is almost to the point of tears, he is so compassionate.

So we just want to look at this thing, as we have, and realize that so much of the money, Mr. Speaker, in this bill is all about pushing an agenda and spending money, some of which may be worthwhile, but it should go through the regular order. That is why we are up here, mainly, to authorize and appropriate spending. That is a major responsibility of the Members of Congress in the House and Senate. And we should do that under regular order. But it is like the chief of staff now, our former colleague here in the House, the chief of staff to President Obama, Rahm Emanuel, the gentleman from Illinois, the same State as the President, said it would be a tragedy to let any crisis go unused, or something to that effect. I am paraphrasing, but it would be a tragedy to let a crisis go to waste. In other words, take a crisis and try to do some good things and put people back to work; but, at the same time, pump all kind of other stuff in there that you have been trying to get passed for years and have not been successful because the majority of the Congress doesn't want it, so you throw it in there as emergency spending and drag it along as we tug at heartstrings.

And that is just not right, Mr. Speaker. That is unfair. It is deceiving the American public, and it is putting a burden on them that I will have no part of. And my colleagues on this side of the aisle, 178 of us, Republicans, and six to eight conservative, fiscally conservative Democrats feel the same way.

I just feel that if we had had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, if we had had an opportunity to present an alternative, we could do that in a bipartisan way. We don't hate each other, as you know, Mr. Speaker. We respect each other, and in many cases best friends are on opposite sides of the aisle. We can do these things. But somehow this top down, my way or the highway, closed rules, no opportunity to go through committee, we are losing out, and it is not right, because the minority represents, what, 48 percent? A lot of people, a lot of people in this country, Mr. Speaker, elected Republican Members of this House and Senate.

So as I conclude, I just want to the say to all of my colleagues, on the Republican side we voted ''no,'' and we voted no for a very good reason. We have great fear, just as Vice President BIDEN said, that this won't work. And it is not like, well, it just didn't work, and we lost that game and we will play another one. No. This is too big a risk. It puts too big a burden on our future generations, and it has the likelihood of leaving us in this recession for a long time to come.

We had an opportunity. My colleague, my Senate colleague from Georgia, JOHNNY ISAKSON, had an amendment on the Senate side that would give every person, every family that bought a new home a $15,000 tax credit. It passed on the Senate side I think by a voice vote, unanimous consent, everybody. I heard Senator SCHUMER say what a wonderful, wonderful idea that the gentleman from Georgia, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, had, because this whole mess started with the downturn of the housing market; and until we get those houses moving and sold, that will get us out of this mess. And the Senate knew it. And yet, when they got to conference committee, what happened? They pulled that amendment out. Pulled that amendment out.

I really believe if that and maybe an opportunity for people to get a fixed-rate mortgage at 4 percent or 5 percent, 30-year fixed rate, let them have that opportunity over the next year or so, the Johnny Isakson amendment, maybe we can pass it as a stand-alone bill. The Republican alternative to this spendulous bill where we emphasize tax cuts and spending cuts and we spend more money on infrastructure, I think if we came back and did that, we would be out of this the recession in 12 months to 18 months.

And so that is why I am here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, just to share those thoughts with my colleagues. And I hope and pray that President Obama will be successful; but when it is something that I have great fear of hurting the country, taking us down a road that our Founding Fathers never intended us to go, then I am going to stand up and I am going to say, ''No, Mr. President,'' as I did today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEE of New York (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of helping to coordinate the Federal response and to provide assistance to the families of the victims of the tragic crash of Continental Airlines Flight 3407 in his district.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 1:30 p.m. on account of his daughter's wedding in South Carolina.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FLEMING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 17, 2009, at 10 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 47, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me god.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1. Jo Bonner
2. Bobby Bright
3. Mike Rogers
4. Robert B. Aderholt
5. Parker Griffith
6. Spencer Bachus
7. Artur Davis

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega

ARIZONA

1. Ann Kirkpatrick
2. Trent Franks
3. John B. Shadegg
4. Ed Pastor
5. Harry E. Mitchell
6. Jeff Flake
7. Raúl M. Grijalva
8. Gabrielle Giffords

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry
2. Vic Snyder
3. John Boozman
4. Mike Ross

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson
2. Wally Herger
3. Daniel E. Lungren
4. Tom McClintock
5. Doris O. Matsui
6. Lynn C. Woolsey
7. George Miller
8. Nancy Pelosi
9. Barbara Lee
10. Ellen O. Tauscher
11. Jerry McNerney
12. Jackie Speier
13. Fortney Pete Stark
14. Anna G. Eshoo
15. Michael M. Honda
16. Zoe Lofgren
17. Sam Farr
18. Dennis A. Cardoza
19. George Radanovich
20. Jim Costa
21. Devin Nunes
22. Kevin McCarthy
23. Lois Capps
24. Elton Gallegly
25. Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon
26. David Dreier
27. Brad Sherman
28. Howard L. Berman
29. Adam B. Schiff
30. Henry A. Waxman
31. Xavier Becerra
32. Hilda L. Solis
33. Diane E. Watson
34. Lucille Roybal-Allard
35. Maxine Waters
36. Jane Harman
37. Laura Richardson
38. Grace F. Napolitano
39. Linda T. Sánchez
40. Edward R. Royce
41. Jerry Lewis
42. Gary G. Miller
43. Joe Baca
44. Ken Calvert
45. Mary Bono Mack
46. Dana Rohrabacher
47. Loretta Sanchez
48. John Campbell
49. Darrell E. Issa
50. Brian P. Bilbray
51. Bob Filner
52. Duncan Hunter
53. Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette
2. Jared Polis
3. John T. Salazar
4. Betsy Markey
5. Doug Lamborn
6. Mike Coffman
7. Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson
2. Joe Courtney
3. Rosa L. DeLauro
4. James A. Himes
5. Christopher S. Murphy

DELAWARE

At Large, Michael N. Castle

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

FLORIDA

1. Jeff Miller
2. Allen Boyd
3. Corrine Brown
4. Ander Crenshaw
5. Ginny Brown-Waite
6. Cliff Stearns
7. John L. Mica
8. Alan Grayson
9. Gus M. Bilirakis
10. C.W. Bill Young
11. Kathy Castor
12. Adam H. Putnam
13. Vern Buchanan
14. Connie Mack
15. Bill Posey
16. Thomas J. Rooney
17. Kendrick B. Meek
18. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19. Robert Wexler
20. Debbie Wasserman Schultz
21. Lincoln Diaz-Balart
22. Ron Klein
23. Alcee L. Hastings
24. Suzanne M. Kosmas

25. Mario Diaz-Balart

GEORGIA

1. Jack Kingston
2. Sanford D. Bishop Jr.
3. Lynn A. Westmoreland
4. Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr.
5. John Lewis
6. Tom Price
7. John Linder
8. Jim Marshall
9. Nathan Deal
10. Paul C. Broun
11. Phil Gingrey
12. John Barrow
13. David Scott

GUAM

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

HAWAII

1. Neil Abercrombie
2. Mazie K. Hirono

IDAHO

1. Walt Minnick
2. Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1. Bobby L. Rush
2. Jesse L. Jackson Jr.
3. Daniel Lipinski
4. Luis V. Gutierrez
5.
6. Peter J. Roskam
7. Danny K. Davis
8. Melissa L. Bean
9. Janice D. Schakowsky
10. Mark Steven Kirk
11. Deborah L. Halvorson
12. Jerry F. Costello
13. Judy Biggert
14. Bill Foster
15. Timothy V. Johnson
16. Donald A. Manzullo
17. Phil Hare
18. Aaron Schock
19. John Shimkus

INDIANA

1. Peter J. Visclosky
2. Joe Donnelly
3. Mark E. Souder
4. Steve Buyer
5. Dan Burton
6. Mike Pence
7. André Carson
8. Brad Ellsworth
9. Baron P. Hill

IOWA

1. Bruce L. Braley
2. David Loebsack
3. Leonard L. Boswell
4. Tom Latham
5. Steve King

KANSAS

1. Jerry Moran
2. Lynn Jenkings
3. Dennis Moore
4. Todd Tiahrt

KENTUCKY

1. Ed Whitfield
2. Brett Guthrie
3. John A. Yarmuth
4. Geoff Davis
5. Harold Rogers
6. Ben Chandler

LOUISIANA

1. Steve Scalise
2. Anh ''Joseph'' Cao
3. Charlie Melancon
4. John Fleming
5. Rodney Alexander
6. Bill Cassidy
7. Charles W. Boustany Jr.

MAINE

1. Chellie Pingree
2. Michael H. Michaud

MARYLAND

1. Frank Kratovil Jr.
2. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger
3. John P. Sarbanes
4. Donna F. Edwards
5. Steny H. Hoyer
6. Roscoe G. Bartlett
7. Elijah E. Cummings
8. Chris Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Olver
2. Richard E. Neal
3. James P. McGovern
4. Barney Frank
5. Niki Tsongas
6. John F. Tierney
7. Edward J. Markey
8. Michael E. Capuano
9. Stephen F. Lynch
10. William D. Delahunt

MICHIGAN

1. Bart Stupak
2. Peter Hoekstra
3. Vernon J. Ehlers
4. Dave Camp
5. Dale E. Kildee
6. Fred Upton
7. Mark Schauer
8. Mike Rogers
9. Gary C. Peters
10. Candice S. Miller
11. Thaddeus G. McCotter
12. Sander M. Levin
13. Carolyn C. Kilpatrick
14. John Conyers Jr.
15. John D. Dingell

MINNESOTA

1. Timothy J. Walz
2. John Kline
3. Erik Paulsen
4. Betty McCollum
5. Keith Ellison
6. Michele Bachmann
7. Collin C. Peterson
8. James L. Oberstar

MISSISSIPPI

1. Travis W. Childers
2. Bennie G. Thompson
3. Gregg Harper
4. Gene Taylor

MISSOURI

1. Wm. Lacy Clay
2. W. Todd Akin
3. Russ Carnahan
4. Ike Skelton
5. Emanuel Cleaver
6. Sam Graves
7. Roy Blunt
8. Jo Ann Emerson
9. Blaine Luetkemeyer

MONTANA

At Large, Denny Rehberg

NEBRASKA

1. Jeff Fortenberry
2. Lee Terry
3. Adrian Smith

NEVADA

1. Shelley Berkley
2. Dean Heller
3. Dina Titus

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Carol Shea-Porter
2. Paul W. Hodes

NEW JERSEY

1. Robert E. Andrews
2. Frank A. LoBiondo
3. John H. Adler
4. Christopher H. Smith
5. Scott Garrett
6. Frank Pallone Jr.
7. Leonard Lance
8. Bill Pascrell Jr.
9. Steven R. Rothman
10. Donald M. Payne
11. Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12. Rush D. Holt
13. Albio Sires

NEW MEXICO

1. Martin Heinrich
2. Harry Teague
3. Ben Ray Luján

NEW YORK

1. Timothy H. Bishop
2. Steve Israel
3. Peter T. King
4. Carolyn McCarthy
5. Gary L. Ackerman
6. Gregory W. Meeks
7. Joseph Crowley
8. Jerrold Nadler
9. Anthony D. Weiner
10. Edolphus Towns
11. Yvette D. Clarke
12. Nydia M. Velázquez
13. Michael E. McMahon
14. Carolyn B. Maloney
15. Charles B. Rangel
16. José E. Serrano
17. Eliot L. Engel
18. Nita M. Lowey
19. John J. Hall
20. Kirsten E. Gillibrand*
21. Paul Tonko
22. Maurice D. Hinchey
23. John M. McHugh
24. Michael A. Arcuri
25. Daniel B. Maffei
26. Christopher John Lee
27. Brian Higgins
28. Louise McIntosh Slaughter
29. Eric J.J. Massa

NORTH CAROLINA

1. G.K. Butterfield
2. Bob Etheridge
3. Walter B. Jones
4. David E. Price
5. Virginia Foxx
6. Howard Coble
7. Mike McIntyre
8. Larry Kissell
9. Sue Wilkins Myrick
10. Patrick T. McHenry
11. Heath Shuler
12. Melvin L. Watt
13. Brad Miller

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large, Earl Pomeroy

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Sablan

OHIO

1. Steve Driehaus
2. Jean Schmidt
3. Michael R. Turner
4. Jim Jordan
5. Robert E. Latta
6. Charles A. Wilson
7. Steve Austria
8. John A. Boehner
9. Marcy Kaptur
10. Dennis J. Kucinich
11. Marcia L. Fudge
12. Patrick J. Tiberi
13. Betty Sutton
14. Steven C. LaTourette
15. Mary Jo Kilroy
16. John A. Boccieri
17. Tim Ryan
18. Zachary T. Space

OKLAHOMA

1. John Sullivan
2. Dan Boren
3. Frank D. Lucas
4. Tom Cole
5. Mary Fallin

OREGON

1. David Wu

2. Greg Walden
3. Earl Blumenauer
4. Peter A. DeFazio
5. Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Robert A. Brady
2. Chaka Fattah
3. Kathleen A. Dahlkemper
4. Jason Altmire
5. Glenn Thompson
6. Jim Gerlach
7. Joe Sestak
8. Patrick J. Murphy
9. Bill Shuster
10. Christopher P. Carney
11. Paul E. Kanjorski
12. John P. Murtha
13. Allyson Y. Schwartz
14. Michael F. Doyle
15. Charles W. Dent
16. Joseph R. Pitts
17. Tim Holden
18. Tim Murphy
19. Todd Russell Platts

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

RHODE ISLAND

1. Patrick J. Kennedy
2. James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Henry E. Brown Jr.
2. Joe Wilson
3. J. Gresham Barrett
4. Bob Inglis
5. John M. Spratt Jr.
6. James E. Clyburn

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Stephanie Herseth Sandlin

TENNESSEE

1. David P. Roe
2. John J. Duncan Jr.
3. Zach Wamp
4. Lincoln Davis
5. Jim Cooper
6. Bart Gordon
7. Marsha Blackburn
8. John S. Tanner
9. Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1. Louie Gohmert
2. Ted Poe
3. Sam Johnson
4. Ralph M. Hall
5. Jeb Hensarling
6. Joe Barton
7. John Abney Culberson
8. Kevin Brady
9. Al Green
10. Michael T. McCaul
11. K. Michael Conaway
12. Kay Granger
13. Mac Thornberry
14. Ron Paul
15. Rubén Hinojosa
16. Silvestre Reyes
17. Chet Edwards
18. Sheila Jackson-Lee
19. Randy Neugebauer
20. Charles A. Gonzalez
21. Lamar Smith
22. Pete Olson
23. Ciro D. Rodriguez
24. Kenny Marchant
25. Lloyd Doggett
26. Michael C. Burgess
27. Solomon P. Ortiz
28. Henry Cuellar
29. Gene Green
30. Eddie Bernice Johnson
31. John R. Carter
32. Pete Sessions

UTAH

1. Rob Bishop
2. Jim Matheson
3. Jason Chaffetz

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Donna M. Christensen

VIRGINIA

1. Robert J. Wittman
2. Glenn C. Nye
3. Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott
4. J. Randy Forbes
5. Thomas S.P. Perriello
6. Bob Goodlatte
7. Eric Cantor
8. James P. Moran
9. Rick Boucher
10. Frank R. Wolf
11. Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1. Jay Inslee
2. Rick Larsen
3. Brian Baird
4. Doc Hastings
5. Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6. Norman D. Dicks
7. Jim McDermott
8. David G. Reichert
9. Adam Smith

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Alan B. Mollohan
2. Shelley Moore Capito
3. Nick J. Rahall II

WISCONSIN

1. Paul Ryan
2. Tammy Baldwin
3. Ron Kind
4. Gwen Moore
5. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr.
6. Thomas E. Petri
7. David R. Obey
8. Steve Kagen

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, John H. Adler, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boccieri, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany Jr., Allen Boyd, Bruce L. Braley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bobby Bright, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Ginny Brown-Waite, Henry E. Brown Jr., Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G.K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Anh ''Joseph'' Cao, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Travis W. Childers, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Kathleen A. Dahlkemper, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Steve Driehaus, John J. Duncan Jr., Chet Edwards, Donna F. Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, John Fleming, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Kirsten E. Gillibrand*, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Parker Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Deborah L. Halvorson, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, Gregg Harper, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth Sandlin, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Mary Jo Kilroy, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ann Kirkpatrick, Larry Kissell, Ron Klein, John Kline, Suzanne M. Kosmas, Frank Kratovil Jr., Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher John Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, Michael E. McMahon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Connie Mack, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Betsy Markey, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Eric J.J. Massa, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Walt Minnick, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Devin Nunes, Glenn C. Nye, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Pete Olson, Solomon P. Ortiz, Frank

Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Thomas S.P. Perriello, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Earl Pomeroy, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Adam H. Putnam, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Silvestre Reyes, Laura Richardson, Ciro D. Rodriguez, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers (AL–03), Mike Rogers (MI–08), Dana Rohrabacher, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Sablan, John T. Salazar, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Mark Shauer, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, Zachary T. Space, Jackie Speier, John M. Spratt Jr., Bart Stupak, Cliff Stearns, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Gene Taylor, Harry Teague, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Greg Walden, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Charles A. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

583. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R-1315] received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

584. A letter from the President and CEO, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's annual report on the provision of service to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting and public telecommunications entities, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396(m)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

586. A letter from the Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2007 Annual Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 Report, pursuant to Section 203 of the No FEAR Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

587. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7201; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

588. A letter from the Chief, End. Species Listing Branch, FWS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Reticulated Flatwoods Salamander; Designation of Critical Habitat for Frosted Flatwoods Salamander and Reticulated Flatwoods Salamander [FWS-R4-ES-2008-0082] [MO 9921050083-B2] (RIN: 1018-AU85) received February 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

589. A letter from the Acting Chief, Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Protections for the Gray Wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Northern Rocky Mountains in Compliance with Court Orders [FWS-R6-ES-2008-008 92220-1113-0000; C6] (RIN: 1018-AW35) received February 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

590. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition filed on behalf of workers from Mallinckrodt Chemical Co., Destrehan St. Plant, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

591. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition filed on behalf of workers from Vitro Manufacturing, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

592. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 803 (121 Stat. 266, 360); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

593. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000,'' pursuant to Public Law 106-386; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

594. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) [Docket No.: FBI 117; AG Order No. 3042-2009] (RIN: 1110-AA30) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

595. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey Zone; Allegheny River, Clinton, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1085] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

596. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey Zone, Bayfront Park New Year's Eve Celebration, Biscayne Bay, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0984] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

597. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0977; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-15775; AD 2008-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received Janaury 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

598. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation (RRC) AE 3007A Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2008-0975; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-15772; AD 2008-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

599. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier-Rotax GmbH 914 F Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. FAA-2008-0842; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-15771; AD 2008-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

600. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CT7-8A Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-24261; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-15768; AD 2008-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

601. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-200, AT-300, AT-400, AT-500, AT-600, and AT-800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-1120; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-064-AD; Amendment 39-15767; AD 2008-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

602. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 560 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0903; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-15770; AD 2008-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

603. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saad Aerosystems Model 340A (SAAB/SF340A) and SAAB 340B Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1044; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-15774; AD 2008-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

604. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8-11, DC-8-12, DC-8-21, DC-8-31, DC-8-32, DC-8-33, DC-8-41, DC-8-42, and DC-8-43 Airplanes; Model DC-8-50 Series Airplanes; Model DC-8F-54 and DC-8F-55 Airplanes; Model DC-8-60 Series Airplanes; Model DC-8-60F Series Airplanes; Model DC-8-70 Series Airplanes; and Model DC-8-70F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0858; Directorate Identifier

2008-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-15773; AD 2008-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) Received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

605. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA-46-350P, PA-46R-350T, and PA-46-500TP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1085; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-057-AD; Amendment 39-15777; AD 2008-26-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

606. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company 172, 175, 177, 180, 182, 185, 188, 206, 207, 208, 210, 303, 336, and 337 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1328; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-066-AD; Amendment 39-15776; AD 2008-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

607. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries a.s. (Type Certificate G60EU previously held by LETECKE ZAVODY a.s. and LET Aeronautical Works) Model L 23 Super Blanik Sailplane [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1138; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-059-AD; Amendment 39-15778; AD 2008-26-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

608. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8-11, DC-8-12, DC-8-21, DC-8-31, DC-8-32, DC-8-33, DC-8-41, DC-8-42, and DC-8-43 Airplanes; Model DC-8-51, DC-8-52, DC-8-53, and DC-8-55 Airplanes; Model DC-8F-54 and DC-8F-55 Airplanes; Model DC-8-61, DC-8-62, and DC-8-63 Airplanes; Model DC-8-61F, DC-8-62F, and DC-8-63F Airplanes; Model DC-8-71, DC-8-72, and DC-8-73 Airplanes; and Model DC-8-71F, DC-8-72F, and DC-8-73F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0123; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-056-AD; Amendment 39-15763; AD 2008-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) Received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

609. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1250; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-49-AD; Amendment 39-15775; AD 2008-17-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 1058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits and tier 1 railroad retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1059. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for an heir of a deceased homeowner to receive certain housing-related disaster assistance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a NADBank guarantee is not considered a Federal guarantee for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 1061. A bill to transfer certain land to the United States to be held in trust for the Hoh Indian Tribe, to place land into trust for the Hoh Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. FALLIN, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 1062. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and implementation of a system to verify that persons who receive United States foreign assistance funds are not affiliated with or do not support foreign terrorist organizations or do not otherwise commit or support acts of international terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 1063. A bill to repeal a requirement with respect to the procurement and acquisition of alternative fuels; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CAO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WATT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1064. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 1065. A bill to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PETRI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SOLIS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HARE, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. KAGEN):

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide continued funding for the Peace Corps, to increase the readjustment allowances for Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Texas (for himself and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992 to choose either lump sum payments over four years totalling $5,000 or an improved benefit computation formula under a new 10-year rule governing the transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WU, Mr. STARK, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland):

H.R. 1068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain securities transactions to the extent required to recoup the net cost of the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1069. A bill to provide for certain requirements related to the closing of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the capital loss carryovers of individuals to $10,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 1071. A bill to prohibit the imposition and collection of tolls on certain highways constructed using Federal funds; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1072. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the United Nations for the purpose of paying or reimbursing the legal expenses of United Nations officers or employees charged with malfeasance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 1073. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer individuals detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to facilities in Florida or to house such individuals at such facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 1075. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand access to hospital care for veterans in major disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect youth from exploitation by adults using the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 1077. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of services of qualified respiratory therapists performed under the general supervision of a physician; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARCURI (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1078. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SPACE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1079. A bill to expand the research, prevention, and awareness activities of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health with respect to pulmonary fibrosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1080. A bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1081. A bill to amend the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 to extend the public assistance pilot program through December 31, 2009; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1082. A bill to prohibit the importation for sale of foreign-made flags of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1083. A bill to regulate certain State taxation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HARE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1084. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe a standard to preclude commercials from being broadcast at louder volumes than the program material they accompany; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1085. A bill to impose a limitation on lifetime aggregate limits imposed by health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MACK, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LINDER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 1086. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PITTS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction under section 179 for the purchase of qualified health care information technology by medical care providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 1088. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a one-year period for the training of new disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives by National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 1089. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the enforcement through the Office of Special Counsel of the employment and unemployment rights of veterans and members of the Armed Forces employed by Federal executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for care packages provided for soldiers in combat zones and a credit for providing volunteer service to military families through the America Supports You program of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 1091. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct local educational agencies to release secondary school student information to military recruiters if the student's parent provides written consent for the release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KAGEN:

H.R. 1092. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit discrimination in group health coverage and individual health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1093. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the maximum level of fees authorized to be charged by representatives with respect to claims of entitlement to past-due benefits and to require cost-of-living adjustments to such level of authorized fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1094. A bill to ensure that home health agencies can assign the most appropriate skilled service to make the initial assessment visit for home health services for Medicare beneficiaries requiring rehabilitation therapy under a home health plan of care, based upon physician referral; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1095. A bill to prohibit any recipient of emergency Federal economic assistance from using such funds for lobbying expenditures or political contributions, to improve transparency, enhance accountability, encourage responsible corporate governance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 1096. A bill to create an electronic employment eligibility verification system to ensure that all workers in the United States are legally able to work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for obtaining transportation worker identification credentials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 1098. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational assistance payable by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals pursuing internships or on-job training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1099. A bill to provide for extension of existing and expiring agreements under the Moving-to-Work program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER:

H.R. 1100. A bill to authorize the Commandant of the Coast Guard to issue regulations that require certain pilots on vessels operating in designated waters to carry and utilize a portable electronic device equipped for navigational purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1101. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for reimbursement of certified midwife services and to provide for more equitable reimbursement rates for certified nurse-midwife services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1102. A bill to require full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOYD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1103. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. CANTOR):

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H. Res. 169. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Robert Burns was a true friend of the United States, that his work inspired the citizens of this Nation, as well as his native Scotland, and that the annual celebration of his birth is a tradition that transcends national boundaries, and as a result, should be observed in communities around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H. Res. 170. A resolution recognizing the sesquicentennial of the admission of Oregon into the Union and the contributions of Oregon residents to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. POMEROY):

H. Res. 171. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the need for constitutional reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the importance of sustained United States engagement in partnership with the European Union (EU); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 172. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Administration in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H. Res. 173. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of its 6-day mail delivery service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 174. A resolution acknowledging the growing threat of anti-Semitism throughout South America, namely in Venezuela, Bolivia, and Argentina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Res. 175. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 176. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to continue aggressive growth in our Nation's telecommunications and technology industries, the United States Government should "Get Out of the Way and Stay

Out of the Way''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H. Res. 177. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning membership of the United States in the International Renewable Energy Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NYE, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HARE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 178. A resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and support for the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

6. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of Coldwater, Mississippi, relative to economic stimulus proposals for funding consideration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California introduced A bill (H.R. 1104) for the relief of Mikael Adrian Christopher Figueroa Alvarez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 24: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 31: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 44: Mr. CAO.

H.R. 52: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 81: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 131: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 147: Mr. NYE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 164: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 175: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 211: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 216: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 225: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 226: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 235: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 270: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 303: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 333: Mr. BOREN and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 336: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 345: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DENT, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 347: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 406: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, MRS. BIGGERT, Mr. KIND, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 424: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 467: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 470: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 479: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 483: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 510: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 557: Mr. COBLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 560: Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 564: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 574: Mr. STUPAK and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 577: Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 578: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 587: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 593: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 599: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 613: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 627: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 630: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 649: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 658: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 667: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 702: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 734: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 745: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 775: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 783: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 796: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 802: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 819: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 824: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 836: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 846: Mr. HARE and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 847: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 857: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 866: Mr. LINDER and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 886: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 900: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 904: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 911: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 930: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 958: Mr. HARE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 964: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 968: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 980: Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 981: Mr. OLVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 994: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1015: Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1024: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1032: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1039: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Con. Res. 14: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. LINDER.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. BOREN.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 50: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. FARR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 22: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 42: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 47: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H. Res. 68: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 69: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Res. 81: Mr. PERRIELLO and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 101: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 109: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 125: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 130: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CLARKE.

H. Res. 164: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 166: Mr. GRAYSON.