United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2009 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Lord God, Father of us all, Your providential care for our Nation and Your well-timed blessings during singular events of our individual lives, have revealed Your constant and personal love.

Even before we were born, You prepared the way for us with well-chosen people who knew our need. To this very day a single voice can speak wisdom over the din of a crowd. People tell us their dreams and inspire us in our daily efforts.

Someone asks the right question at exactly the right moment and occasions the answer needed but until then hidden.

History has shown us: wars create heroes in our midst. The struggle for civil rights and to put an end to suffering has called forth leadership when most needed.

Lord, You continue to fashion and challenge us until we reach the full potential You have placed within us. Therefore, we are confident in our present difficulties You have placed in position those who know what we need and will guide and protect us.

May Your truth and Your love be realized in us today and last forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1512. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

WON'T YOU BE MY NEIGHBOR DAY

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

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an upcoming expression of caring and activism. Tomorrow, March 20, would have been Fred Rogers' 81st birthday. It also marks the second annual ''Won't You Be My Neighbor Day,'' a day each year dedicated to furthering the efforts of Pittsburgh native Fred Rogers, known to many as Mr. Rogers from the long-running TV show ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood.''

Fred Rogers spent most of his adult life nurturing the development of self-assured, well-rounded, and caring young people.

Family Communications, Incorporated, the nonprofit organization founded by Fred Rogers in 1971, is asking all Americans to put on their favorite sweater tomorrow and undertake some act of neighborliness or caring—anything from striking up a friendly conversation with your neighbor to helping out in your neighborhood, so long as it helps create closer communities and exemplifies what it really means to be a good neighbor.

I hope my colleagues and people across the country will join me in honoring Fred Rogers' remarkable life's work by observing ''Won't You Be My Neighbor Day'' tomorrow.

BUREAUCRATIC OFF-ROAD BLOCK

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, Montanans can enjoy our beautiful State from the convenience of a road; but to really get out and experience it, we often have to leave the roads behind. That is why off-roading has become a major part of Montana's heritage, and our economy.

Unfortunately, the Consumer Products Safety Commission has erected a bureaucratic off-road block for young all-terrain vehicle enthusiasts. ATV parts, which are unlikely to be handled by children, have been banned, forcing ATV and motorcycle dealers to remove these products from their showrooms. And now couldn't be a worse time as many of these dealers are just trying to stay afloat through the slow economic times.

I have introduced legislation to fix this problem. We all want to ensure the safety of our kids, but let's put our efforts into protecting them from real threats, not bureaucratic bungling.

SPACE SOLAR ALLIANCE

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Printed on recycled paper.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, this week the Space Shuttle Discovery docked at the International Space Station to deliver the final platform of solar panels that will support additional laboratories and the arrival of an expanded crew.

As the new chair of the Space and Aviation Subcommittee and a champion of solar energy, I am delighted by the space solar alliance that will advance human knowledge and technological development.

The panels being installed 220 miles above us this week have a wingspan of a 747, and they contain over 32,000 cells, enough to power 50 homes.

Recently, First Solar, an Arizona solar panel maker, announced solar cells that will be less than $1 per watt. Global Solar, another Arizona company, creates solar cells that can be integrated into military and police gear.

What started as an expensive niche technology is now a consumer-driven, mass-produced product. Solar was absolutely vital to America's success in fulfilling our bold commitment to explore the heavens. Today it is playing a vital role in tackling an equally daunting task, America's energy independence.

OUTRAGE TOWARD AIG

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans share the outrage of the American people that AIG would use taxpayer dollars to award executive bonuses during this economic crisis.

But we believe the American people deserve 100 percent of their money back, not 90 percent. The American people deserve to know that this whole outrage could have been avoided.

Senator WYDEN authored an amendment banning executive bonuses, and that amendment was stripped from the stimulus bill. Senator DODD took responsibility, but he told CNN that ''the administration had a problem with the amendment.''

The bill on the floor today to enact a 90 percent tax on AIG employees is just a cynical attempt to divert attention from the truth that Democrats in Congress and this administration made these bonus payments possible in the first place.

House Republicans have legislation that would ensure 100 percent of these bonuses are returned to taxpayers, but they blocked the plan from receiving a vote today. The American people have a right to get 100 percent of their money back, and Mr. Geithner should resign.

WAL-MART BATTLES TO DEVELOP ON BATTLEFIELD

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, 164 years ago brave Texans and brave Vermonters fought on an historical battlefield about 60 miles south of here, the Battle of the Wilderness. There were 165,000 troops amassed there, including Vermonters from the 1st Brigade; and 1,200 from Vermont's ranks died. Among them was Daniel Lilly, a teacher in Barnard, Vermont. His funeral is still today remembered as the largest funeral in the history of that town. Another, Ed Holden, fought and survived, but saw his brother with his head shot off die on the battlefield.

Today a different battle is taking place on that hallowed ground. It is a conflict between a great American corporation, Wal-Mart, and a great American historic battlefield, the Wilderness. My friend from Texas and I have joined together to ask Wal-Mart to do the right thing and not build its facility, a 140,000-foot facility, on that battlefield where troops were massing.

The question for us is whether we can honor the fallen. And that, as my friend will tell you, is just the way it is.

WAL-MART VS. HALLOWED GROUND

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the historical comments my friend from Vermont has said regarding Union troops from his home State. The Battle of the Wilderness took place in May 1864.

On the second day of the 3-day battle with a statement made by General Lee, ''Texans always move them,'' the Texas Brigade successfully forced back Grant's Union troops. However, the Texans sustained 60 percent casualties.

There were 165,000 troops, Union and Confederate, in this Battle of the Wilderness. That is the number of troops that we have in Afghanistan and Iraq put together on one battlefield. There were 29,000 casualties. The fighting was so fierce in the dense woods it caught fire, and hundreds of wounded on both sides burned to death. Their graves are only known by God.

Mr. Speaker, those troops from the North and South were all Americans. Mr. Speaker, here is the battlefield. It is outlined in this black line. On this hallowed ground right here, you can see this X is where Wal-Mart wants to build one of their beautiful stores. There are other locations available for Wal-Mart. So we from the North and South in a bipartisan way want Wal-Mart to build someplace else.

And that's just the way it is.

MARCH MADNESS BRINGS US TOGETHER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans may disagree on things, and people in my city of Memphis may disagree on things over the years. But one thing that brings us together is March Madness, the NCAA tournament which tips off this morning.

In that tournament will be my home team, the University of Memphis Tigers. They have the longest winning streak in the country, 25 games, and they have the Coach of the Year in John Calipari. We have a great team that came just inches away from winning the national championship last year.

We were seeded number two this year rather than number one where we should have been. But this is the opportunity to show who deserves to be seeded number one. The University of Memphis Tigers that bring my community together and do something that basketball and sports can do for this country in bringing us together in difficult times and giving us a pastime that is so important will do well, and our city will cheer for them and see that they do well.

President Obama has picked them to make the Final Four. He was correct. He picked them to lose to Louisville; he was wrong. We will do well.

Go Tigers.

□ 1015

AIG SCANDAL

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today we understand that the Obama administration's stimulus bill—the $1 trillion stimulus bill—was also the AIG bonus protection plan, because we understand now today that language is contained within the stimulus bill that would ensure that the AIG bonuses would stay with the executives who received them.

The American people are outraged. We are outraged as well. But who knew about these bonuses? When did they know about it? CBS News has reported the Obama administration has known for weeks about these bonuses. Senator CHRIS DODD also said that he knew about these bonuses, put the amendment into place, but says it wasn't his language, it was the administration's language.

This is a scandal that is brewing in Washington. We need to have answers. The American people need answers. This is their money that is being spent for these failing businesses. It's time that the American people know what the real truth is.

AIG OUTRAGE

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in outrage over the recent news that AIG paid out over $165 million to

executives, some of whom are no longer with the company.

Every day in southern Nevada, families face tough decisions about their economic futures; can they afford to stay in their home? Are they going to be able to provide for their children's future?

I find it insulting that the CEO of AIG said that his decision to give out these bonuses was ''difficult.'' Difficult is trying to figure out how to keep a roof over your head when you've lost your job. Difficult is providing for your children when your hours at work have been cut back. Difficult is not deciding if you are going to dole out hundreds of millions of dollars to irresponsible Wall Street executives.

I urge Congress and the administration to act quickly to recoup the taxpayers' money.

NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 and 9, the young Government of Northern Ireland was put to the test. Two British soldiers and a policeman were killed by fringe groups trying to change peace to chaos, trying to reach the future through a return to the past. They failed, and the people of Northern Ireland became stronger.

The people voted for peace and acceptance of the Good Friday Agreement. The people voted for their First Minister Peter Robinson and Deputy First Minister Martin McGuinness, who jointly condemned the murders.

The people of Northern Ireland grew stronger when thousands of Catholics, Protestants, Unionists, and Nationalists marched together saying ''No going back.''

As Americans, as fellow lovers of freedom and democracy, we are with the people of Northern Ireland. We are both nations of law, and can only survive when the law is upheld.

God be with the families who have suffered a loss. And God bless the people and the peace of Northern Ireland.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 257

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 19, 2009, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure addressing excessive compensation paid to employees of corporations in which the Federal government has a significant interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. For the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time to myself as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, people across the country are rightly outraged by the egregious nature of the AIG bonuses. It is unconscionable for AIG to pay out $165 million in bonuses to the same top executives who mismanaged the company to the point of failure.

It is fundamentally wrong to be rewarding the very same people who ran AIG while it was losing billions and billions of dollars with risky schemes that directly led to the staggering $170 billion bailout last year. It is a stunning example of greed and shamelessness, and it is gross mismanagement and misuse of taxpayer funds that borders on criminal.

People in Maine, my district, and around the country are angry. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents sharing their outrage. One resident of Wells, Maine, in the straightforward way that my constituents do, wrote to me in this manner. He said, ''Let AIG fail. Let those greedy, bloodsucking executives find out what it means to lose their life savings. You need to tell those that want our tax dollars, these are the conditions, clear and simple. And if you don't want to use it for what we want, you will get nothing.'' He went on to say, ''It has become a sad day in our history when we have to lose our retirements, and then have to give billions to those that have caused the problems, and then, in turn, they give it to themselves as bonuses.''

Another Mainer wrote, ''I am writing to you because I am absolutely appalled that we, as citizens and taxpayers, have given billions of dollars to AIG, only to have that company give us all the proverbial finger and pay out $165 million in bonus money to their staff. AIG's conduct, given their own monetary losses that are in the billions of dollars, is criminal.''

The small businesses in my State of Maine are doing what businesses around the country are doing; they are diversifying, they are freezing wages. They are using their own resources, adopting cost-saving measures, whatever it takes to stay in business and keep people in their jobs.

Like so many businesses around the country, a businessman in Portland recently chose to dig into his own pocket and use his own money so he wouldn't have to lay off his employees. And just last week, I met with the owners of a small machine shop that had been growing. They came to me with questions about how they could better use the money in the recovery package to stay in business just to stay afloat. They weren't looking to line their own pockets, they were asking for help to keep people employed and keep their business afloat. These are the types of people who are stung the hardest by the AIG bonuses.

Families and businesses in Maine and across the country are struggling to make ends meet and stay in their homes. And they are helping each other out of a shared sense of responsibility. Meanwhile, on Wall Street, we see executives who seem to think they live by a different set of rules and who refuse to take responsibility for the damage they have caused. It is a perfect example of why we have, and will continue to have, a commitment to transparency and oversight in government.

When the House passed TARP last year before I was here, this type of abuse is exactly what the American people were afraid of. We knew there was a chance of waste, fraud or abuse, and now it has come to light. We are here today to fix it. We will continue to forge ahead to fix our struggling economy.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Ms. PINGREE, for yielding the time and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What concerns me about this scandalous AIG bonus issue is that the Obama administration was asleep at the wheel. Two weeks ago, the President's press secretary was asked, is the administration confident that it knows what happened to the tens of billions of dollars given to AIG? The response from the President's press secretary was, ''It is confident.''

Yesterday, we learned that the Obama administration asked the Senate Banking Committee chairman, Mr. DODD, to insert a provision in last month's so-called economic stimulus legislation that had the effect of authorizing AIG's bonuses. First, that gentleman who I just referred to said that he didn't know how the bonus authorization had made it into the legislation, but the next day he said yes, he authorized it after being asked to do so by the Obama administration.

Was the administration complicit? I think this is an issue that Congress needs to investigate. Yesterday, I made a motion on this floor that would have allowed debate on H.R. 1577, a bill introduced by my colleague, Representative PAULSEN, and the rest of the Republican freshmen, to deal with the

AIG bonus scandal. My motion was defeated, but it garnered bipartisan support. Every Republican voted for it, and so did eight Democrats on what is a procedural motion—very interesting. Although the motion failed, I am pleased that it attracted the attention of the majority leadership and they finally decided to take action on this scandal.

So, here we are today. Although I support the bills we will consider today, I find it quite unfortunate the way in which the majority leadership has decided to handle this scandal. The heavy-handed process they are using will block all Members of this House from offering amendments. It will also block every procedural right the minority has to shape legislation, including the motion to recommit. It will even limit debate on this important issue to a total of 40 minutes.

Why is the majority refusing Members to participate in the legislative process, Mr. Speaker? This is an issue that Members on both sides of the aisle feel outrage about, so why not allow Members to participate? Is it because the majority is afraid of the minority's thoughtful ideas? Actually, as Congress debated the so-called stimulus bill, it was the Republicans—the thoughtful opposition—who advocated for transparency and accountability, but again, the majority blocked effort after effort by the minority to participate in the legislative process. That is unfortunate.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlelady from the great State of Maine for yielding, and for her important leadership on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has become somewhat rare for the Members of this body to find themselves in virtually universal agreement, but outrage over the retention bonuses for the very members of the AIG Financial Products Division, who brought a corporate giant to its knees and the economy of our Nation to a standstill, has produced such an agreement.

It would be both morally reprehensible and fiscally irresponsible for us to quietly hand over millions to those who have cost this country billions. And it is a rare cause that compels so many Members, all acting independently, to craft bills aimed at righting the same wrong.

The bill we consider now to tax bonus payments, such as the ones in question at AIG, at the effective rate of 90 percent sends a message that cannot be mistaken. The game is finished, the casino is closed.

I applaud Speaker PELOSI, Mr. MILLER, and Chairman RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee for coming together so swiftly to react and incorporating ideas from many bills—from my colleague, STEVE ISRAEL, from GARY PETERS, from myself, from ELIJAH CUMMINGS, from many, many others—and coming forward swiftly with this bill that would tax at 90 percent. The remaining 10 percent would probably be taxed by States and cities.

If a company receives over $5 billion of taxpayers' money, and anyone earning over $250,000, they would be subject to this tax. So it moves the money back to the American taxpayer.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I'm shocked at the shock. I cannot believe that we are here and people are shocked. Every person—or, I don't want to offend anybody, but almost every person on the other side of the aisle—voted for the stimulus bill that had the provision in that protected, authorized, and allowed these bonuses. And today, they're shocked.

When Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden, they were then pictured with fig leaves. The bill they want to bring today isn't a fig leaf, it's a fig tree.

Now, Ross Perot, when he ran for President in 1992, he talked about the giant sucking sound. Well, today there is another giant sucking sound going on in Washington, D.C., and that's the tightening of sphincters on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue as people are having to explain who put into the stimulus bill this provision of law. And specifically, it's title VII, section 111, paragraph 3(i), that basically said that the bonuses that were paid out that people are shocked about today were protected and would not be touched.

Now, I think people have to man up around here and admit responsibility. Mr. Speaker, how much more time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I am happy to yield my 1½ minutes to anybody on the other side of the aisle who can tell us who was in the room, who took out the Wyden-Snowe amendment that prohibited this executive compensation and inserted section 111, subparagraph 3(i). Anybody?

Who did it? Was it some staffer? We see a Senator on the other side of the Capitol blaming it on the Treasury Secretary. We see the Treasury Secretary blaming the Senate. And the last time I checked, the Secretary of the Treasury doesn't have legislative authority. He didn't write it. Who wrote it?

What I do know is that we told you, how can you give us 90 minutes to read a piece of legislation that's over a thousand pages long? You said, well, who needs to read the legislation? Well, apparently, today, when the chickens have come home to roost, and we have read the legislation and the Democratic majority and the Democratic administration authorized AIG employees—73 of them—to get over a million dollars, today they're embarrassed.

□ 1030

And their response? It's a typical Democratic response: Let's tax people.

It's unconstitutional what they want to do; it's wrong what they want to do. And if we let the majority of this House that does not believe in transparency, that made us vote on a bill after giving us 90 minutes to read it, that is now embarrassed by the firestorm that's been created and the finger pointing that they're now engaging in, we shouldn't be here.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I too am shocked at the shock. When the stimulus bill came through the House, there were warnings from the minority party that we did not have time to read it, that we would find in that bill things that would be egregious and outrage the sensibilities of the American people.

But I will give credit where credit is due. It is, in fact, in this part a stimulus bill, for it stimulated the greed of the bonus babies at AIG because it protected and approved taxpayer-funded bonuses to that bailed-out company.

Facts are hard things to disprove. Every single Democrat in this House that voted for that bill voted to approve and protect those AIG bonuses. Every single Democrat in the Senate that voted for that stimulus bill, along with three Republican Senators, voted to approve and protect those AIG bonuses. The President of the United States signed into law the protection and approval of those AIG bonuses that they now find so repugnant now that the American people know what was done.

In my mind, this was part of a deliberate strategy to keep the employees at AIG who had broken the bank there to fix the mess that they had made. They knew that this Congress would not go alone with the executive bonuses being paid to bail out companies. They had to protect them with this amendment. It was dropped in in the dead of night.

If you are shocked, be shocked at the Members of your own party or administration that put it in and be shocked that we will now pass a bill of attainder that is unconstitutional to try to cover our, shall we say, tracks on this matter.

Here is the sad reality of where we are today. In a time of crisis, they passed the Wall Street bailout. The nightmarish prognostications of myself and others have been exceeded. Now what we find is an attempt to cover

one's tracks with another bill in a time of crisis that will leave no one, no one, safe from the hand of the taxman when the politicians come to cover their tracks at your expense.

The public deserves better. The public deserves transparency. We cannot fail them again.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, a recent headline read ''AIG is a P.I.G.'' And that's exactly the way that most Americans feel.

The TARP bill, however ill-thought out, was intended to slow the bleeding of our economy. Instead, that money is being used to line the pockets of the very crooks that drew the first blood. You know it and I know it and the American people know it.

However, what the American people do not know is who put that provision in the economic stimulus bill to ensure AIG's ability to pay out these outrageous bonuses. I don't know the answer to that. Was it Senator DODD? Well, just yesterday he said, no, he did it at the behest of the Obama White House. We need to remember this. The American people deserve to know who knew what, when they knew it.

We all agree that the fat cats at AIG shouldn't be rewarded for their irresponsible actions, and we'll take care of that today. But there are bigger questions.

This Member from Florida voted against the stimulus bill. However, most Democrats on the other side voted for the stimulus bill. And it's amazing that now they are so concerned and so shocked about a provision that was put in the bill that they fostered that never went through the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve. We held a very brief briefing on it, but we did not get to vote on it. We did not get to put any amendments onto it.

I would at this point yield to the gentlewoman handling the bill on the other side, Ms. PINGREE, to ask her, who had the opportunity to vote against it, why she didn't.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much for yielding.

I want to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we are here at this moment to pass the rule to allow us to fix this situation.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I don't believe that the gentlewoman responded to the question.

We're here today to remedy something that you had the opportunity to vote against, you and your colleagues had the opportunity to vote against. That language was in there.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wasn't here. Just to remind you, although I'm happy to be here to manage this bill, I was not here when many Members of the House voted on that particular bill. But I do want to say all of us in this Chamber had the opportunity to vote on the conditions on the TARP to make sure we dealt with things like executive compensation, and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in fact, most of them, refused to vote in favor of those conditions. So we have had those opportunities to do that over time.

I do agree it should be further investigated exactly how things happened here. We are in one of the most tumultuous times in our economy than any of us have ever faced or previous generations have faced. But I personally voted in favor of those conditions of the TARP. And I do find it a little disingenuous to find many of my new colleagues, whom I am just getting to know, so anxious to talk about executive compensation, capping executive compensation, looking at this, when it was an issue that only probably weeks or months ago they wouldn't have gone near with a 10-foot pole. In fact, they wouldn't even have discussed this. They would have said leave business to itself, we're not going to get involved in this particular issue. This is an issue that has concerned me and my constituents back in my home State for a long time. I was proud to vote in favor of the conditions of the TARP.

And I want to remind my colleagues again we are here today to allow this rule to come to the floor so that we can have full debate on all of the opportunities afforded to us in this bill and this will be with us in only moments as soon as we vote in favor of this rule.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, let me say that what Ms. BROWN-WAITE was talking about was the $800 billion so-called stimulus package. In that legislation was the authorization for these bonuses to AIG. And my understanding is that all of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for that stimulus package. So that's for the record.

And I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to urge their leadership to take processes seriously. I remember when, that week of the stimulus package, the so-called stimulus package with $800 billion, the House unanimously voted for a 48-hour period for everybody to be able to see what was in that package, and yet the majority leadership ignored the unanimous view of the House.

So I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to tell their leadership, please, pay attention to the will of the House, especially and including on process, because we now see that when process is abused, things make it into legislation that later embarrasses those who vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule as well as the bill because of the lack of need for this and the disgrace that this has brought upon us.

Yesterday, for instance, the Federal Reserve met and they came out and announced that they would create new money to the tune of $1.25 trillion. The dollar promptly went down 3 percent, and today it went down another 1.5 percent. And today on emergency legislation, we're going to deal with $165 million worth of bonuses, which obviously should have never been given. But who's responsible for this? It's the Congress and the President, who signed this.

So this is a distraction. This is an outrage so everybody can go home that voted for this bill and say, look, I am clamping down on this $165 million but I don't care about the previous $5 trillion the Fed created and the $1.25 trillion they created yesterday.

Think of the loss in purchasing power in less than 24 hours. And we think that we can solve this problem. We first appropriate, unconstitutionally, $350 billion. We give it to the Treasury. We have no strings attached. And then you have an unintended consequence; so we express this outrage. And at the same time, what do we do? We come along and we now propose that we pass a bill of attainder. So we do things that are unconstitutional. They have an unintended consequence. So what is our solution? To further undermine the Constitution.

A line should be drawn in the sand. Let's quit appropriating funds in an unconstitutional manner. Let's quit bankrupting this country. Let's quit destroying our dollar.

If you really want to do something, you ought to consider H.R. 1207, which would monitor and make the Fed answer questions. I understand the Fed and the Treasury were involved in a lot of these antics, and yet the Fed is not even required to answer any questions.

So it's about time we have an open book about the Federal Reserve and solve some of these problems.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, just in a quick answer to my good colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, I was proud to vote in favor of this stimulus bill and very happy to vote for things that are helping my district at this very moment around health care and jobs and road construction and things that are desperately needed in my State.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado for her leadership, and it's a pleasure to be on the floor with her today. Let me as well thank the Speaker for the opportunity to educate the American public and to dialogue with my colleagues.

I think it's important to note that about 1.1 or 3 trillion of the debt that we are facing is the result of the past administration. We are now climbing a very difficult mountain because of the enormous amount of irresponsibility that occurred. Today we are trying to fix problems that were contractually based, already existing. And certainly we recognize that we have a combination of a deficit, we have an increasing unemployment rate, and we have an important challenge of fixing the collapsed financial markets.

Everybody has heard of AIG. They finance and insure almost every aspect of our lives. And it was this leadership that focused on the recovery of providing stimulus dollars to our community. It was this leadership that infused into the stimulus package unemployment benefits to extend to hardworking Americans. And certainly it is this leadership that intends to fix this debacle. We will do it together. We will ensure that the moneys that were given to those, either unjustly or unfairly, are returned to the American public.

I don't like the format that we are dealt or the cards that we are dealt. I don't like the idea that we were told that these were existing contracts, that these were retention bonuses.

But now as the transparency opens up, good news. The American people, all of us, can see the structures of capitalism that we'd like to change. But we do believe in Americans being able to recover their investments. We want small businesses to survive. We believe in a capitalistic system. But it has to be fixed. Today is the day we fix it and provide the return of taxpayer dollars.

I am supporting the underlying rule because it is a sense of urgency now. And what we are doing is giving the opportunity to give money back.

I'm a lawyer. I realize that this may be subjected to constitutional challenge and/or the courts, but you know? I'm prepared to battle in the courts. Why? Because they look at issues of equity. What does equity mean? It means who's in here with unclean hands, and if there is a situation where they are taking Federal money, such as AIG, and all of a sudden they give retention bonuses, our courts will look at this legislation and say it is fair to give the money back to the American people because the circumstances have changed. So I'd rather take the chance of going forward on your behalf. And I am grateful to the leadership for allowing us to debate legislation that will help return the money.

We also protect those recipients. If you are making under $250,000, we do not take that money back.

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

□ 1045

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, facts are inconvenient things and the United States Constitution is an inconvenient truth at times, particularly when Congress wants to show it's upset about something it already did.

Here are the facts. In the stimulus package, an amendment was adopted that the majority put in, the majority voted for, stating that provisions in the TARP and in the stimulus bills that limited compensation payments would not apply to ''any bonus payment required to be paid pursuant to a written employment contract executed on or before February 11, 2009.''

It was written specifically to protect the very bonuses that we are talking about here today. So now we are asking, how do we undo what we did? And the majority has brought to us a bill that doesn't recognize the truth of the Constitution.

There is something called a bill of attainder. You cannot punish a group because you don't like them. You can't have them treated more onerously than somebody else without a trial.

Now, that's an unfortunate truth that we have to deal with. How can we deal with this? Yesterday in Judiciary Committee, applying bankruptcy principles, we had an alternative. But that's not here on the floor today, because that's arguably constitutional. This is to get headlines to show that we are outraged.

But let me tell you, if we overturn the Constitution to show our outrage, no single American is safe. Because in the future what we will do is say we have a precedent that when we have an unpopular group, when we have a group that deserves some punishment, we won't go through the real laws, what we will do is we will pass a new tax law with confiscatory rates and say we have done it for the American people.

Well, if you do that, you are tearing up the Constitution. I didn't come here to tear up the Constitution to undo something that the majority did just a few weeks ago. We are better than that. We need to protect our Constitution.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts and my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are not tearing up the Constitution here, we are responding to bad behavior. We are telling corporate America that we are not going to bail them out, our financial institutions. We are not going to bail them out and let them do what AIG just did.

The American people are outraged, and rightly so, at the news that insurance giant AIG has given large bonuses to some of its employees. It is outrageous that a company that is being bailed out by the American people is providing bonuses to the people who dealt in these exotic financial instruments. Those employees made bad bets, and now the American people are paying the tab.

Mr. Speaker, not many of my constituents are getting so-called retention bonuses these days, and I can tell you that. They are not sure if they are going to wake up tomorrow with a job.

In Fall River, the unemployment rate is 16 percent. The city is being forced to lay off police officers and firefighters. Food banks are at their capacity, and they are being asked to pony up so-called retention bonuses for the people who got us into this mess? It is absolutely nuts.

Now I know that the CEO of AIG said yesterday that he has asked the people who have received these bonuses to give them back, and that's great. But I am afraid we can't simply rely on their good-hearted generosity. I understand, and I support the need to ensure the stability of the American banking system.

We need to get the credit flowing again. We need to make sure that people have access to mortgages and car loans and student loans. We need to make sure that small businesses have access to credit.

But we also need to make sure that bad behavior isn't rewarded with taxpayer money, and that's what this bill is all about. And as President Obama has rightly said, we must also put in place the appropriate rules and regulations going forward so that this kind of financial collapse never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get this right. We inherited a lousy economy from the previous administration, and we are in a position now where we need to help us support our financial institutions, but we need to make sure that we do so in a way that doesn't allow this kind of bad behavior to continue.

I applaud Speaker PELOSI and the leadership for bringing this bill to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former colleague, the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Bill Archer, always provided us with a great directive. He said here in this institution we should follow the Hippocratic Oath, that being to do no harm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know full well that the stimulus package had no Republican support, and many Republicans were maligned for having just

said ''no.'' And we all know very well, Democrats, Republicans alike know that we as Republicans came forward with a bold, robust, strong stimulus package ourselves, but they said we were just the Party of No.

Well, the fact of the matter is, again we offered a viable alternative. But we know very well that rushing as we did to this stimulus package is what has led to the challenge that our friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to clean up today. A great deal of harm has been done and this, Mr. Speaker, is just one tiny example.

Over in the visitor's center right now a hearing is being held by our Economic Stimulus Working Group, and testimony was just provided by a man called Mike Stevens of Action Printing from Lubbock, Texas. He was talking about the challenge of trying to get a printing press, and he said that only those banks that did not accept TARP monies had the flexibility to get the credit that he needed to purchase his printing press.

Mr. Speaker, if that example does not underscore, again, that the reach of government into our lives, trying to own companies and engage in this kind of activity is jeopardizing the potential for economic recovery, I believe that it is an absolute mistake for us to be going down this road. And I think those of us who stood up in opposition to this stimulus package have, in fact, had the statement made very, very clear.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. DOGGETT.

Mr. DOGGETT. AIG—It has become shorthand for ''Arrogant, Irresponsible Greed.'' The big difference between the AIG insurance bootleggers and Ponzi felon Bernie Madoff is Madoff hasn't asked for a bailout yet, although taxpayers are providing him public housing in prison.

Of course, we wouldn't need to react so swiftly today about these outrageous bonuses if more people had been willing to speak out, not in January, but last September, when the Bush bailout provided almost $1 trillion on unconditional terms. So many here accepted it, hook, line and sinker. Some of us urged last September the dangers of a bailout with no effective limitation on executive compensation, or on compelling taxpayers to bail out the rest of the world.

Well, today's bill is very important in restoring Eisenhower-level taxes to those who took these bailouts. We need to ensure that it gets to the bonuses paid to foreign AIG employees. We need to question why this bailout helped AIG provide 20 European banks almost $60 billion, without asking them to sacrifice one red cent.

The same arrogance and indifference to the struggles of American families that necessitate today's bill, means that some of the most creative people in the world are already working to find ways around the bill. They will use the same creativity they have employed to dodge their tax responsibilities by going to offshore tax havens, and creating subsidiaries, and other creative means that we need to guard against in this legislation.

Meaningful reform means getting behind thoroughly crafted legislation that returns accountability, transparency, responsibility, and the rule of law to markets that haven't had the rule of law for the last 8 years.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Ever since the Bush Administration insisted taxpayers fund a near bottomless bailout, the problem has been battling the mindset that some folks are special—they are above responsibility for their actions, above any public accountability.

Today's legislation is important. It has been swift. It is an overdue step that Congress needs to take, but it must be the first step, not the last.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, no more blaming Bush. Mr. DODD said that it's the Obama administration that asked them to authorize these bonuses.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by submitting for the record the vote record for the stimulus bill, which included the provision for the AIG bonuses that the administration pushed for, showing that the gentlelady from Maine, who said earlier that she had not voted for these bonuses, when she told the gentleman from Florida she didn't vote it.

HOUSE ROLLCALL VOTE 70, FEB. 13, 2009

YEAS (246)

Republicans (0).

Democrats (246): Abercrombie (HI–01), Ackerman (NY–05), Adler (NJ–03), Altmire (PA–04), Andrews (NJ–01), Arcuri (NY–24), Baca (CA–43), Baird (WA–03), Baldwin (WI–02), Barrow (GA–12), Bean (IL–08), Becerra (CA–31), Berkley (NV–01), Berman (CA–28), Berry (AR–01), Bishop, S. (GA–02), Bishop, T. (NY–01), Blumenauer (OR–03), Boccieri (OH–16), Boren (OK–02), Boswell (IA–03), Boucher (VA–09), Boyd, A. (FL–02), Brady, R. (PA–01), Braley (IA–01), Brown, C. (FL–03), Butterfield (NC–01), Capps (CA–23), Capuano (MA–08), Cardoza (CA–18), Carnahan (MO–03), Carney (PA–10), Carson, A. (IN–07), Castor (FL–11), Chandler (KY–06), Childers (MS–01), Clarke (NY–11), Clay (MO–01), Cleaver (MO–05), Cohen (TN–09), Connolly (VA–11), Conyers (MI–14), Cooper (TN–05), Costa (CA–20), Costello (IL–12), Courtney (CT–02), Crowley (NY–07), Cuellar (TX–28), Cummings (MD–07), Dahlkemper (PA–03), Davis, A. (AL–07), Davis, D. (IL–07), Davis, L. (TN–04), Davis, S. (CA–53), DeGette (CO–01), Delahunt (MA–10), DeLauro (CT–03), Dicks (WA–06), Dingell (MI–15), Doggett (TX–25), Donnelly (IN–02), Doyle (PA–14), Driehaus (OH–01), Edwards, C. (TX–17), Edwards, D. (MD–04), Ellison (MN–05), Ellsworth (IN–08), Engel (NY–17), Eshoo (CA–14), Etheridge (NC–02), Farr (CA–17), Fattah (PA–02), Filner (CA–51), Foster (IL–14), Frank, B (MA–04), Fudge (OH–11), Giffords (AZ–08), Gonzalez (TX–20), Gordon (TN–06), Grayson (FL–08), Green, A. (TX–09), Green, G. (TX–29), Grijalva (AZ–07), Gutierrez (IL–04), Hall, J. (NY–I9), Halvorson (IL–11), Hare (IL–17), Harman (CA–36), Hastings, A. (FL–23), Heinrich (NM–01), Herseth Sandlin (SD–AL), Higgins (NY–27), Hill (IN–09), Himes (CT–04), Hinchey (NY–22), Hinojosa (TX–15), Hirono (HI–02), Hodes (NH–02), Holden (PA–17), Holt (NJ–I2), Honda (CA–I5), Hoyer (MD–05), Inslee (WA–01), Israel (NY–02), Jackson, J. (IL–02), Jackson Lee (TX–18), Johnson, E. (TX–30), Johnson, H. (GA–04), Kagen (WI–08), Kanjorski (PA–11), Kaptur (OH–09), Kennedy, P. (RI–01), Kildee (MI–05), Kilpatrick (MI–13), Kilroy (OH–I5), Kind (W1–03), Kirkpatrick (AZ–01), Kissell (NC–08), Klein, R. (FL–22), Kosmas (FL–24), Kratovil (MD–01), Kucinich (OH–10), Langevin (RI–02), Larsen, R. (WA–02), Larson, J. (CT–01), Lee (CA–09), Levin, S. (MI–12), Lewis, John (GA–05), Loebsack (IA–02), Lofgren (CA–16), Lowey (NY–18), Lujan (NM–03), Lynch (MA–09), Maffei (NY–25), Maloney (NY–14), Markey, B. (CO–04), Markey, E. (MA–07), Marshall (GA–08), Massa (NY–29), Matheson (UT–02), Matsui (CA–05), McCarthy, C. (NY–04), McCollum (MN–04), McDermott (WA–07), McGovern (MA–03), McIntyre (NC–07), McMahon (NY–13), McNerney (CA–11), Meek, K. (FL–17), Meeks, G. (NY–06), Melancon (LA–03), Michaud (ME–02), Miller, B. (NC–13), Miller, George (CA–07), Mitchell (AZ–05), Mollohan (WV–01), Moore, D. (KS–03), Moore, G. (WI–04), Moran, James (VA–08), Murphy, C. (CT–05), Murphy, P. (PA–08), Murtha (PA–12), Nadler (NY–08), Napolitano (CA–38), Neal (MA–02), Nye (VA–02), Oberstar (MN–08), Obey (WI–07), Olver (MA–01), Ortiz (TX–27), Pallone (NJ–06), Pascrell (NJ–08), Pastor (AZ–04), Payne (NJ–10), Pelosi (CA–08), Perlmutter (CO–07), Perriello (VA–05), Peters (MI–09), Pingree (ME–01), Polis (CO–02), Pomeroy (ND–AL), Price, D. (NC–04), Rahall (WV–03), Rangel (NY–15), Reyes (TX–16), Richardson (CA–37), Rodriguez (TX–23), Ross (AR–04), Rothman (NJ–09), Roybal-Allard (CA–34), Ruppersberger (MD–02), Rush (IL–01), Ryan, T. (OH–17), Salazar, J. (CO–03), Sanchez, Linda (CA–39), Sanchez, Loretta (CA–47), Sarbanes (MD–03), Schakowsky (IL–09), Schauer (MI–07), Schiff (CA–29), Schrader (OR–05), Schwartz (PA–13), Scott, D. (GA–13), Scott, R. (VA–03), Serrano (NY–16), Sestak (PA–07), Shea-Porter (NH–01), Sherman (CA–27), Sires (NJ–13), Skelton (MO–04), Slaughter (NY–28), Smith, Adam (WA–09), Snyder (AR–02), Solis (CA–32), Space (OH–18), Speier (CA–12), Spratt (SC–05), Stark (CA–13), Stupak (MI–01), Sutton (OH–13), Tanner (TN–08), Tauscher (CA–10), Teague (NM–02), Thompson, B. (MS–02), Thompson, M. (CA–01), Tierney (MA–06), Titus (NV–03), Tonko (NY–21), Towns (NY–10), Tsongas (MA–05), Van Hollen (MD–08), Velazquez (NY–12), Visclosky (IN–01), Walz (MN–01), Wasserman Schultz (FL–20), Waters (CA–35), Watson (CA–33), Watt (NC–12), Waxman (CA–30), Weiner (NY–09), Welch (VT–AL), Wexler (FL–19), Wilson, Charlie (OH–06), Woolsey (CA–06), Wu (OR–01), Yarmuth (KY–03).

NAYS (183)

Republicans (176): Aderholt (AL–04), Akin (MO–02), Alexander, R. (LA–05), Austria (OH–07), Bachmann (MN–06), Bachus, S. (AL–06), Barrett (SC–03), Bartlett (MD–06), Barton (TX–06), Biggert (IL–13), Bilbray (CA–50), Bilirakis (FL–09), Bishop, R. (UT–01), Blackburn (TN–07), Blunt (MO–07), Boehner (OH–08), Bonner (AL–01), Bono Mack (CA–45), Boozman (AR–03), Boustany (LA–07), Brady, K. (TX–08), Broun (GA–10), Brown, H. (SC–01), Brown-Waite, G. (FL–05), Buchanan (FL–13), Burgess (TX–26), Burton (IN–05), Buyer (IN–04), Calvert (CA–44), Camp (MI–04), Cantor (VA–07), Cao (LA–02), Capito (WV

0902), Carter (TX–31), Cassidy (LA–06), Castle (DE–AL), Chaffetz (UT–03), Coble (NC–06), Coffman (CO–06), Cole (OK–04), Conaway (TX–11), Crenshaw (FL–04), Culberson (TX–07), Davis, G. (KY–04), Deal (GA–09), Dent (PA–15), Diaz-Balart, L. (FL–21), Diaz-Balart, M. (FL–25), Dreier (CA–26), Duncan (TN–02), Ehlers (MI–03), Emerson (MO–08), Fallin (OK–05), Flake (AZ–06), Fleming (LA–04), Forbes (VA–04), Fortenberry (NE–01), Foxx (NC–05), Franks, T. (AZ–02), Frelinghuysen (NJ–11), Gallegly (CA–24), Garrett (NJ–05), Gerlach (PA–06), Gingrey (GA–11), Gohmert (TX–01), Goodlatte (VA–06), Granger (TX–12), Graves (MO–06), Guthrie (KY–02), Hall, R. (TX–04), Harper (MS–03), Hastings, D. (WA–04), Heller (NV–02), Hensarling (TX–05), Herger (CA–02), Hoekstra (MI–02), Hunter (CA–52), Inglis (SC–04), Issa (CA–49), Jenkins (KS–02), Johnson, S. (TX–03), Johnson, Timothy (IL–15), Jones, W. (NC–03), Jordan (OH–04), King, P. (NY–03), King. S. (IA–05), Kingston (GA–01), Kirk (IL–10), Kline. J. (MN–02), Lamborn (CO–05), Lance (NJ–07), Latham (IA–04), LaTourette (OH–14), Latta (OH–05), Lewis, Jerry (CA–41), Linder (GA–07), LoBiondo (NJ–02), Lucas (OK–03), Luetkemeyer (MO–09), Lummis (WY–AL), Lungren (CA–03), Mack (FL–14), Manzullo (IL–16), Marchant (TX–24), McCarthy, K. (CA–22), McCaul (TX–10), McClintock (CA–04), McCotter (M1–11), McHenry (NC–10), McHugh (NY–23), McKeon (CA–25), McMorris Rodgers (WA–05), Mica (FL–07), Miller, C. (MI–10), Miller, Gary (CA–42), Miller, J. (FL–01), Moran, Jerry (KS–01), Murphy, T. (PA–18), Myrick (NC–09), Neugebauer (TX–19), Nunes (CA–21), Olson (TX–22), Paul (TX–14), Paulsen (MN–03), Pence (IN–06), Petri (WI–06), Pitts (PA–16), Plaits (PA–19), Poe (TX–02), Posey (FL–15), Price, T. (GA–06), Putnam (FL–12), Radanovich (CA–19), Rehberg (MT–AL), Reichert (WA–08), Roe (TN–01), Rogers, H. (KY–05), Rogers, Mike (MI–08), Rogers, Mike D. (AL–03), Rohrabacher (CA–46), Rooney (FL–16), Roskam (IL–06), Ros-Lehtinen (FL–18), Royce (CA–40), Ryan, P. (WI–01), Scalise (LA–01), Schmidt (OH–02), Schock (IL–18), Sensenbrenner (WI–05), Sessions, P. (TX–32), Shadegg (AZ–03), Shimkus (IL–19), Shuster (PA–09), Simpson (ID–02), Smith, Adrian (NE–03), Smith, C. (NJ–04), Smith, L. (TX–21), Souder (IN–03), Stearns (FL–06), Sullivan (OK–01), Terry (NE–02), Thompson, G. (PA–05), Thornberry (TX–13), Tiahrt (KS–04), Tiberi (OH–12), Turner (OH–03), Upton (MI–06), Walden (OR–02), Wamp (TN–03), Westmoreland (GA–03), Whitfield (KY–01), Wilson, J. (SC–02), Wittman (VA–01), Wolf (VA–10), Young, C.W. (FL–10), Young, D. (AK–AL).

Democrats (7): Bright (AL–02), DeFazio (OR–04), Griffith (AL–05), Minnick (ID–01), Peterson (MN–07), Shuler (NC–11), Taylor (MS–04).

NOT VOTING (4)

Republicans (2): Campbell (CA–48), Lee, C. (NY–26).

Democrats (2): Clyburn (SC–06), Lipinski (IL–03) P.

Mr. Speaker, this rushed legislation is coming from the same people who threw together the final stimulus bill in the dead of night and gave us over 12 hours to read over 1,000 pages, the same people who drafted the stimulus bill containing a provision that gave the green light to these $1 million bonuses. They have never learned the expression ''Act in haste, repent at leisure.''

It's important to note that the same majority, Democrat majority that's expressing outrage over these AIG bonuses—rightly expressing outrage, I might add—is the same majority that voted overwhelmingly for the so-called stimulus that paved the way for these bonuses.

Let's take a measured approach. Unlike the approach that President Bush took on the bailout-panic last fall, unlike the stimulus frenzy last month that put us where we are today, we can recoup this money in a constitutional manner. In fact, Republicans have a bill that will allow us to do that, but they will not let us vote on that bill.

Now, let me say, also, that we got a letter, or the leadership of this House got a letter, dated January 12, 2009, from Mr. Summers, Dr. Summers, saying, that, he ''will ask his Department of Treasury to put in place strict and sensible conditions on CEO compensation and dividend payments until taxpayers get their money back. We will ensure that resources are directed to increasing lending and preventing new financial crises and not to enriching shareholders and executives.''

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. MCGOVERN, another Member of the Rules Committee, said, ''The statement by the Obama administration, the statement by Larry Summers, is all very encouraging. It demonstrates a real appreciation of what average people are going through.''

They really understand average people in this country.

This bill unconstitutionally gets, back 1/1000th—that's one one thousandth of the bailout cash that AIG has gotten. We need to get all of it back—all $170 billion. We need a bailout exit strategy. And passing unconstitutional laws is not an exit strategy.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for bringing in my voting record and remind her that I was very proud to vote for the stimulus or recovery package, whichever we choose to call it, and have already stated that on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me set the record straight, particularly with regard to the comments of Mr. DREIER from California. The TARP bill is the one that provided the bailouts. It contained highly ineffectual, giant loophole-containing limits on executive compensation.

Not surprisingly, those provisions did not prevent the outrageous AIG bonuses, nor do they prevent million-dollar a month salaries. It is the TARP bill which should have limited and pretended to limit executive compensation to those who got money from the TARP bill. The gentleman from California voted for the TARP bill, as I understand it. I voted against it, twice.

Then in January we considered a bill that had little or nothing to do with the TARP bailout. It, thankfully, included some effort to control bonuses. That was in addition to the restrictions found in the TARP bill. It was a step in the right direction, but it was not enough to stop AIG bonuses. To attack people for voting to make the TARP Program a little better, and to have those attacks come from somebody who voted for the TARP bill, seems just a little outrageous.

But what about the bill we are going to consider today? It's a good step, but it ain't going to get us where we need to go. Because the bill we will consider today allows for half-million-dollar a month salaries, million-dollar a month salaries, without any taxation, without any limitation, without any effect from this legislation, just as those million-dollar a month salaries were unaffected by the TARP bill and by the stimulus bill.

□ 1100

We need to come to this floor next week and improve the bill that I hope we pass today—to deal with all executive compensation, not just bonuses. Because if you think people are angry today at the AIG bonuses, you see how angry they get when we tell them we've solved the problem and then they find out some people at bailed-out firms are getting $500,000 a month salaries. Because they couldn't get bonuses, they went to the employer and said, Well, better make it $1 million a month.

We have got to deal with the entire compensation package.

The bill we'll consider today also allows unlimited commissions. Now, you could argue that maybe certain commissions shouldn't be limited. But if you don't define the word commission, you can be sure everybody on Wall Street will rename what would have been a bonus into a commission. And it will not be taxed under the bill we are going to deal with today.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentlelady. Finally, the bill we are going to deal with today deals only with executives of firms that have received capital infusions of over $5 billion. That means that they got $5 billion and they sold the Treasury their preferred stock.

Well, that's the way we did business last year. Now Treasury is about to stop buying preferred stock. They're going to start buying toxic assets.

The bill we'll consider today does not deal with those firms who sell $5 billion, $10 billion, $50 billion worth of toxic assets to the U.S. government. So we have to deal with the bailed-out firms that get over $5 billion, whether they get it for toxic assets or whether they get it for preferred stock.

We have to deal with salaries, we have to deal with commissions, we have to deal with Employee of the Week bonus payments or prize payments. We have to deal with all aspects

of compensation. Until then, our constituents will be justifiably skeptical.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, it seems altogether appropriate that the President is appearing on the Jay Leno show tonight. The administration's response to the AIG debacle has been nothing short of a comedy routine all week long. And we in Congress have played Laurel to the administration's Hardy all week long.

What we are about to do with this legislation, however, is not a laughing matter. We are responding to our failure to adequately review the stimulus bill by passing a bill that we have spent even less time reviewing.

A cursory review of this legislation seems to reveal that it's nothing more than a bill of attainder—a measure that is clearly unconstitutional. Does that matter to anyone here?

Let me offer just one example of why we should subject this legislation to a bit more deliberation. We don't have sufficient money in the Treasury, nor can we responsibly borrow enough money to purchase the toxic assets currently on the balance sheets of our financial institutions. We are going to need a great deal of investment from the private sector to do that.

Who in the private sector, Mr. Speaker, seeing what we are doing here today, would put their own money at risk for the possibility of financial return if they know that Congress, with one day's notice, can pass legislation to tax 90 percent of it?

It's tough enough, Mr. Speaker, for government to control the commanding heights of the economy without riding a high horse while doing it.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Last fall, like a majority of House Republicans, I opposed the Wall Street bailout because I feared we'd arrive at days like today, in part. House Republicans share the outrage of the American people that AIG would use taxpayer dollars to award executive bonuses during an economic crisis. But the Democratic bill brought to the floor today is constitutionally questionable. In its obviously transparent attempt to divert attention away from the truth, the Democrats in Congress and this administration made these bonus payments possible.

House Republicans believe the American people deserve 100 percent of their money back. House Republicans have proposed legislation that will deny AIG one more dime of bailout money until they have recovered all of the bonus payments from their employees.

Lastly, the American people deserve to know this whole outrage could have been avoided. The truth is that it was a Democrat Senator from Oregon, RON WYDEN, who authored thoughtful legislation that would have banned executive bonuses included in the stimulus bill, and it was—late in the night, late in the process—removed.

Here's what he had to say about it. Senator WYDEN told the Associated Press, ''The President goes out and says this is not acceptable, then some backroom deal gets cut and lets these things get paid out anyway.

''He said, 'I think it's unfortunate.' He said we could have had a well-targeted message 'which would have communicated how strongly the administration felt about blocking these executive bonuses,' but I wasn't able to convince them.''

''Even Senator CHRIS DODD, the head of the conference committee for the stimulus bill said, 'I didn't negotiate with myself. I wasn't trying to change it on my own. The administration had expressed reservations. They asked for modifications.' ''

The American people deserve to know that, thanks to the work of Senator RON WYDEN and Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, we wouldn't be here today, because the stimulus bill would have banned these bonuses altogether. But that language was removed.

The American people deserve 100 percent of their money back. They deserve to know why House Democrats blocked efforts to ban executive bonuses. We deserve the truth.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. The Democrats have actually controlled this Congress for over the last 2 years, and it was the Democrats who controlled the passage of the TARP legislation in the first place. I voted against that legislation.

But ABC News reported yesterday that ''during late-night, closed-door negotiations for the House, Senate, and White House, a measure was stripped out of the stimulus bill that could have restricted these AIG bonuses. The Senate had approved the amendment to the stimulus bill aimed at restricting bonuses over $100,000 that had been authored by OLYMPIA SNOWE and by RON WYDEN. Then, the provision was stripped out during the closed-door conference involving House and Senate leaders and the White House. Dodd's measure explicitly exempted bonuses agreed to prior to the passage of the stimulus bill.''

Now, most of the Democratic Members voted for this on the House floor, all of the Republicans voted against it. That's the record.

We should vote ''aye'' on this bill. And the reason we should is because it's going to stop executives from coming here to take TARP funds from Washington. It's going to stop capitalists from being converted into quasi-socialists. That's the reason we should vote ''aye.''

I brought an amendment to this floor in 2005 to try to prevent—with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—to try to regulate them for systemic risk, arguing that their over-leveraging as GSEs was going to cause bankruptcy and a financial collapse. It was voted down.

It was voted down, but this year those executives from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, it was reported yesterday, they are going to get over $1 million in bonuses.

How do we stop every executive coming to this town to get TARP money and over-leveraging their firms and then the consequent bailout at cost to the taxpayers?

Well, we passed legislation removing their bonuses so that all of the time and effort that these business executives put into coming to D.C. is reversed.

When you take TARP money, when they do that, they have the full backing of the U.S. government behind them. So they can borrow money without market discipline and without limit, at a lower interest rate than their competitors, and drive them out of business, which is what AIG is doing right now to other smaller private sector businesses.

It's 80 percent owned by the government. Without that market discipline, what consequently happens, economists tell us—and this is exactly what happened with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac as government-sponsored enterprises—they drive out their competition, they become larger and larger, they over-leverage, and then they collapse, requiring more in government infusions of capital into these institutions.

You have got to change the incentive structure. You have got to put up a firewall between government and the markets. You don't want these fellows down here with their lobbyists. You don't want these men and women, these executives down here trying to figure out ways to get the taxpayers to back them so that they can become quasi-GSEs, because the long-term consequence of becoming a government-sponsored enterprise is the same as what happened to Fannie and Freddie.

This is what economists have tried to explain to us. We finally have a method to distinguish between those in the private sector, those who are free-market businessmen, who are going to take risks, not with government money, and are going to make a salary and are going to pay bonuses to their executives, and those who decide that they want to be quasi-public in nature, that they want to be like Fannie and Freddie.

Why should they make bonuses of $1 million a year this year for Fannie and Freddie? Why should they make twice as much as they made in bonuses last year? It is only because, unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle did not listen to this argument on TARP funding.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, the people have spoken on the extraordinary issue of AIG lavishing fat bonuses on some of its executives. Indeed, some of the very people whose reckless actions destroyed this once great company. The people have said no. In fact, they've said: Hell no. And give us our money back.

This is not just another case of runaway corporate greed and arrogance, ripping off shareholders by excesses lavished around the executive suite. These bonuses represent a squandering of the people's money because it's the vast sums we have been forced to pour into this now pathetic company.

The bill before us is unlike any tax bill I have ever seen. But it reflects the strong feelings of our constituents and the bipartisan will of this body. We will not tolerate these actions. We are not going to wring our hands, shake our heads, look at our feet and mumble ''Ain't it a shame.''

Starting right here, right now, we are saying: No more. We are saying: Give us our money back. And we will not stop until we get it back.

The fact that we have to take this step at all is appalling to me. Have the recipients of these checks no shame at all? They failed in their work. They wrecked a corporate icon. They contributed mightily to the economic crash that has cost the Treasury $170 billion so far. And they want to cash their bonus checks.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield another 30 seconds.

Mr. POMEROY. Let today's vote say loud and clear to those running to cash their ill-gotten checks: You disgust us. By any measure, you are disgraced, professional losers. By the way, give us our money back.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. We want the money back—the money that was used for executive bonuses.

But I rise today in opposition to this rule. Frankly, I find it incredibly disappointing how this Congress has handled the AIG situation. And now the majority is simply repeating the same mistakes that led us here.

As we all know, the 1,100-page stimulus package was made public in the dead of night, just hours before the vote. No one could have read it except those that crafted it behind closed doors. No committee hearings were held, no alternatives or amendments were permitted. And now we find another reason why the majority didn't want it exposed to close scrutiny.

Apparently the majority quietly stripped out language passed in the Senate that would have blocked these outrageous bonuses funded with taxpayer dollars.

And who is responsible? First, no one took responsibility or seemed to have any idea who did it. Then Senator DODD admitted that he stripped out the language at the behest of the administration.

Now Congress is making the same bad mistake by passing another piece of rushed legislation introduced in one day, and hasn't had the proper scrutiny.

□ 1115

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who has legislation filed and who has been working diligently on this issue, Mr. PAULSEN.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also agree that taxpayers deserve 100 percent of their money back. But, Mr. Speaker, I would urge our colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule that is before us today.

Voting ''no'' on this rule today will allow us to consider the very commonsense proposal that we tried to bring up yesterday and now that the gentleman from Florida is trying to bring up once again today, a bipartisan proposal, actually, that would require not only that the bonuses get returned, have the Treasury Department return those bonuses, but, more importantly, put accountability in place so it never happens again. No more excuses. Requiring the Treasury Department to sign off on any future bonuses, requiring the Treasury Department to sign off on any future contracts regarding TARP legislation.

The bill that is being brought to the floor by the majority today was hastily written, as were provisions of the stimulus bill. It is covering the shoddy work that was done in the oversight of the TARP funds, the shoddy work that was put together in the stimulus bill, and it is covering up the shoddy work as well of government incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, let's have a vote for accountability by voting ''no'' on this provision so we can insert better bipartisan legislation.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am the last speaker for this side. I will reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and yielded back his time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am asking all Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question. It won't preclude consideration of the other suspension bills we expect to consider today, but it will give the administration another way to recover the taxpayer funds given in those outrageous bonuses to AIG, and it will also help prevent another bonus scandal, as Mr. PAULSEN, the author of the legislation that I wish would be able to be debated, has just explained.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, really, to say enough is enough with regard not only with the scandalous misuse of taxpayer funds, but the abuse of the process by the majority; because on an issue like this, where there is outrage on both sides of the aisle, there should be no problem with discussion and debate and consideration of ideas from other Members, not just the office of the leadership here, the majority leadership.

And with regard to what we have heard about blaming the prior administration, it is going to be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see how long that lasts. I am sure they will try to make it last for 4 years, but how long will it be effective? Because the authorization for the bonuses was in the so-called stimulus package voted for by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I again urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I can be very brief in my close, and I thank all of the eloquent speakers from our side who have come to the floor to talk about this important issue and the importance of voting on it today.

Let me be clear, a ''no'' vote, a ''no'' vote on this, is to allow the executives at AIG to keep their bonuses.

Now, how many people have come before us today to say it is unconscionable to think that they would take taxpayers' dollars to fund a misguided scheme, and then be given bonuses by the taxpayers? It is unthinkable. A ''no'' vote here is unthinkable.

We have talked about a whole variety of things from each other's voting records to the constitutionality, to a whole range of issues that do and don't apply to what we are talking about right now, and that is to allow a rule to allow us to proceed with doing something about the executive bonuses at AIG.

How many people have come before us? How many constituents have we heard from who have said: You have got to do something about these bonuses. I am struggling. I am struggling to keep my business going. I am struggling to keep my home going. Numerous things we have all heard from all of our constituents that have said to us, do something, do it right now. That is what people are asking us, in this extreme difficult economy where people are struggling every day, where businesses are struggling, where in my district we are hearing a layoff notice almost every day. People are saying to us, it is time to do something. That is why we are here.

I urge a ''yes'' vote of my colleagues on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 257, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, without intervention of any motion or recess, the Speaker shall entertain a motion offered by the Minority Leader or his designee, that the House suspend the rules relating to the bill (H.R. 1577) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pursue every legal means to stay or recoup certain incentive bonus payments and retention payments made by American International Group, Inc. to its executives and employees, and to require the Secretary's approval of such payments by any financial institution who receives funds under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Clause 8(a) of rule XX shall not apply to such motion. A motion to adjourn shall not be in order during consideration of such motion.

(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.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield back the balance of my time and 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 265

Whereas, Mr. Paul Magliocchetti, a former Appropriations Committee staffer, founded a prominent lobbying firm specializing in obtaining defense earmarks for its clients and whose offices—along with the home of the founder—were recently raided by the FBI.

Whereas, the lobbying firm has shuttered its political action committee and is scheduled to cease operations at the end of the month but, according to the New York Times, ''not before leaving a detailed blueprint of how the political money churn works in Congress'' and amid multiple press reports that its founder is the focus of a Justice Department investigation. (The New York Times, February 20, 2009)

Whereas, CQ Today noted that the firm has ''charged $107 million in lobbying fees from 2000 through 2008'' and estimates of political giving by the raided firm have varied in the press, with The Hill reporting that the firm has given $3.4 million to no less than 284 members of Congress. (CQ Today, March 12, 2009; The Hill, March 4, 2009)

Whereas, The Hill reported that Mr. Magliocchetti is ''under investigation for [the firm's] campaign donations,'' the Washington Post highlighted the fact that federal investigators are ''focused on allegations'' that he ''may have reimbursed some of his staff to cover contributions made in their names . . .,'' and the New York Times noted that federal prosecutors are ''looking into the possibility'' that he ''may have funneled bogus campaign contributions'' to members of Congress. (The Hill, February 20, 2009; The Washington Post, February 14, 2009; The New York Times, February 11, 2009)

Whereas, Roll Call reported on ''the suspicious pattern of giving established by two Floridians who joined [the firm's] board of directors in 2006'' and who, with ''no previous political profile . . . made more than $160,000 in campaign contributions over a three-year period'' and ''generally contributed the same amount to the same candidate on the same days.'' (Roll Call, February 20, 2009)

Whereas, The Hill also reported that ''the embattled defense lobbyist who led the FBI-raided [firm] has entered into a Florida-based business with two associates whose political donations have come into question'' and is listed in corporate records as being an executive with them in a restaurant business. (The Hill, February 17, 2009)

Whereas, Roll Call also reported that it had located tens of thousands of dollars of donations linked to the firm that ''are improperly reported in the FEC database.'' (Roll Call, February 20, 2009)

Whereas, CQ Today recently reported that Mr. Magliocchetti and ''nine of his relatives—two children, his daughter-in-law, his current wife, his ex-wife and his ex-wife's parents, sister, and brother-in-law'' provided ''$1.5 million in political contributions from 2000 through 2008 as the lobbyist's now-embattled firm helped clients win billions of dollars in federal contracts,'' with the majority of the family members contributing in excess of $100,000 in that timeframe. (CQ Today, March 12, 2009)

Whereas, CQ Today also noted that ''all but one of the family members were recorded as working for [the firm] in campaign finance reports, and most also were listed as having other employers'' and with other occupations such as assistant ticket director for a Class A baseball team, a school teacher, a police sergeant, and a homemaker. (CQ Today, March 12, 2009)

Whereas, in addition to reports of allegations related to reimbursing employees and the concerning patterns of contributions of business associates and board members, ABC News reported that some former clients of the firm ''have complained of being pressured by [the firm's] lobbyists to write checks for politicians they either had no interest in or openly opposed.'' (ABC News The Blotter, March 4, 2009)

Whereas, Roll Call has taken note of the timing of contributions from employees of Mr. Magliocchetti's firm and its clients when it reported that they ''have provided thousands of dollars worth of campaign contributions to key Members in close proximity to legislative activity, such as the deadline for earmark request letters or passage of a spending bill.'' (Roll Call, March 3, 2009)

Whereas, reports of the firm's success in obtaining earmarks for their clients are widespread, with CQ Today reporting that ''104 House members got earmarks for projects sought by [clients of the firm] in the 2008 defense appropriations bills,'' and that 87 percent of this bipartisan group of Members received campaign contributions from the raided firm. (CQ Today, February 19, 2009)

Whereas, clients of Mr. Magliocchetti's firm received at least three hundred million dollars worth of earmarks in fiscal year 2009 appropriations legislation, including several that were approved even after news of the FBI raid and Justice Department investigation into the firm and its founder was well known.

Whereas, the Chicago Tribune noted that the ties between a senior House Appropriations Committee member and Mr. Magliocchetti's firm ''reflect a culture of pay-to-play in Washington.'' and ABC News indicated that ''the firm's operations—millions out to lawmakers, hundreds of millions back in earmarks for clients—have made it, for many observers, the poster child for tacit ''pay-to-play'' politics . . .'' (Chicago Tribune, March 2, 2009; ABC News The Blotter, March 4, 2009)

Whereas Roll Call has reported that ''a handful of lawmakers had already begun to refund donations tied to'' the firm ''at the center of a federal probe . . .'' (Roll Call, February 23, 2009)

Whereas, the persistent media attention focused on questions about the nature and timing of campaign contributions related to Mr. Magliocchetti, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of Congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution.

Whereas, the fact that cases are being investigated by the Justice Department does not preclude the Committee on Standards from taking investigative steps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(a) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or a subcommittee of the committee designated by the committee and its members appointed by the chairman and ranking member, shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between the source and timing of past campaign contributions to Members of the House related to the founder of the raided firm and earmark requests made by Members of the House on behalf of clients of the raided firm.

(b) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives within 2 months after the date of adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 257, and adopting H. Res. 257, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 180, answered ''present'' 15, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Childers
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
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
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
Rohrabacher
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
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kosmas
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walz
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—15

Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Conaway
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Hastings (WA)
Hill
Kline (MN)
Lofgren, Zoe
Poe (TX)
Walden
Welch

NOT VOTING—10

Boustany
Culberson
Delahunt
Hinchey
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Olson
Radanovich
Shuster
Souder

□ 1157

Messrs. CALVERT and TEAGUE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CONYERS, CLEAVER, ENGEL, SMITH of Washington and Ms. WATSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Messrs. BARRETT of South Carolina, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and WALDEN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 141 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the motion to table H. Res. 265—Raising a question of privileges of the House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 257, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 180, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
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
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
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
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
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)
Kratovil
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
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
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
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

NAYS—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
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
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)
Kosmas
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Boustany
Culberson
Delahunt
Hinchey
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Olson
Radanovich
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1206

Mr. MCNERNEY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 142 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 257—Which provides for consideration of motions to suspend the Rules.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

TAXING EXECUTIVE BONUSES PAID BY COMPANIES RECEIVING TARP ASSISTANCE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1586) to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1586

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

SECTION 1. BONUSES RECEIVED FROM CERTAIN TARP RECIPIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employee or former employee of a covered TARP recipient, the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year shall not be less than the sum of—

(1) the tax that would be determined under such chapter if the taxable income of the taxpayer for such taxable year were reduced (but not below zero) by the TARP bonus received by the taxpayer during such taxable year, plus

(2) 90 percent of the TARP bonus received by the taxpayer during such taxable year.

(b) TARP BONUS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''TARP bonus'' means, with respect to any individual for any taxable year, the lesser of—

(A) the aggregate disqualified bonus payments received from covered TARP recipients during such taxable year, or

(B) the excess of—

(i) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for such taxable year, over

(ii) $250,000 ($125,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

(2) DISQUALIFIED BONUS PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''disqualified bonus payment'' means any retention payment, incentive payment, or other bonus which is in addition to any amount payable to such individual for service performed by such individual at a regular hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, or similar periodic rate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include commissions, welfare or fringe benefits, or expense reimbursements.

(C) WAIVER OR RETURN OF PAYMENTS.—Such term shall not include any amount if the employee irrevocably waives the employee's entitlement to such payment, or the employee returns such payment to the employer, before the close of the taxable year in which such payment is due. The preceding sentence shall not apply if the employee receives any benefit from the employer in connection with the waiver or return of such payment.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT OF TAX TREATED AS TARP BONUS.—Any reimbursement by a covered TARP recipient of the tax imposed under subsection (a) shall be treated as a disqualified bonus payment to the taxpayer liable for such tax.

(c) COVERED TARP RECIPIENT.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered TARP recipient'' means—

(A) any person who receives after December 31, 2007, capital infusions under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 which, in the aggregate, exceed $5,000,000,000,

(B) the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation,

(C) any person who is a member of the same affiliated group (as defined in section 1504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, determined without regard to paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b)) as a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B), and

(D) any partnership if more than 50 percent of the capital or profits interests of such partnership are owned directly or indirectly by one or more persons described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

(2) EXCEPTION FOR TARP RECIPIENTS WHO REPAY ASSISTANCE.—A person shall be treated as described in paragraph (1)(A) for any period only if—

(A) the excess of the aggregate amount of capital infusions described in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to such person over the amounts repaid by such person to the Federal Government with respect to such capital infusions, exceeds

(B) $5,000,000,000.

(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section which are also used in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning when used in this section as when used in such Code.

(e) COORDINATION WITH INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Any increase in the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reason of subsection (a) shall not be treated as a tax imposed by such chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under such chapter or for purposes of section 55 of such Code.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to disqualified bonus payments received after December 31, 2008, in taxable years ending after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman PETERS, Congressman ISRAEL and Congresswoman MALONEY for coming together and working with the committee to see how, the best we could, right a wrong.

Most all Americans believe that a bonus is something that is paid as a reward for a job well done. And certainly we don't believe in the House that when a handful of people receiving taxpayers' money for threatening the community in which we live, and indeed our country and the financial structure of the world, the whole idea that they should be rewarded millions of dollars is repugnant to everything that decent people believe in. But notwithstanding that, it is not our job to tell the private sector what to do; it is our job to say you don't do it at taxpayers' expense.

All this bill does is just pull out that part that they called bonus. And if you received, or the company received, $5 billion of taxpayers' money, we say the tax that you will pay on this is 90 percent. The rest of your income would be at the regular rate of 35 percent. If, indeed, this combination of the so-called bonus reward is combined with the regular salary and reaches a cap of $250,000, only the regular 35 percent would count.

Maybe somewhere along the line someone might say, ''I don't deserve this, we've caused enough damage, people have lost their jobs, their savings, they've lost their homes, their health insurance, they've lost their dignity, they've lost their pride, and we don't deserve to take this money from the taxpayers.'' Then give it back, don't receive it, and the law certainly would not apply. But if you're proud of what you've done, we are saying the buck is going to stop here, the red light is flashing. And anyone thinking about doing this, we say you just pay your dues to the IRS because we're going to be watching this.

Mr. Speaker, we're not trying to punish anybody, we just say do what you have to do. Rewards are subjective, but you don't do it with taxpayers' money.

At the end of the day, I do hope that this will be a message that will be sent in a bipartisan way. We may have differences in how we resolve this problem in the future, but this problem is there, and we are saying to the IRS and to the commissioner that we really want to make certain that, at the end of the day, they're not the ones that caused the problem and then get rewarded for it.

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

□ 1215

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I caught a little grief 5 weeks ago when we had the stimulus bill on the floor. Remember the 1,100-page bill that no one had time to read and then no one did read? Obviously, the President didn't have time to read it either, because in that bill was this one sentence, this one sentence that made it clear that someone knew that these AIG bonuses were about to be paid, and they didn't want them stopped. So somehow in the dark of night, this one sentence was added to the bill so that AIG would pay these bonuses to their executives. This language wasn't in the House bill. This language wasn't in the Senate bill. This language showed up in the dead of night, and no one got to see it.

I'm wondering where did the language come from. Who wrote it? Who asked the conferees to put it in the bill? What conferees on the part of the House agreed to this? I'm looking for somebody to put their hand up. That's the whole issue.

This political circus that's going on here today with this bill is not getting to the bottom of the questions of who knew what and when did they know it? Somebody was responsible for drawing up this language. Someone brought it to the conferees. Someone brought it to the Democrat leadership, who wrote this bill in secret, and put this language in there. But we have no idea who it was.

Secondly, the bill that's before us attempts to recoup 90 percent of these bonuses. Why 90 percent? The American people are outraged. I'm outraged. And we just voted down an opportunity to bring a bill to the floor from our freshmen Members that said, real simple: We ought to get 100 percent of this money back. We can get 100 percent of it back because the Treasury Secretary has the ability to get it all back. The administration has the ability to get it all back. Why don't we just get it all back? And why are we bringing this bill to the floor today to give Members political cover when, in fact, the Treasury Secretary has the authority, the administration has the authority, to get all of it back? But, no, that got voted down. Our bill would have been a better bill.

Thirdly, our colleagues Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. MCCOTTER have introduced a resolution of inquiry to get all of the documents surrounding communications between the Treasury, the Fed, and AIG to understand who was in the middle of this conversation. People have known about this for months, and yet we just found out about it over the last 48 hours. So we want this resolution of inquiry to be passed by the committee. We want to get to the bottom of all of this. But in the meantime, do we have to have this political charade of bringing this bill out here? I don't think so.

I think this is a bad bill with bad consequences. We didn't see the bill until last night. Nobody in the committee marked it up, nobody debated it, and nobody understands the consequences of what we're about to do. How can we possibly vote ''yes'' on a bill like this?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me try to answer a couple of questions.

Whatever point the minority leader was making as to what happened in the Senate bill, he should have an inquiry and do whatever he has to do. I can say, as a conferee, that issue never was in conference.

Having said that, it doesn't mean whatever he comes up with with his inquiry that these people deserve to have these bonuses at taxpayer expense. And that's the issue before the floor. It has nothing to do with what was in conference. It has everything to do with, do these people deserve, at taxpayers' expense, to receive these types of bonuses?

The second thing is that, while it's only 90 percent Federal, there is local and State liability, and they're entitled in their 10 percent to take a look at that and make the decisions that they have to.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague from New York, Congressman ISRAEL.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished chairman for giving me the honor of cosponsoring this legislation with him.

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen the difference between rhetoric and action. We can finger point. We can lay blame. We can talk about the past. We just want to recover the taxpayers' money for them. We want to recover the money, and others want a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is the difference between solving the problem or continuing the problem. We're going to cast this vote and go home to our districts, and the American people are going to say to each of us, did you get my money back or did you continue your posturing? Did you get my money back or did you continue in politics? Did you vote to recover my money or did you vote to allow them to get away with my money? That's what this is about, Mr. Speaker.

The American people have had it with the posturing and the partisanship and the politics. They want their money back. And the only way to get their money back, Mr. Speaker, the only way to get it back is to tax it back.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. I have heard from some of my friends in New York who said this is unfair. It's unfair because I thought I'd get my bonus. Mr. Speaker, they're going to have to tighten their belts just like the rest of America.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Frankly, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and I agree that bypassing the committee is a dangerous way to legislate. That invites unnecessary errors, and I think the stimulus bill is proof positive, and that's why we are here today. But again we are faced today with a bill that has had no public scrutiny and has not come before the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Speaker, let us do our jobs.

When Congress acted to stave off an imminent financial and economic collapse, the results of which would have been Depression-era unemployment levels, we did so with faith that past and current administrations would carefully manage the people's money. That trust has been shattered. Lesson learned.

What has been particularly troubling is the difficulty with which the truth has come out recently. After many varying and contradictory excuses, we now know that the Obama administration, working behind closed doors, secretly eliminated provisions that would have prevented the appalling abuse of taxpayer money. Adding insult to injury, they explicitly protected bonuses at companies that in many cases are operating only due to the generosity of the American people. It's a breach of the public trust that should have the Treasury Secretary, who repeatedly failed to pay his own taxes, looking for a new job.

Several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and even Chairman RANGEL have noted good reasons to oppose the bill before us. It's an extreme use of the Tax Code to correct an extreme and excessive wrong done to the American people. I'm sure we'll hear today that two wrongs don't make a right. But neither does inaction. It is our duty to protect and defend hardworking taxpaying Americans. At the end of the day, this insult to taxpayers cannot, should not, and will not stand, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the measure.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank my leader, the ranking Republican on the committee, for pointing out that this is, and I agree, an extraordinary procedure. And I've given a lot of thought to it. And it just seemed that this is an extraordinary situation when President Bush and Secretary Paulson would come to the Congress and ask for $700 billion of taxpayers' money, and if we didn't do it in a week or two, the sky would fall not only in the United States but around the world. If, indeed, people among that group of people, who without regard to the people that we were trying to protect, take this money, then it calls for an extraordinary response to it.

So I feel very, very comfortable in saying we tried to look at the arsenal that we had, whether it's the Justice Department, the Finance; the American people demand protection, and that's what we're doing today with your help.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call on a senior member of the committee, my friend from Michigan, Congressman LEVIN, for 1 minute.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to hear the debate from the other side. I guess some are going to vote ''yes,'' and I hope the vast majority will, after trying to make political points. This isn't the time for that. We are in the midst of a national economic crisis. Almost 4½ million jobs lost during this recession, homes are being lost. I think everybody has to participate in the solution and no one should exploit it.

In one bonus payment, these executives, who worked in the division that helped bring about the havoc, are taking home more money than 99 percent of Americans take home in a year.

The head of AIG has suggested their returning the bonuses. They should. And if they don't, we're taking action. We have the authority under the Tax Code not to punish but to protect the taxpayers of the United States of America. That's what we are doing today, and we should pass this overwhelmingly.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, what we should really do here today is slow down.

What I want to know is who's responsible for including this in the stimulus package, authorizing these bonuses? We need to know if it's Senator DODD, if it's Secretary Geithner, or President Obama. Who knew and who knew when? So, to me, if we're looking at whom to blame for this, we ought to be looking at the folks that voted for the bailout, that voted for the stimulus bill. Every Republican opposed the stimulus bill.

I believe this is a gimmick. I don't think this bill will become law. I don't even know if it's constitutional. This bill never even went through regular order.

I think what we should do today is calm down, stop this process, and go meet in the Ways and Means Committee so that we can go through this bill and determine whether or not this is the right course of action. So today I ask my colleagues to just slow down. Let's read the legislation. Let's not vote on this today. And let's come up with a real solution and not just a gimmick.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I've taken a deep breath and am now relaxed. I have reviewed this thing, and I am going home saying we have got the taxpayers' money back. And our colleagues and friends and those who love America as much as I do are saying, hey, slow down, we've got to make an inquiry.

You make your inquiry; we're going to do what we have to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a young man that is a freshman who hasn't been here that long but he came here with a feeling about what is moral, what is just, and the committee appreciates his advice on this bill, Representative PETERS from Michigan, for 1 minute.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1586, legislation that I helped craft that will reclaim outrageous bonuses paid with our taxpayer dollars that were given out to AIG and other companies that received billions in TARP funds. Million-dollar bonuses to the very people who drove our economy to the brink of collapse is simply unacceptable.

When reports of AIG bonuses broke this week, many said there was nothing that we could do because AIG was contractually obligated to pay the rewards. I rejected that notion. Auto industry workers are renegotiating their contracts and making sacrifices as a condition of receiving Federal support.

If financial executives had thought that they should be held to a different standard, today they know that we mean business.

□ 1230

I am grateful to my colleagues who worked with me to quickly develop a plan to put a stop to these outrageous bonuses.

I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL, Congressman ISRAEL, and Congresswoman MALONEY for working with me to help write this bill, which turned the outrage of the American people into action for the American taxpayer.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. The public has an absolute right to be upset, and I share that. But let's look at the facts here. This language that specifically allows the bonuses was written into the stimulus, with the righteous indignation of my colleagues and friends on the Democrat side now demagoguing what they voted for and put in.

Another fact: no Republican was allowed in the room when that conference report was actually written. We do know four people that were involved in writing that: one was Senator REID, Senator DODD, who has claimed responsibility for that language and accepted $200,000 in donations from AIG; we know Speaker PELOSI was in the room; and we know BARNEY FRANK was, too, probably Secretary Geithner.

Another fact was that the original language, before it got into that private little room, said that bonuses would be banned. But yet they replaced it with specific language allowing the bonuses.

So what we see here today, with the people who actually voted for the bonuses, is a little CYA, a disingenuous attempt to cover their rears.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, it seems like my friends on the other side got the wrong bill. If you want support for an inquiry, let's talk about it.

We want the taxpayers' money back, no matter who is wrong. So talking about the inquiry, we are talking about recouping the taxpayers' money.

I yield to my friend, Mr. BLUMENAUER, from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your leadership and the ability to work with you on this bill on what has been a sharp reversal of past practice.

In most of my career here, we have watched the Tax Code twisted, stretched, bent to lavish rewards on a tiny minority of Americans, a few thousand of the richest Americans, and the favored special interests.

Today, in a sharp reversal, under your leadership, we used the Tax Code to rebalance the scales. We will use the Tax Code to strip away the outrageous benefits of these bonuses to some of the people who helped drive the economy into the ditch in the first place.

We are helping protect taxpayers, get their money back, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, sending a message on how the Tax Code will be used under the Obama administration and in your work on the Ways and Means Committee to be able to help the American public as we move forward to protect and rebalance the American economy.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, here, once again, we are going to hastily do something wrong, good intentions. There is nobody in this Congress that wants that money back more than I do.

But going back to September, going back to the stimulus, spendulus, going back to the omnibus, we hastily went through this stuff. Some of us said don't go so fast, and we can make sure we got a better bill, and we didn't do that.

So here we are, going to hastily shred the Constitution, with an ex post facto law that says we will take 90 percent as taxes.

Mr. Speaker, that's not right. We don't take bad law and make worse law shredding the Constitution. You want to get it back, I want more than 90 percent. I want 100 percent.

You do that by forcing them into bankruptcy, going back and putting these preferences aside so we can get 100 percent, and we can get more than just the bonuses in bankruptcy or receivership. That's constitutional.

Don't shred the Constitution after we have already messed up by blowing aside the procedure and doing the hastily wrong thing.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, there is no constitutional challenge here, I can assure you. But one thing may be clear, I may be supporting an inquiry as to who did the stimulus, schpimulus.

The people want to know, are these guys going to get away with what they have done to our communities, what they have done to our homes, what they have done to our pride, what they have done to our country, and what they have done for the world?

So when the score is taken, it is going to be those who voted for the bill and those who voted against it. And that's it. You can go on with your inquiry, but this bill is abundantly clear, and the question is which side are you on?

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee from Florida, Representative MEEK.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, thank you so very much for bringing this bill to the floor.

The bottom line is, at the top of this week, when we all learned what happened with the bonuses and all, the American people wanted to know what the Congress was going to do as it relates to these taxpayer dollars that are being used for the bonuses.

Are you going to get our money back, are you going to file an inquiry? No one called me, no one called my district office and said, ''Congressman, please go to Congress and file an inquiry about what happened with my taxpayer dollars.'' They are saying, ''Get it back, get it back now.''

Now the other side is talking about the Constitution and wrapping themselves in the flag right now saying that, ''oh, my goodness, we are shredding the Constitution.'' Well, that's the pot calling the kettle black, as far as I am concerned. Because the Supreme Court, and courts throughout the land, there are unconstitutional measures that have been brought to this floor, and that's up for the courts.

But as far as I am concerned, what we are being told, that this is fine. This language is well in order, and we are going to pass this legislation. So you have to vote up or down.

You can't come with excuses. The bottom line is we are getting the taxpayer dollars back.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GOHMERT. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Is it inappropriate and against the rules to ask another person to yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member can ask another Member under recognition to yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Is it inappropriate, when somebody accuses me of being the pot calling the kettle black, in other words, of being the very thing I am accusing others of doing, of asking the gentleman to yield so I can find out where the heck he is coming from?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. So it's inappropriate to ask?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. The parliamentary inquiry is, if I am allowed to ask someone to yield after they have called me a name?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. So you are saying you don't know whether I can ask another person to yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A Member under recognition is allowed, by House Rules, to determine who they will or will not yield to.

Mr. GOHMERT. All right. So, would it be inappropriate to ask the gentleman who controls the time to specify how I am shredding the Constitution when I say someone else is doing so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That's not a parliamentary inquiry.

Does the gentleman have another parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GOHMERT. I think you have pretty well taken care of that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The stimulus bill was 1,100 pages. My good friend, CHARLIE RANGEL, signed that. And in that was this language that was stuck in in the middle of the night that allowed for all these bonuses to be paid to AIG executives.

CHARLIE, you signed that, and nobody on our side voted for it, and nobody on our side read the bill, and nobody on your side read the bill. And that's because they were trying to sneak this through in the middle of the night without anybody knowing it.

In my opinion, this is a way that you cover up a big mistake that was made by you and the conferees. This should never have happened. These bonuses should never have happened. And now you are trying to do something that's of questionable constitutionality to cover up a big mistake. I don't know why you just don't own up to it.

This is something that should not have happened. This is something that the Democrats, my good friend, CHARLIE, and others signed on to, it's a bill that nobody read in this Chamber, and we certainly didn't vote for it.

And now you are saying if we don't vote for this cover-up that you are coming up with, we are the bad guys. We are not. The American people won't be fooled by this.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me say to my friend that you have to look at me and read my lips.

This issue was not before the conference committee. Now, it may have been on the other side.

And after I say that, I am telling you that this has nothing to do with this being the right time to correct anything that you allege is wrong. These people are getting away with murder. They are getting paid for the destruction that they have caused our communities.

And before we leave here, we have to decide not what they did on the other side, because no one back home was asking about the conference report, they are asking, ''Are these people going to take away bonuses that taxpayers have paid for?''

And I think that DANNY DAVIS, the gentleman from Illinois, might be in a better position to explain our position in the majority, for 1 minute.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, where I live on Main Street in America, if you get something that you didn't deserve, or if you get something that was unwarranted, you either give it back or it's taken back. It's my position that these bonuses were unwarranted, not deserved.

If they are not going to give them back, then we are going to take them back, and I know that the people in mainstream America will applaud us.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. My good friend, Mr. RANGEL, took some time to make a statement just a moment ago.

Did he claim any time when he made that statement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is always charged his allotted time whenever he is speaking.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But it was charged to him, the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan, while they are on their time, are charged for that time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the President most recently in his inaugural address said, and I am quoting, ''And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account—to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day—because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.''

Well, I agree wholeheartedly with the President's statement.

Now, if we expect the American people to trust the decisions we are making with their hard-earned money, we, ourselves, must be accountable.

Now, it is a fact that, as Members of Congress, we earn a base pay. Members of leadership earn an amount above that, essentially a bonus, a performance bonus. If this bill were under a rule, I would have an amendment, and the Burgess amendment very simply would tax that extra pay, the bonuses that we give leadership, on top of their congressional salary. The Democrats' leadership solution is to impose a huge tax on bonuses.

But what about raising the tax on their own performance bonuses? Again, Mr. Speaker, how can we expect to be able to restore the vital trust between the people and this government, as the President stated, if we will not first hold ourselves accountable?

AMENDMENT

OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF TAX TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a member of Congressional leadership—

(1) so much of the annual rate of pay of such member as exceeds the annual rate of pay of a Member of Congress who is not a member of Congressional leadership shall be treated as a TARP bonus for purposes of section 1, and

(2) the Federal Government shall be treated as covered TARP recipient for purposes of such section.

(b) MEMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP.—For purposes of this section, the term ''member of Congresssional leadership'' means the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the majority and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANGEL. May I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker I would like to yield to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ETHERIDGE, 1 minute.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward, we are all outraged, as we should be. It affects every American. The fact that they are using public money to pay bonuses should enrage everyone.

Taxpayer funds should not be used to reward the individuals whose excessive risk-taking caused the financial crisis that has harmed the livelihood of my constituents in North Carolina, people across America and people around the world.

We ought to be outraged. We ought to be together on this. There shouldn't be a division on this issue. There is room for that on others. We should not reward Wall Street traders who have done this, at the expense of people, not just people on Main Street, to people who live on rural roads all across this country.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we voted for this package originally to put money in banks, to lend to people, to buy cars, to save for homes, to pay for college education, to do the things that make a difference and help America grow. And here we are today taking care of the very scoundrels that got us into this mess.

I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

If AIG will not halt these bonuses, and if its employees will not voluntarily turn them down, then this bill will ensure that the money is returned to the taxpayers. I regret having to use the tax code in this manner, but the blatant abuse of taxpayer dollars by AIG leaves us with no other choice. This bill will send a message not only to AIG, but to other companies receiving taxpayer aid that this behavior is unacceptable.

□ 1245

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. There's no question everyone wants these bonuses returned. That isn't an issue before us today. Taxpayers have a real simple question: When did the White House know about these bonuses, and why didn't they stop them?

The government owns AIG, for heaven's sake, so don't tell me they couldn't have stopped them if they truly would have wanted to.

The bill before us today really is a diversion—an attempt to shift the blame from Democrats who, at the last moment, got approval for these bonuses snuck into the stimulus bill. For our folks back home, the President has said honestly, he didn't know this provision is in the bill. Yet his own White House made the request and they complied with the bill.

Let's not cover up the truth here. Let's get the real answers. That's what taxpayers deserve.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Here we go again. This Congress is finally doing the right thing in a timely fashion, recovering ill-gotten gains. What do the American people do? They turn on the television and they hear this turned, once again, into a partisan controversy, an effort to deflect blame onto the other party, instead of celebrating the fact that we have a chance to do something together as an institution.

This is the heart of the problem, Mr. Chairman. To the many people watching this broadcast now, listening to these proceedings, there are two sets of rules—one set of rules for people who are trying to send their kids to college, who are trying to make a living, but making sacrifices during this incredibly deep recession; and another set for rules for these Wall Street geniuses who are so smart, they figured out how to wreck a company so completely to almost wreck a national economy. That does take a level of skill, I suppose, to figure that out, how to be that bad at doing anything.

We are recouping those ill-gotten gains. And the American people ought to be glad to see this prompt, decisive action. Instead, they are hearing more partisan back and forth.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Like a majority of Republicans in Congress last fall, I opposed this Wall Street bailout from the beginning because I feared both the intended consequences and the unintended consequences that would come and bring us to days like today.

House Republicans share the outrage of millions of Americans that AIG would use taxpayer dollars to award executive bonuses. But the plan brought to the floor today by the Democratic majority is a constitutionally questionable bill. It would enact a 90 percent tax on AIG employees and, the truth is, it's a transparent attempt to divert attention away from the fact that Democrats in Congress and this administration made these bonus payments possible.

House Republicans believe the American people deserve 100 percent of their money back. We have offered legislation that would deny one more dime of bailout money to AIG until they collect 100 percent of those bonuses back for the American people. But Democrats have blocked the Republican plan. And the American people deserve to know this entire outrage that has dominated the national debate this week could have been avoided.

Senator RON WYDEN, the Democrat from Oregon, authored thoughtful legislation in the so-called stimulus bill that passed the House. It was legislation that would have banned bonuses of this type but, to use his words, he said ''It was unfortunate that it was stripped from the bicameral conference committee.'' He said, ''We had an opportunity to send a well-targeted message that would have communicated how strongly the administration felt about blocking these excessive bonuses,'' but, ''I wasn't able to convince them.''

Senator DODD, the chairman of the bicameral conference committee, said the administration expressed reservations about the language. They asked for modifications.

The truth is that Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate were in the room when this language was struck that made these bonuses possible.

The American people deserve to get 100 percent of their money back. They deserve it to be done in a way that doesn't give offense to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Let's do what's right for the American people, and let's speak the truth.

Mr. RANGEL. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. The power to tax is the power to destroy. I will support destroying this creeping socialism imposed on us by the Bush administration before it takes over our entire economy. Executives and boards of private companies must know that to call in the Federal cavalry means that you will be run out of town when you misbehave.

Businesses beware. You do not want the Federal Government or the American people owning your business. We will hunt down your executives with pitchforks, we will subpoena your boards and haul you before Congress, we will use personal rhetoric to decry your greed, we will make life miserable.

And no, our cruelty will not be reserved just for your executives. Your workers will be bureaucratized, your competent managers squeezed out, your conferences and travel canceled.

I am proud to support this bill, and hope that it serves as a siren call to executives, shareholders, and workers to oppose nationalization of your companies.

In voting for this bill today, Mr. Speaker, we are demonstrating that there is a fate worse than death, and this is it. And if your business might be ''too large to fail,'' then, by all means, spin off divisions and downsize, because too big to fail seals a purgatory stay of abject misery.

Pillage not our public troughs yet ye be pillaged.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. I will support destroying this creeping socialism imposed on us by the Bush administration before it takes over our entire economy. Executives and boards of private companies must know that to call in the federal cavalry means that you will be run out of town when you misbehave.

I am reminded of Emperor Alexius I of Byzantium, who called forth the Christian kings of western Europe to help him hold off the Turks at his gates. Help us, he said, prevent the heathens from taking the holy land.

The Christian kings of the west responded in force. At first the crusades served Alexius's goals. But with time many crusaders saw a richer and easier target in Constantinople itself, and the hordes from the west looted the very emperor's domain who had called them forth.

Businesses beware, you do not want the federal government or the American people owning your business. We will hunt down your executives with pitchforks, we will subpoena your boards and haul you before Congress, we will use personal rhetoric to decry your greed, we will make life miserable. And no, our cruelty will not be reserved for your executives. Your workers will be bureaucratized, your competent managers squeezed out, your conferences cancelled, your work hours extended, your incentive structure turned upside down. I dare say that with a different party in the white house and congress as is unfortunately the case from time to time, your union will be busted and your jobs lost.

I will be supporting this bill, and hope that it serves as a siren call to executives, shareholders, and workers to oppose nationalization of your companies. In voting for this bill today, Mr. Speaker, we are demonstrating that there is a fate worse than death, and this is it.

And if your business might be ''too large to fail'' then by all means please spin-off divisions and downsize; because too big to fail seals a purgatory stay of abject misery.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. On opening day, January 6, our leader, Mr. BOEHNER, indicated that we would provide better solutions to the issues confronting the American people. Obviously, on a bipartisan basis, Congress wishes to address this issue, and to address this issue as quickly as possible.

House Republican Members on the Republican side—freshmen—have a better solution, we believe. Our solution—and I'm sorry it's not debated on the floor—the House Republican freshmen would demand that Treasury, notwithstanding any other provision of

law, implement a plan within the next 2 weeks to recoup 100 percent of the payment of AIG bonuses.

Also, the freshmen plan on our side says that any future bonus payments of any kind to TARP recipients must be approved in advance by the Department of the Treasury. Third, any future contractual obligations entered into by TARP fund recipients to make bonus payments of any kind must be approved in advance by the Treasury.

We commend to our friends in the majority our freshman Republican proposal in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. RANGEL. I certainly wish I'd heard the Republican freshmen proposal before, because we really wanted to get a bipartisan solution to this problem.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today we have been told to slow down, take a deep breath. Well, I'm not in the mood for slowing down and I'm not taking a deep breath.

I was in a grocery store and had people coming up, saying, What are you going to do about it?

My friends on the other side have spent the largest portion of the debate today finger-pointing, wondering who said what; who wrote what, when. I do know this. When this vote is called, that board will have red lights and green lights next to every Members' name. And the chairman is absolutely right—for those Members who feel that they cannot and don't want to make sure that these people get their bonuses, they will vote for Mr. RANGEL's bill. For those of you who want to continue to dole it out to the people who deserve it the least, then you're going to have a red light next to it.

I will have a green light next to my name. I am tired of this. These people have stolen the very money that is supposed to help keep people in their homes.

Don't ask me to slow down and don't ask me to be patient. My patience has run out.

I thank the chairman for his work on this bill. And if anybody wants to worry about the constitutionality, you take it up with the court.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in Congress when the main justification for passing legislation we don't understand is that we are correcting legislation we didn't read.

We keep hearing that we have got to do this because our constituents are demanding it; that they want to see these executives tarred and feathered.

George Washington once said, ''If to please the people we do what we ourselves disprove, how do we later defend our work?'' That is the position we are in today.

This is a representative democracy. Our constituents may not understand that this is a bill of attainder, but we know that. We are the representatives of the people—and we know that. And it's our duty to uphold the Constitution.

I don't like the fact that these executives got these bonuses—and we should find a way constitutionally to deal with this issue. But rushing to pass a bill we don't understand to correct a bill we didn't read, is not the solution here today.

Let's reject this proposal.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to a person that was one of the prime movers in this concept, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Chairman RANGEL. New York is so proud of you. Thank you for your leadership. I stand in strong support of the Democratic leadership during this financial crisis.

On Sunday night, the bonuses were sent. On Thursday we are on the floor correcting this and returning the money to the American taxpayer. Rarely have I seen so many Members of Congress come forward with proposals to correct it.

Chairman RANGEL has molded all of the ideas together in this fine proposal before us today. If anyone wants to criticize someone, President Obama has said, ''I'm in charge. Criticize me. But then let's get back to work, get our eye on the ball of moving this economy forward, putting Americans back to work, putting more credit out into the communities, stabilizing housing.''

President Obama said, ''When you're going in the wrong direction, you've got to change course.'' And under 55 days of his leadership, we have passed the economic recovery bill, we have passed a housing stabilization bill, we have passed measures to stabilize our financial institutions. We are investing in education and health care.

Vote positive. Vote for this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. My colleagues, here are some facts. Last month, the Senate unanimously approved an amendment that would stop these bonuses. It was an amendment by OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine and, of course, RON WYDEN from Oregon.

They had that in the bill. They went to the conference. The conference stripped out that amendment, bipartisan amendment, by Senator CHRIS DODD, a Democrat from Connecticut. All of you know that.

Now Mr. RANGEL is here on the floor saying he knew nothing about this conference report. Yet the amendment by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN was stripped out by Senator DODD. And I find it very difficult, Mr. RANGEL, that you knew nothing about this amendment that was stripped out, explicitly exempting bonuses agreed to prior to the passage of the stimulus bill.

How in the world can you say you knew nothing about it? I've got the exact language from Senator DODD talking about his amendment which stripped out the amendment of Senator SNOWE and Senator WYDEN.

The fact is Republicans have a plan to include 100 percent of these bonuses. I ask Mr. RANGEL: Why didn't you take 100 percent of these bonuses?

The American people have a right to know what the administration knew, and when they knew it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage at the AIG taxpayer-funded executive bonus giveaway and Senator DODD's and the Obama Administration's potential implication in ensuring AIG would be able to hand out hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars to executives who ran AIG into the ground contributing to a global economic crisis.

Insurance company AIG—which has been deemed ''too big too fail''—has received $170 billion in federal bailout money, yet this money has done little to stabilize the company. And now, millions of Americans awoke to news yesterday that their taxpayer dollars intended to prevent AIG from collapse are being funneled to AIG executives in the form of ''bonuses.''

The most unfortunate part of this story is that a senior member of the Senate Democratic party offered an amendment allowing this to happen. The utter abuse of taxpayer dollars that we have seen through the TARP program due to lack of transparency and Democrat legislative neglect is staggering. But to know that these bonus payments could have been easily prevented is beyond disheartening. This atrocious abuse of taxpayer dollars must stop now.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the leader of our Democratic caucus, indeed, a leader in the Congress, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the chairman for bringing this important legislation to the floor in all due speed, because it was necessary.

What is at stake here is really the full faith and credit of our system. When those in the private sector and on Wall Street and the great barons of capital can laugh up their sleeves at the American public that sacrifices on a daily basis, who find themselves unemployed, unable to educate their kids, out of work, and we are going to sit idle and allow them to receive these bonuses? This is wrong. And if we expect to govern as an institution, we have to do the extraordinary and set it right.

These are difficult and unchartered waters and unchartered times and it's time for us to act on behalf of the American people.

Thank you, Mr. RANGEL.

□ 1300

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this majority

mendacity bill, or maybe unrighteous indignation bill. You just heard it from the other side.

They want to say to the American people that we are going to make everything all right by getting back with a 90 percent tax this $175 million. But what they don't say, Mr. Speaker, is how they are going to get back the $170 billion that was given to AIG in the first place, 1,000 times these bonuses.

Yes, we are outraged over the bonuses; but on our side of the aisle, we are outraged over these bailouts and these giveaways, and there is nothing in this bill about getting the $170 billion back.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Lenten season, so let me make a little analogy for my non-Catholic friends. This is like asking forgiveness for a mortal sin by saying one Hail Mary, one Hail Mary, this little bill to pass under suspension to get those bonuses back, when the real sin is the $170 billion that was thrown away on AIG.

Mr. RANGEL. Let the church say ''amen.''

I would like to yield 30 seconds to Congressman KRATOVIL from Maryland on this subject.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Speaker, once again, this body finds itself engaging in a classic example of partisan politics and the blame game. I am no longer interested in wasting any more time or any more taxpayer dollars arguing who is to blame for our failing economy, who is to blame for the AIG bonuses being paid, or who is to blame for a declining sense of personal responsibility we see not just among our AIG executives but across this country.

What I am interested in doing today is doing what we can do to recoup the taxpayer dollars that were used to pay AIG executives bonuses that not only did they not deserve but should be ashamed for having accepted. That is what this bill does.

Now, just so there is no confusion. This body voted to increase the oversight and accountability of the monies provided under TARP in the TARP Reform and Accountability Act. I voted for that legislation to address the exact issue that is now presented at AIG. 166 members of this House voted against it and many of them now stand up and criticize the lack of oversight with regard to these contracts. This country has had enough of partisanship and obstruction on one hand, combined with no solutions on the other.

In terms of the stimulus bill, the language in the bill provided more, not less restrictions on executive pay.

How can those who voted against additional restrictions on the TARP funds and against additional accountability, now stand up and with a straight face argue that we have not done enough.

The American people are tired of these old political games. What we need are solutions, not rhetoric.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CAMP for yielding.

Now we find out that President Obama's stimulus bill, over $1 trillion stimulus bill, was actually the AIG Bonus Protection Plan. This is a scandal of huge proportions that we are only now just unraveling. It appears that language was put in the stimulus bill that would prevent the United States Government from recouping these outrageous bonuses that were paid to executives at AIG.

The Republicans have a message, and it is this: We want 100 percent of these bonuses to come back to the United States taxpayer, and we say ''time out'' on these bailouts. No more bailouts. We don't want to see any more. They haven't been working, and the American people are saying enough is enough.

This is a scandal. We need to know, who knew about these bonuses? When did they know about them?

Yesterday in the Financial Services Committee, the CEO, Mr. Liddy, disclosed that the chair of the Federal Reserve knew about the bonuses and acquiesced to them. We are now finding out that the Treasury Secretary as well, or that Mr. Summers, also knew about these several weeks ago. We need an investigation and we need answers.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. A moment ago we heard you stand up and say that there is a question about whether or not the freshmen were engaged. You had questions about whether or not we would be bipartisan. Are you kidding me? Seriously. We have been here in this body.

Look, I am a freshman; I didn't create this problem, but I am here to help clean it up. And the idea and the suggestion that there was no idea, no sense that the freshmen had an idea, because it would come from the Republican side of the aisle.

It is not in the spirit of this body to make a question about whether or not we are going to be participants in this. Absolutely, the Republicans have suggestions. We have been excluded from this process. We were promised time and time again that we would have time to see and read bills, and that has not happened.

I would encourage both sides of the aisle, but especially my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, to stay true to their word and actually engage and allow us to participate in the dialogue that should be in the best interests of the United States of America and in this body.

Again, I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up. And any suggestion that says that you didn't know that there was a bill introduced, come on.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It occurs to me that, once again, Democrats in this House are acting in haste and we can repent in leisure. It seems to me fairly clear that there are questions that deserve to be answered.

Secretary Geithner began the week saying that he had only known about these bonuses for roughly 1½ weeks; and yet, yesterday Ed Liddy, the chairman of AIG, said that the Federal Reserve was told about these bonuses in December. Where was Mr. Geithner? How come he didn't act? If he didn't know back then when the bailout occurred, it seems to me he should have known.

Now, flash forward to yesterday again. Not just Mr. Liddy places doubt on what Mr. Geithner claims, but no less than Senator DODD says that, in February, he put the money into the bill at the request of the Treasury Department. Who was the head of the Treasury Department at that point in time? It was Secretary Geithner.

I would suggest that Secretary Geithner wants us to believe that when he was at Fed, he neither knew nor should have known and then, when he was the head of Treasury and the language was put in by the Secretary of the Treasury he neither knew nor should have known. I think there are questions that Mr. Geithner needs to answer before we are asked to vote on this bill.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) is recognized for the remaining 2½ minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, just briefly. We have a chance today to do the right thing by those who acted right, those who went to work every day, paid their taxes, and did nothing wrong, and that is the American taxpayer. This is their money, and we should get it back. I urge support for this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the remarks of the other side, and I appreciate and have a great deal of respect for those Members that want to inquire about how these contracts came about, who knew what, and when did they know it.

The Ways and Means Committee has no jurisdiction over these questions, whether they are valid or not. The real question is, do you really believe that people who did this damage to our families, to our community, to our country and, indeed, the world, deserve a bonus? If you want to know whether it is 90 percent or 100 percent or whether the State or local governments get the 10 percent, that is another question.

We are not always right, but what we are saying is that the American people do not want their taxpayers' money paying for bonuses for people who have caused such destruction, and to that we have unanimity.

So at the end of the day, when we put this on the suspension calendar, it is because we didn't think it was controversial. We didn't think it was a Democratic idea or a Republican idea. We thought you felt the frustration of your constituents in saying stop the thievery at taxpayers' expense.

Now, this has been going on. No one can deny this will not happen. I urge you to vote for this bill for the American people.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the power to tax is the power to destroy. Today I rise in support of H.R. 1586 and destroying the creeping socialism imposed on by the Bush Administration before it takes over our entire economy. Executives and boards of private companies must know that to call in the federal cavalry means that you will be run out of town.

I am reminded of Emperor Alexius I of Byzantium, who called forth the Christian kings of Western Europe to help him hold off the Turks at his gates. Help us, he said, prevent the heathens from taking the holy land.

The Christian kings of the west responded in force. At first the crusades served Alexius' goals, there were some initial ''bonuses'' such as the taking of Antioch and Jerusalem. But with time many crusaders saw a richer and easier target in Constantinople itself and soon the very forces that Alexius called forth looted his own capital and hastened the demise of the Byzantine Empire.

Businesses beware: You do not want the federal government or the American people owning your business. We will hunt down your executives with pitchforks, we will subpoena your boards and haul you before Congress, we will use personal rhetoric to decry your greed, we will make life so miserable that you will leave. And no, our cruelty will not be reserved for your executives. Your workers will be bureaucratized, your competent managers squeezed out, your travel and conferences cancelled, your work hours extended, your incentive structure turned upside down. I dare say that with a different party in the White House and Congress, as unfortunately happens from time to time, your union will be busted and your jobs lost.

I will be supporting this bill and hope that it serves as a siren call to executives, shareholders, and workers to oppose nationalization of your companies. By voting for this bill today, Mr. Speaker, we are demonstrating that there is a fate worse than death, and that this is it.

And if your business might be ''too big to fail'' then by all means, please spin-off divisions and downsize because ''too big to fail'' means that you will end up in this eternal purgatory of misery, blame and scapegoating.

Let your companies die quietly, silently, and call forth not the mighty crusaders from Washington DC lest we loot and pillage your company as the Christian crusader innocently called forth by Alexius I went on to loot the center of eastern Christendom itself.

Pillage not our public troughs lest ye be pillaged.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Wall Street, and possibly some in Congress and the Treasury Department, still don't get it.

When Congress voted to create the TARP program, we were voting to unfreeze the credit markets and get capital flowing again. Little did we know that much of the capital would be flowing out of the Treasury and into the bank accounts of executives at AIG.

As a former Human Resources Manager, I know the value of performance based bonuses in motivating outstanding employee performance. The only thing that these bonuses are motivating is more bad behavior. Obviously we are dealing with a system that is severely broken, where Wall Street executives truly don't know the value of a dollar or even right from wrong.

We need a massive overhaul of our financial services regulations, and it can't come a moment too soon. While H.R. 1586 is a measure to fix a specific problem, we need to put in place laws to prevent these abuses from happening in the first place. The days of the ''anything goes'' mentality on Wall Street must come to an end, and it must end now.

Mr. Speaker, today must be the first of a series of bills that come to the House Floor to address our broken regulatory and oversight system of the financial services sector. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as a way not only to express our outrage, but also as our commitment to a new system of regulation and oversight.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1586, a simple measure to address an appalling practice.

My constituents are angry. As they scrimp and save and watch the value of their homes and college savings plummet, AIG—the recipient of more than $180 billion in government funds—has decided to award over $165 million in bonuses to the very executives that created the ongoing financial mess. I voted against the Wall Street bailout twice, precisely because it rewarded bad actors and bailed out companies that created a financial house of cards. Make no mistake, these bonuses are not necessary to keep the ''best and brightest,'' they are simply a leftover bad habit from a company and an industry that was unregulated and left to run wild.

This legislation is straightforward. Any executive of a company surviving because of government intervention (including AIG, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac) that has received or chooses to accept a bonus will be taxed at a 90% rate. Companies will no longer continue to be able to reward bad actors at taxpayer expense.

Despite the outrageous behavior of AIG and others, most Americans understand that the current economic times call for shared sacrifice and a renewal of the American dream. My constituents know that we have to rebuild our nation and turn the page on the last eight years. Today we have the chance to send a message to AIG and others that would put private greed above the public good: enough.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, none of us support payments of these bonuses to AIG employees or employees of other companies that the government has had to bail out. Unfortunately, we are only presented with one alternative to correct the situation. Interestingly enough, it is a tax bill.

But the more important point is: How did we get here? We got here because the Democratic majority insisted on passing a 1000 page bill which nobody read and which was not exposed to the light of day, and in the hundreds of provisions in that bill was one that allowed bonuses to be paid. That bill passed without a single Republican in the House voting for it.

And now that the provision tucked away in that 1000 page bill has come to light and proven embarrassing, how does the majority deal with it? They tax it—at a 90% tax rate.

Now if this sounds familiar, it should. Hidden spending provisions, high taxes, spending, taxes, taxes, spending. It's a pattern.

The majority wants to make sure that the government decides who gets what and then is able to take it away. And they want to deflect attention away from their missteps.

The better approach would have been for the Obama Administration not to allow these bonuses to begin with. They can put the necessary conditions on the money. It would have better to have that 1000 page bill open for viewing and for amendment. Instead we are left with a crass attempt at political cover. There has to be a better way.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the H.R. 1586, a bill to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients. Financial firms such as AIG, who have accepted government assistance, need to recognize that the days of lavish travel, million dollar bonuses and golden parachutes are over.

When bridge loans were granted to General Motors and Chrysler, they were required to reduce wages and salaries. Auto workers are being asked to accept lower wages and stock contributions to their benefits account—which funds their healthcare—rather than cash.

What are executives at banks and financial institutions asked to do? Maybe spend fewer afternoons at the spa. Those firms should be subject to the same requirements imposed on GM and Chrysler and on their employees. My constituents have had enough of the double standard that rewards greedy executives and punishes working families.

After accepting $170 billion from the federal government, AIG is responsible to the American taxpayer.

Before I ran for elected office, I was a high school Latin teacher. And I can tell you that in Latin, ''bonus'' translates to ''good.'' A bonus is supposed to be a reward for something good—for excellent performance, not for running your company into the ground and sending the economy into a tailspin.

AIG's performance warrants a pink slip, not a paycheck.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1586 to pose an additional tax on bonuses received from TARP recipients. Like my constituents, I am frustrated and angry that the American International Group (AIG) paid $165 million in bonuses after we have given them billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Clearly, the 'G' in AIG stands for greed.

It is outrageous that taxpayers are subsidizing bonuses as much as $6.5 million at a time when working families are struggling to make ends meet. I am reminded of the saying: 'Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.' I wholeheartedly opposed the decision to pour an additional $30 billion into AIG earlier this month given the company's record. AIG is a company that spent $440,000 on a luxury retreat less than a week after receiving its first federal bailout. To make matters worse, the company then spent $86,000 on an English hunting trip. Enough is enough.

I support any and all legal efforts to recoup this money, and protect working families in this difficult economy.

I urge all my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 1586 and tell the American people that this Congress is fed up with corporate abuses of the Troubled Asset Relief Program and we will do everything in our power to be better stewards of taxpayer money.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with pitchfork in hand to take back from the executives at AIG, monies that rightfully belong to the taxpayers of this country. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1586.

The understanding that most Members of Congress had when we passed the TARP legislation was that these measures were necessary to keep our financial system from collapse. I believe the term is systemic risk.

We then voted last month for another economic recovery package of over $700 billion dollars which contained language that limited executive compensation for companies that received certain TARP funds.

It appears that the AIG executives may not have broken the law but certainly the spirit of the law. In other words, if AIG has received over $190 billion in funds from the federal fiscal coffers in the last year, the company is acting in broad contravention of the essence of the law to use $165 million of that for bonuses. The country is now $12 trillion dollars in debt after passage of last month's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. We literally cannot afford irresponsible uses of taxpayers' dollars.

Last September, the House and Senate voted on one of the most extraordinary pieces of legislation in the history of our country. During the same time, the federal government loaned the American Insurance Group (AIG) $85 billion, as the company could no longer access credit to fund its day-to-day operations. In addition, an economic ''bailout'' package enacted in October (PL 110–343) provided a total of $700 billion in federal aid to financial institutions to remove ''toxic'' debts and infuse capital into the credit market.

AIG has now received more than $180 billion in taxpayer money and is now nearly 80 percent owned by the government. As part of a restructuring plan announced by the Treasury Department earlier this month, AIG is set to receive an additional $30 billion in federal rescue aid.

The news that AIG paid $165 million in retention bonuses, including bonuses of at least $1 million each to 73 employees who worked in the financial products division that contributed to the company's troubles, has incited fervor among lawmakers and the public over the past week. Eleven of those top bonus recipients—including one who received $4.6 million—have since left AIG. If these payments were intended to motivate them to stay with the company it truly scares me to think what they might have needed to stay—$1 million not being enough.

Edward M. Liddy, the chief executive of AIG—selected in consultation with the Treasury Department after the first large infusion of government assistance—testified before a House Financial Services subcommittee that he has called on employees who received in excess of $100,000 to give back at least half of their bonuses, but which he also said are a legal obligation of the company. The reason that Mr. Liddy was selected is because he was expected to have the common sense as well as the financial sense which his job now entails.

Over two million Americans have lost their jobs in the last four months. Many of them still owe taxes from last year and will not get a stimulus check, TARP payment or waiver to pay those taxes. Neither will they have access in many cases to teams of topflight lawyers from swanky law firms to defend this excess that reminds me of the biblical tale of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Previously, Merrill Lynch paid $3.6 billion in bonuses days before its merger with Bank of America to avoid collapse. Bank of America, which acquired Merrill Lynch on January 1, 2009 received $45 billion in bailout money, some of which it used to acquire.

I was pleased to learn that Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman TOWNS sent a letter to Bank of America's chief executive last week asking for details on the bonuses. It appears they are ready to comply with Chairman TOWNS's request.

Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner sent a letter about the AIG matter to lawmakers this week saying the Treasury Department will ''deduct from the $30 billion in assistance an amount equal to the amount of those payments.''

This bill taxes bonuses given to individuals at a rate of 90 percent—if their employer received more than $5 billion in federal assistance under the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP). It applies to individuals whose total family adjusted gross income exceeds $250,000 per year, and affects bonuses received after December 31, 2008.

Employees or former employees of covered TARP recipients would face a tax on their income minus the TARP bonus as determined by existing tax code, plus a 90 percent tax on the bonus. The term ''TARP bonus'' is defined by the bill to include any retention payment, incentive payment, or other bonus that is in addition to the amount paid to the individual at a regular rate, but it does not include commissions, welfare or fringe benefits, or expense reimbursements.

Employees who waive their entitlement to the bonus payments, or return them to their employers before the close of the taxable year, would not face a TARP bonus tax.

This exemption would not apply, however, if the employee receives any benefit from the employer in connection with a waiver or return. Any reimbursement of the tax by a TARP recipient would be treated as a TARP bonus to the taxpayer.

The TARP recipients that are covered under the bill include any entity that received, after December 31, 2007, capital infusions exceeding $5 billion under the financial industry ''bailout,'' as well as the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). It would also apply to members of affiliated groups or partnerships with more than 50 percent of the capital or profits owned by TARP recipients. Any tax increase as a result of the measure would not be treated as income tax for purposes of determining the amount of any credit against the alternative minimum tax.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to seek redress from AIG with this strong piece of legislation so that we may get on with the business of moving our economic recovery forward.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1586, which will impose a significant tax on bonuses received by employees of certain TARP-recipient companies. This legislation, of which I am an original cosponsor, sends a clear message that excessive compensation practices by TARP-recipients are indefensible and, as such, must be heavily penalized. On Tuesday of this week, I introduced my own bill, H.R. 1543, on this matter, which would subject bonuses to employees of TARP-recipients to a 95 percent tax. I am pleased to see that H.R. 1586 incorporates elements of my bill and thank Chairman RANGEL for his kind consideration in doing so.

As AIG's recent actions remind us, it is unconscionable that companies dependent upon the largesse of the federal government for their very existence should in turn pay irresponsibly exorbitant bonuses to the rapscallions partially responsible for the current recession. From their glass towers, they frittered away the Nation's economic well-being. Compare that to the men and women who work on the assembly lines now being asked to make wage and healthcare concessions—also contractually guaranteed, I might add—to justify the rescue of U.S. manufacturers. If we can demand that decent people, who wear hard hats and blue jeans, must renegotiate their contracts, I see no reason those people wearing neckties and $1,000 suits should not also have to sacrifice to help their country in this time of need.

In closing, I offer my thanks to Chairman RANGEL, as well as Representatives PETERS, ISRAEL, and MALONEY, for their work to ensure that TARP funds are not wasted on reprehensible and undeserved bonuses. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 1586.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1586, which will recover outsized and unwarranted executive bonuses at companies like AIG that have received taxpayers' money under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP), if those bonuses are not voluntarily repaid.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot continue with business as usual. These are serious times, and the American people expect that their hard-earned money will be used to repair the financial system—not reward the very executives that helped cause the current financial crisis. The bonuses at AIG are an egregious waste of taxpayer dollars, and we must take quick and decisive action to ensure that taxpayers are repaid.

I urge my colleagues to join me and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1586.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1586.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1315

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BONUSES PAID BY AIG AND OTHER COMPANIES RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 76) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding executive and employee bonuses paid by AIG and other companies assisted with taxpayer funds provided under the Troubled Assets Relief Program of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 76

Whereas the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, said in testimony to Congress on March 3, 2008: ''If there is a single episode in this entire 18 months that has made me more angry, I can't think of one, than AIG. AIG exploited a huge gap in the regulatory system; there was no oversight of the financial products division. This was a hedge fund basically that was attached to a large and stable insurance company, made huge numbers of irresponsible bets, took huge losses. We had no choice.'';

Whereas, on March 15, 2009, Chairman Bernanke said on the news program ''60 Minutes'' that ''we must address the problem of financial institutions that are deemed too big—or perhaps too interconnected—to fail. Given the highly fragile state of financial markets and the global economy, government assistance to avoid the failures of major financial institutions has been necessary to avoid a further serious destabilization of the financial system, and our commitment to avoiding such a failure remains firm.'';

Whereas the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have committed almost $200 billion in various forms of taxpayer assistance to AIG for the company's liquidity shortages, the purchase of certain assets, and to dispose of other assets for an orderly wind-down of the company;

Whereas the commitment of almost $200 billion in taxpayer assistance represents one of the largest Federal government rescues of a single private corporation in United States history;

Whereas the Federal Reserve has committed tens of billions of taxpayer dollars in a combination of facilities to purchase AIG's mortgage-backed securities and liabilities tied to collateralized debt obligations;

Whereas the Federal government has taken a 79.9 percent stake in AIG in exchange for providing financial assistance extending credit;

Whereas, under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, the Bush Administration and the Obama Administration have provided AIG with access to $70 billion in direct capital infusions, which in turn have been used, in part, to cover AIG's collateral for positions taken by the company in unregulated and risky credit default swaps;

Whereas AIG's Financial Products division's irresponsible practice of not setting aside sufficient capital to cover its exposure on more than $1 trillion of complex financial products, including credit default swaps, have threatened the stability of the financial system and resulted in substantial losses to the company, to pensioners, to investors, and ultimately to the taxpayer;

Whereas, despite the irresponsible actions of AIG executives that threatened the company as a going concern, and exposed taxpayers to almost $200 billion to cover losses from excessive risks, these executives will receive hundreds of millions of taxpayer money in retention payments and bonuses for performance in 2008 and 2009;

Whereas, in a letter to Treasury Secretary Geithner, AIG CEO Edward Liddy said that ''AIG also is committed to seeking other ways to repay the American taxpayers for AIG Financial Products retention payments.'';

Whereas, in the same letter, Liddy said that ''AIG's hands are tied. Outside counsel has advised that these [retention payments] are legal, binding obligations of AIG, and there are serious legal, as well as business, consequences for not paying. Given the trillion-dollar portfolio at AIG Financial Products, retaining key traders and risk managers is critical to our goal of repayment [to the taxpayer].'';

Whereas the appropriate committees in the House of Representatives and the Senate have already convened hearings to examine the sizable government assistance provided to AIG, and the House Financial Services Committee has focused its oversight on the excessive compensation provided AIG's executives and employees, among other matters;

Whereas common sense dictates that a company such as AIG that was so mismanaged as to threaten the stability of the financial system of the Nation and that requires billions of dollars of taxpayer money for its survival should not reward that mismanagement through lavish bonuses; and

Whereas, on March 15, 2009, President Obama stated: ''In the last six months, AIG has received substantial sums from the U.S. Treasury. I've asked Secretary Geithner to use that leverage and pursue every legal avenue to block these bonuses and make the American taxpayers whole'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President is appropriately exercising all of the authorities granted by Congress under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, and any other Federal law, by taking all necessary actions to ensure that—

(1) in the absence of a voluntary decision by AIG employees and executives to forego their contractual retention bonuses, AIG will repay taxpayers for the hundreds of millions of dollars the company provided to executives and employees in retention bonuses;

(2) going forward, companies that receive a capital infusion under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 that the Secretary of the Treasury deems necessary to restore liquidity and stability to the financial system of the United States are prohibited from providing to executives and employees unreasonable and excessive compensation payments that are not directly tied to performance measures, such as repayment of the companies' obligations to the taxpayers, profitability of the company, adherence to appropriate risk management, and transparency and accountability to shareholders, investors, and taxpayers; and

(3) companies that receive a capital infusion under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 that the Secretary of the Treasury deems necessary to restore liquidity and stability to the financial system of the United States are complying with the letter of the provisions included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that strengthen executive compensation restrictions for recipients of capital infusions, such as limiting base salaries for executives to no more than $500,000 per year, banning golden parachutes, limiting bonuses for executives, requiring shareholders to approve pay packages, requiring executives to certify they are meeting the law's restrictions, requiring a company-wide policy on luxury expenditures, and prohibiting compensation on the basis of excessive risks that threaten the viability of such companies, and adhering to all executive compensation guidelines the Secretary of the Treasury may establish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of anger in the Nation, and it is reflected in this House, which is representative of the Nation, about retention bonuses given to people who worked at AIG. Retention bonuses in this situation, Mr. Speaker, strike me as a form of legalized extortion. These are not performance bonuses. I was unclear about that and misspoke about it to some extent. These are bonuses paid solely so that people who had been employed at AIG would not leave AIG as it became clear the company was in trouble.

Specifically, we were told that these retention bonuses go to employees who were engaged in complex financial transactions. Now it is, in sum, these complex financial transactions that caused the company the problem. The insurance entities, regulated by State insurance regulators, caused no problem. In fact, they generated the resources and the revenues that allowed these other people to get themselves in trouble.

According to Mr. Liddy, who was appointed to head AIG after the failure, a decision was initiated by the Federal Reserve last September to lend them money and then make a change in the company's management. Mr. Liddy said he was afraid—and he is genuinely sincere about this—he was afraid that some of these people who had been working at the company and who had intimate knowledge of these complex transactions would leave the company and might, in fact, even use their knowledge in ways that would be adverse to the company.

That is a very sad commentary on them. These are people who were engaged in these transactions, the effect of which was to put the company in trouble. And we are told that they have to be bribed not to abandon the company in their time of trouble.

Now, I am skeptical that the best way to get out of the hole that those

people dug was to let them get extra pay for wielding the shovel. I believe there could have been other people hired. My colleague, Mr. CAPUANO, did some good questioning in this. We were told AIG felt, no, they had to pay the bonus. I think that is a very grave error.

My own preference is, and I have urged this on the administration, my preference is that they bring a lawsuit on behalf of the U.S. as the major shareholder so that we can recover here; that is, it is not a case of us as a regulator intruding on a contract by others. This is a case where we are the major owners of this company. And I believe that it is a grave error to enrich people who have apparently threatened to leave the company, abandon it and not help them get out of the problems they created unless they are given these bribes called ''retention bonuses.'' We have a resolution here which talks about several things.

First, it does express our determination to prevent these from happening in the future. We have already done some of that. We should note, this provision here, this decision was made unilaterally by the Federal Reserve system under a 1932 statute. There was no congressional input whatsoever into the decision last September to do this. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Paulson, accompanied me, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, and they came to Congress, and they said that Mr. Bernanke had decided to give a loan of $85 billion to this company. No restrictions were put on the company. Two days later, the same two gentlemen asked us to enact legislation providing for $700 billion in authority.

At that point, we said, among other things, there has to be some restrictions on the compensation paid. Now we didn't get all the restrictions we wanted because we were in the negotiation process. But it was instructive that when the Fed did it on its own with the Secretary of the Treasury's support, there were no restrictions on compensation. Two days later, we immediately raised that, had a debate and got some of them. Now, we have gone further.

I would make this contrast. We have AIG without any restrictions. Under the TARP program, which Congress voted and which is now being administered by the current administration, we have not only imposed restrictions, we are now being criticized in the press and by some of the recipients for being too tough on them. In the New York Times last week, there was a front page article that said the banks are going to have to give the money back because we are too tough on compensation, lavish entertaining and too much pressure to make loans. There was an article in the Washington Post business section 3 days ago making the same point. I welcome that kind of criticism. I welcome the recognition that we have now become very tough. The problem is that these bonuses were granted under an authority that the Federal Reserve gave before Congress got into the situation and were able to put on the restrictions. This resolution is a beginning of what we will be doing.

There is also, I hope, going to be a lawsuit. I have been pressing the administration for a shareholders' lawsuit to recover the bonuses that have already been paid. And there will be other legislative vehicles. I hope that the Committee on Financial Services will mark up a bill next week which will embody much of what is in this resolution. We will have a markup in committee. I hope we will be able to bring a bill to the floor that will deal with this both prospectively and retroactively. At this point, this is a statement of intention which I think is appropriate because people in this country want to know what we are doing. It will be followed up by a markup in committee.

We have had several hearings on the subject of compensation and a big one on AIG, obviously, yesterday. And we will have another AIG hearing next week with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. But we will be marking up legislation next week in committee and voting on it the final week before the recess so that what we state here as our intention I hope will become law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the Chair. At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Like the American people, I'm extremely disappointed by the recent news that AIG paid millions of dollars in money bonuses after it received a massive government bailout. We all agree that the decisions that led to the collapse of AIG and the payment of large bonuses to some of the same executives who caused the collapse are indefensible.

However, the legislation we vote on today arrives at conclusions based not on facts, but rather, is focused on delivering political cover to my Democratic friends and colleagues. The bill reads, ''It is the sense of the Congress that the President is appropriately exercising all of the authorities granted by Congress.''

How can we come here today after all we and the American people have learned this week and say that everything the President has done is appropriate? The American people recognize the absurdity of such a statement, and so should we. In reality, there is not a single Member of Congress who can say with certainty that the President has done everything in his power in connection with these bonuses.

For instance, just today, Bloomberg quotes the Senate Banking Committee Chairman CHRIS DODD as saying that the Obama administration asked him to insert a provision in last month's $787 billion economic stimulus legislation that had the effect of authorizing AIG's bonuses. If that is correct, do you really want to vote to say that what the President did in enabling these bonuses was appropriate? I think not.

We are here today because the majority is trying to paper over its mistake. And now, they are asking us to compound that mistake by endorsing everything the President had done in connection with these million-dollar bonuses. It was a mistake not to read the stimulus package before you voted on it. You didn't read it. You didn't understand it. It had this provision in it. How could we, in good conscience, support legislation lauding the President's actions in allowing these bonus payments if it was that same administration that worked to enact legislation that now prevents us from recouping this $160 million dollars?

Such a vote would be a vote of confidence for an administration whose actions in handling the AIG matter have not earned the confidence of the American people.

Make no mistake, today's vote is not an effort to ensure oversight nor an effort to hold people responsible for their actions. Today's vote, instead, I conclude by saying, is a thinly veiled political ploy by the Democratic majority to deflect responsibility. That is wrong. The American people know it. Working families deserve better. They deserve an exit strategy from this continued cycle of government bailouts. And they deserve to be repaid 100 percent. They don't deserve a cover-up.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I learn a lot in this job. Now, I have learned about a theory called creationism which in some cases holds that the world was created 4,000 years ago or 7,000 years ago by calculating what the Bible said. But I now am astounded to see a new and more compressed theory of when the world was created. It apparently was created at noon on January 20, 2009.

You just heard someone say, ''it is Obama's fault.'' In September of 2008—and I regret that we are getting into this kind of political discussion—but the gentleman from Alabama raised it. In September of 2008, two appointees of George Bush came to the Congress and said, Mr. Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who had previously been on the Bush economic advisory staff, and Mr. Paulson, the Secretary of the Treasury, and they said, ''we are going to lend $85 billion through the Federal Reserve to AIG.'' They didn't ask us.

Mr. BACHUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BACHUS. The economic stimulus package——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, I'm sorry. I will yield to talk about what I am talking about. I take back my time.

Mr. BACHUS. The language was inserted in that bill last night.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, please instruct someone who should know better about the rules. I took back my time. The point is this: He had the chance to make his argument. He wanted to make it political. Yeah, there was something in the stimulus package. Before the stimulus package, there was September of 2008. It does exist. Your revisionism doesn't work.

I would say to my friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, in September—I note, Mr. Speaker, how sensitive the subject is that I raised. I got one sentence into describing the role of the Bush administration, and up comes my colleague from Alabama, because they don't want this to be discussed.

In September of 2008, George Bush's two top economic appointees came, and Mr. Bernanke informed us that he was going to lend $85 billion to AIG. I said, at the time, because he said ''we have obligations all over the world here, and we have to make our foreign partners know that this is not going to be a default on them.'' I said, ''well, are they contributing?'' I asked them at the time, ''will there be any contribution from foreign banks to make up what AIG owes?'' The answer was ''no.'' So from September of 2008 until January 20, 2009, the Bush administration was in charge of this.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Would the gentleman yield on that one point?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will yield again to your sensitivity.

□ 1330

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It is not to my sensitivity, just that since you are throwing out the dates, you said from September until January.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. January 20, yes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is it not true that somewhere in between there, approximately on November 10, there was a restructuring that was done from the $85 billion initially, and the gentleman is correct when you said it initially came from the Fed, but restructuring was done perhaps at the request because of the credit ratings and what have you, and they needed to change the terms, and that the funds then came in part from TARP; is that correct?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes. I will reclaim my time to say that the gentleman has just reaffirmed what I said. I said it was the during the Bush administration.

I just reclaimed my time. Do Members not understand the rules on the other side? I yielded twice. I reclaimed my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I got briefly into my response. Two of my colleagues have now jumped up because they don't want the story to be told. I said that it was under the Bush administration.

The gentleman from New Jersey got up, and, frankly, I thought he was going to say, ''Oh, no, that was the Federal Reserve, they are not technically the Bush administration.''

Instead, what he wanted to do was to drive home my point and say it wasn't just the Federal Reserve, it was the Department of Treasury in November 2008. Who was running the Department of Treasury? Bush appointees. So I accept the gentleman's correction. I should have been more clear that it wasn't just the Federal Reserve, it was also the Secretary of the Treasury and there was a restructuring.

The Bush administration was in control from September of 2008 until January. The decision to lend the money with no restrictions on compensation was a Bush administration decision.

Now, when we had to vote on the rescue plan, we did insist on some compensation restrictions. They were grudgingly applied. Under the current administration, we have greatly expanded these. If, in fact, we had covered the restrictions—well, the restrictions, let's just put it this way, that are now in place on the rescue plan are so tough that people want to give us the money back. The recovery plan, we said they could give the money back.

But the point is that yes, in November of 2008 it became even more of a Bush administration situation because Treasury had a larger role.

I would yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The point that I was about to make on completion of that was that yes, it was the Bush administration, his Secretary in November, November 10, 2008, who did the restructuring to help the situation move along. But they were not able to do that unilaterally, were they? In other words the TARP money that they spent, they didn't just pull that out of thin air like the Fed when they created money, they had to do that by requesting the House and the Senate to pass TARP legislation. My question to you was: Did that go through the House and who was it that sponsored the TARP legislation that provided the money?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The answer is the gentleman appears to have forgotten. How did it go through? Yes, the TARP legislation, requested by the Bush administration, did pass the House with the support of a majority of Democrats and a minority of Republicans, but supported by the Republican leadership.

Excuse me.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain to the gentleman, when you are recognized, you can speak. If you are not the one who is recognized, you ask someone to yield. If he yields, as I have done to you twice, you can speak. If he doesn't yield, you wait until someone does. It is an orderly process.

Now, again, I understand that this is an unusual degree to which I am being asked to yield because the Members on the other side want to make a partisan attack and not have the facts. The facts are—no, I will not yield to a continued kind of pattern of interruption because Members don't want the story told. I listened to the gentleman. He asked about how the TARP bill was passed. The Bush administration lobbied for it strongly. The Republican leadership of the House supported it, although a slight majority of the Members voted against it. A heavy majority of Republicans in the Senate passed it. So the TARP bill did pass with a majority of Republicans in the Senate, the Republican leadership in the House, and Democratic majorities in both Houses, and the Bush administration. It was genuinely bipartisan.

It included some restrictions on compensation, less than I would have liked because Republicans in the Senate, working with the Bush administration, resisted them.

We have since increased both the types of restrictions and the levels. So the answer to the gentleman's question: yes, the TARP bill did pass at the request of the Bush administration with support from the House Republican leadership, which I notice is conspicuously off the floor now to avoid embarrassment, and the majority of Republicans in the Senate. But that's the point, Mr. Speaker, this was initiated by the Bush administration, and the decision to give the TARP money without any restrictions came from the Bush administration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the level of hypocrisy is astounding here. The resolution before us asks us to agree by our vote that the President is properly exercising all of the authorities granted to him by the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act, which did ban bonuses and golden parachutes.

What we do know is, the conference report, which was on a complete partisan basis adopted and signed by the President, had protection of bonuses to AIG written into it.

Now what we don't know is how the language that was previously in the stimulus was taken out in conference secretively and this language put in. We do know that Senator DODD was part of it because he has come out publicly and said I accept responsibility for putting this language in.

Now, we don't know who came——

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. TERRY. So we know that Senator DODD put this language in, but we don't know at whose request. But he has said at the President's request, probably through Geithner. So I can't in good conscience vote for this saying what the President has done through Secretary Geithner is appropriate.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY).

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, the great Winston Churchill said, ''The price of greatness is responsibility.'' AIG has shown that for them the price of greatness is greed, putting greed above greatest, putting self-interest above responsibility.

Today I rise in support of this resolution and to express the will of the American people to stop rewarding this behavior.

Let me be clear: We should focus on the behavior of AIG and those traders that were nothing more than gamblers, gambling in credit default swaps not in cards. But in the end, they gambled away the financial security of our markets. And when they failed and put the financial system at risk, the risk was pushed back onto the backs of the American people. America has had enough.

Instead of taking responsibility for the massive damage they have caused, AIG has continued this culture of greed. Today, in this resolution, we can tell these traders that business as usual is over. We don't care about their excuses and contracts. Contracts are, frankly, renegotiated every day. We care about cleaning up this mess and changing the culture that caused this debacle.

This resolution states our intent that without a voluntary decision by AIG employees to give the bonus money back, we will act to make them do so.

Today we hear that some employees have been shamed into giving back this money. Some is not good enough. All is the only option.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY). I am hopeful she will answer a question or two about the actual bill she has sponsored.

Ms. KILROY, would you mind answering a question about the bill that you are sponsoring? I would like to enter into a colloquy with Ms. KILROY.

Ms. KILROY, you are the sponsor of this bill having enabled this language and voting in favor of the stimulus bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah should direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a question of the woman who just spoke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah should direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, do we know why she walked away? I just wanted the ability to ask a question about the bill that she sponsored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has the time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a question about why she walked away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I was trying to ask the Speaker why the gentlewoman would walk away from the microphone when I simply wanted to ask a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has the time. Does the gentleman from Utah have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The question that I had, Mr. Speaker, is had the gentlewoman actually read the stimulus bill before she voted on it?

I wanted to ask the gentlewoman if it was her opinion that the administration is doing everything it should to prevent these bonuses from going through?

I also wanted to ask the gentlewoman did these bonuses happen under their watch?

Finally, I wanted to ask her, Didn't the White House ask Senator DODD?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have followed all of the discussion, and I understand the first vote is an instrumental vote and it actually does something.

This particular resolution I don't understand at all. Essentially, as I see it, it is a cover-up vote for the administration saying they did everything right. I don't disagree that there were problems in the previous administration. There are problems in this administration with all of this. There are a lot of problems in Congress, and perhaps with AIG. But to suggest that this administration has done everything correctly is just not accurate. It was Mr. Geithner, after all, when he was the head of the New York Federal Reserve and made the first payment to AIG in which they received most of the stock of AIG who was involved from that point on. It was his people who were involved from that point on.

There were discussions recently in the stimulus package about who actually took out the language with respect to allowing these bonuses to take place because there was language apparently put in by the Senate that would have prohibited that. And again, the White House was apparently involved in that.

Then there were discussions as to when everybody knew about this. And Mr. Geithner apparently indicated that he was informed I guess late last week and then informed the President. And yet we heard from Mr. Liddy at AIG that the Federal Reserve was involved with this from the beginning and knew about it from the beginning, and he assumed probably shared that information with Treasury.

Either way, you are talking about the administration. Individuals either did know or should have known, and to absolve the administration of fault is just wrong. And whether we vote ''yes'' or ''no'' on the previous bill, in my judgment everybody should vote ''no'' on this legislation. It is just not proper. I am not even sure why we are trying to consider it today, but it is not proper. It is not accurate. The bottom line is it should have a ''no'' vote.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will continue to reserve.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Delaware for his comments, and pointing out the fact that members of this administration, specifically Secretary Geithner was actually considered the architect of the AIG bailout bill.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I am angered. The American people are angered. But they are not just angered by what is going on with these bonuses at AIG, they are also angered at what is going on right here in Washington, DC, and in this Capitol by people who helped create this mess.

For those of us who voted against the bailout and who voted against the stimulus bill, we are equally angered not just at the bonuses, but also at the fact that this language was inserted into the stimulus bill.

Senator CHRIS DODD, the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee himself said this language, protecting AIG bonuses, was put in the bill because of a request from the White House.

We deserve to know who at the White House knew about that, who at the White House asked for this language to be put in protecting AIG bonuses. And now that people are rightly angered across the country, they are trying to cover themselves with this language in this resolution which is part of this coverup.

If Secretary Geithner knew that this language was going to be inserted and he helped direct it in there, he needs to resign. But the President needs to answer these questions to the American people who are rightfully angered about what is happening.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to my colleagues not try to be problem solvers. The work of this body is to in fact solve problems, fix the capital markets, ensure that we restore the confidence in the capitalistic system. And yes, to overcome mishaps and issues that raise concern with all of us.

Today we create the opportunity and the vehicle to solve these problems. The taxation on retention bonuses speaks loudly on behalf of the American people. The expression of opposition to actions that occurred speaks loudly on behalf of the American people.

□ 1345

This body has many committees that will engage in oversight. My colleagues

don't think that the work will be done—and it will continue—on how these issues came about, but maybe they should look at the past and understand the reason we are here is the $1.1 trillion debt that was created by the past administration. We are fixing the problem. Let's join those of us who want to work it out on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution that I believe only begins to express the outrage that the American people and many Members of Congress are feeling right now. Our constituents feel like they have been handed a raw deal from the executives at AIG. They have given out large bonuses that would make most people blush with shame.

The understanding that most Members of Congress had when we passed the TARP legislation was that these measures were necessary to keep our financial system from collapse. However, the reality of a few months has proven quite different.

Last month, we voted for another economic recovery package of over $700 billion which contained language that limited executive compensation for companies that received certain TARP funds.

It appears that the AIG executives may not have broken the law but certainly the spirit of the law. This is unconscionable. It is an outrage that these businessman have bucked the system and chosen to dole out federally appropriated dollars to their own bank accounts. Where is the fairness? Where is the equity? $165 million is no small change.

In other words, if AIG has received over $190 billion in funds from the federal fiscal coffers in the last year, the company is acting in broad contravention of the essence of the law to use $165 million of that for bonuses. The country is now $12 trillion dollars in debt after passage of last month's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. We literally cannot afford irresponsible uses of taxpayer dollars.

The unemployment rate is on the rise across the country. In fact, in my state of Texas, the unemployment rate has hit 6.4 percent. And that rate is even higher for minorities. Many of the people of Texas, like many Americans, are suffering through this economic downturn.

By voting for this resolution we are not just voting to take the money back, we are voting to get our country back on the right track. The U.S. dollar has traditionally been one of the strongest in the world. But just last week, an official from China appeared to question the holding of U.S. paper.

The losses that led to AIG's essential failure came largely from two sources: The state-regulated AIG insurance subsidiaries' securities lending program, and the AIG Financial Products (AIGFP) subsidiary, a largely unregulated subsidiary that specialized in financial derivatives. And is it not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that most of the bonuses in question went to AIG executives in those two divisions. Bad actors should not benefit from poor performance. The American people should not be required to pay for the missteps of the AIG top brass, particularly during a time when the unemployment rate is creeping up.

Financial derivatives are products that came into the public consciousness during the Orange County default of 1994. Typically derivatives are used to diversify investment portfolios for institutional and retail investors. If we thought that the derivatives beast had been tamed—apparently we were wrong—it has roared back to bite us.

The securities lending losses were largely due to investments in mortgage-backed securities, and are relatively well-defined at this point. At the end of 2008, the outstanding obligations from the AIG securities lending program were approximately $3 billion, down from over $82 billion at the start of 2008.

The credit derivative losses from AIGFP, however, are potentially ongoing despite actions taken to limit them. AIG reported approximately $300 billion in continued notional net exposure to credit derivatives at the end of 2008, down from approximately $370 billion at the start of 2008.

The government assistance to AIG began with an $85 billion loan from the Federal Reserve in September 2008. This loan was on relatively onerous terms with a high interest rate and required a handover of 79.9 percent of the equity in AIG to the government.

As AIG's financial position weakened after September, several rounds of additional funding were provided to AIG and the terms were loosened to some degree. The lessening of restrictions was necessary because of the overall deterioration of the economy and certain financial services companies.

The second major restructuring of the assistance to AIG was announced in March 2009 and has yet to be completed. Once it is completed, the assistance to AIG will comprise: (1) Up to $70 billion in capital injections through preferred share purchases by the Treasury; (2) up to $40.3 billion in outstanding loans from the Fed; (3) up to $34.5 billion in Federal Reserve loans retired by securities and equity interests provided to the government by AIG; and (4) up to $52.5 billion in loans for troubled asset purchases—assets which are now owned by the government.

In addition to possible continuing losses on AIG's derivative portfolio, the ongoing weakness in the economy may weigh heavily on AIG's future results. It is not clear whether the ongoing government involvement in AIG might strengthen or weaken AIG's core insurance business, as consumers could conclude that their policy with AIG is safe due to the government involvement or they could conclude that their policy with AIG is more risky since the government could change the terms of its involvement at any time.

That is why we must, as a Congress, send a strong message to the American people. They need to know that when we write a bill that is circumvented—Congress will act quickly to address it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is it under the rules of the House that the sponsor of the resolution has to be on the floor during the presentation of the discussions and debate on the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not required under the rules of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, there is a lot of expression of outrage—and indeed, there should be.

I don't believe that this resolution really addresses the real problem that we have. It looks like it's giving the administration an excuse by saying that he is only doing what we have asked him to do, and the administration. And in many ways this is true. The real fault, I think, falls within the Congress ever giving this money and allowing this to happen. But to excuse the administration and then complain about these bonuses and think that that can solve our problems, it just won't do that.

The real outrage, I think, is the lack of monitoring of what we do; we give out money, we have no strings attached, we give out hundreds of billions of dollars, and we totally ignore what the Federal Reserve does by issuing literally trillions of dollars. And yet, this is the emergency legislation.

This is politically driven, I happen to believe. I think people would like to express their outrage, and they do. And it's an easy target, picking on AIG, but we create these problems; we create them by doing things that are unconstitutional. We come up with these schemes and these expressions and excuses, and at the same time, we don't address the subject of why do we spend money, and why do we allow a monetary system to operate without any supervision by the Congress? That's where our real problem is. And someday we will address that and deal with this rather than doing it in the political way of saying, well, it's not our fault, it's their fault.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Texas for pointing out that these problems were, in fact, created through legislation, and that legislation came under the leadership of the Democrat House.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the frustration that my constituents and I have at the abuse of taxpayer dollars.

The American taxpayer, over the past year, has been forced to foot the bill with hundreds of billions to bail out bad decisions made by institutions that were deemed too big to fail, including AIG.

After receiving almost $200 billion in taxpayer bailout dollars, we now know AIG used some $165 million to pay bonuses to many of the same executives who got them into this mess in the first place. These bonuses are outrageous; but even more outrageous is that this whole situation could have been avoided. During the closed-door conference committee meetings for the

Democrat so-called stimulus bill, a provision was slipped in that permitted the AIG bonuses to be paid.

The $165 million in bonuses AIG recently made must be recaptured. As the primary—unwilling—investors, the American taxpayers deserve to know how and when they will be repaid and given assurance that their dollars will not be squandered any further.

The legislation voted on today will not recapture 100 percent of taxpayers' money, and it sets a dangerous precedent for punishing individuals by taxing past behavior deemed inappropriate.

It is disappointing how this body continues to let the American people down.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to correct the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have long thought that I pay closer attention to our colleague from Texas (Mr. PAUL) than his Republican colleagues. He talked about legislation, but he was talking about, in part, the legislation that gives the Federal Reserve the ability to do this.

The gentleman from New Jersey is incorrect. This was not created by the TARP legislation which the Congress passed at the request of President Bush, it was under legislation passed in 1932 which gave the Federal Reserve the authority. Mr. Bernanke was acting under that authority. So it is true that the actual loan was made under the administration of George Bush, but he was acting under authority signed by another great Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen this much gnashing of teeth and beating of breasts since Homer penned ''The Rape of the Sabine Women''.

This is truly amazing. We are being asked to vote on a resolution today that says that the President is doing everything in his power to properly execute a program. Now, I wish I could vote ''yes'' because I happen to think that the President of the United States, Mr. Obama, is doing the best job that he can, but I can't answer that question. I can't answer that question. And I am going to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee if he will answer the question. This is the paragraph—hold on, let me get the citation—title VII, section 111, subparagraph (iii).

Somehow, when the bill left the Senate, it had the Wyden-Snowe language that said ''no executive compensation,'' and it taxed it. When the bill comes out of the conference committee, it has this paragraph in it that makes possible the bonuses that people are so shocked about today.

Now, I wasn't in the conference committee, I've been transferred to the Appropriations Committee, and so I would yield to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee if he would tell me—I assume he was a conferee—how did this get in the bill? I'll yield to anybody on the Democratic side. How did this paragraph get in the bill?

This paragraph said that the government could not stop the $170 billion worth of bonuses, and today we're taxing these bonuses at 90 percent and we're calling these people traitors. Come on. How did this stuff get in the bill? And if you can't answer the question, we can't vote on your resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as a guest of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to our leader, I will yield such time to the chairman if he wishes to answer the question that the gentleman from Iowa asked, which was, how did this language get into the legislation which allowed for these bonuses to go through? He did not answer the question before, but I will yield.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will confess, Mr. Speaker, I was not paying as close attention to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Then I take back my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would he rephrase the question?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I take back my time. Apparently, the gentleman doesn't know the same rules that he was asking for one of his peers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has the time.

The Chair would ask Members to be more orderly in yielding and reclaiming time. Specifically, Members should not interrupt after the Member under recognition has expressed an intent not to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding.

I can see that the political circus continues here with the second piece of legislation today.

I just want all the Members to know what the first paragraph of the ''Resolved'' clause is in this resolution. It says, ''Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that it is the sense of Congress that the President is appropriately exercising all of the authorities granted by Congress under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, and any other Federal law.'' Are you kidding me?

The Secretary of the Treasury has the ability to do this. Before he gave the last $30 billion—you know, that was the day after they reported a $61 billion loss, the Secretary of the Treasury decided they needed another $30 billion. And before he gave them the $30 billion, he couldn't have made clearer that no bonuses were going to be paid.

So I don't know how we can put this ''resolved'' clause in this phony resolution here so all Members can cover their rear-ends that they have come to the floor and they have voted to stop all of these bonuses going to these AIG executives.

This is a joke, and we ought to treat it as such. Vote ''no.''

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that if the gentleman wants to ask me a question—I had said I hadn't heard it—if he would rephrase it, I will try to answer it.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, for I think it's a sham and an attempt to rewrite history.

When I and many of my colleagues voted against the first TARP bailout, I did so because I thought there weren't enough taxpayer protections. Well, you know what? I was right. But now we find out, to make matters worse, the other side of the aisle made it even worse writing in—in secrecy in the dead of night—a provision that actually took away a provision that would protect the taxpayers from these obscene bonuses. Well, they got caught, and now they have no one to blame but themselves.

When they say to 178 Members on this side of the aisle, ''it's my way or the highway,'' this is what they get. But my taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for their mistakes or their arrogance. So maybe I will call their bluff and maybe I will vote for their flawed legislation, which is too little, too late, because I want our taxpayer's money back.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I worry about how we're going to solve this problem.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will continue to reserve.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

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

The outrage is continued. What we have today here is nothing short of a legislative coverup. That's what we're looking at here, Mr. Speaker. And when you look at these two different proposals that have come to the floor, one of which would trample on the Constitution in order to perpetrate this legislative coverup. And now we have the spectacle of Senator DODD pointing the finger at Secretary Geithner, and Secretary Geithner pointing the finger at Senator DODD. But what we do know

is that our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, could have prevented this. But this language got in the bill, and all of a sudden it has no parents. Nobody will claim where this came from, this magical language that somehow allows these outrageous AIG bonuses to be paid.

Here's a news flash: Why don't we tell them, ''No more Federal money, AIG, until these bonuses are repaid?'' Don't come up with this political cover-your-backside language, trying to excuse all the people who are responsible for this in the first place. Don't trample on our Constitution in order to do this legislative coverup.

What happened to supposedly the most open and honest Congress in the history of America? This is transparency? This is honesty? And instead, we have cover up. Vote it down.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I guess I will never get to answer that question, so I will yield, instead, 1 minute to the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor and his ongoing leadership in protecting the national interest of the American people as chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee for the legislation that was debated earlier about how the American people can get their money back, money paid in bonuses for failure, money paid that belongs to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, today we are gathered on the floor to address a symptom, the bonuses, a symptom of the challenge that we face in our economy and in our financial situation in our country. I believe the President is on the right path and did an excellent job in his leadership when we passed the Recovery Act here. This Congress is moving forward with regulatory reform to address the lack of regulation, supervision, and discipline in the financial markets that brought us to this place. The President's initiatives on housing will help people stay in their homes. Addressing the housing crisis is essential to addressing the financial crisis in our country. And then we have to deal with the stability of our financial institutions.

In the course of doing that, with a massive infusion of cash from the Fed on September 16—long before some in this body were even elected to the Congress—the Federal Reserve transferred these funds and the many funds since then without any requirements or conditions.

We come to a point where it is very clear that there are many in our country who believe that the way a free market system works for them, and not in the national interest, is to nationalize the risk and privatize the gain.

□ 1400

They are entrepreneurial, take risk, enjoy the benefits when success is there. But when it is not, these undue risks have to be paid for by the taxpayer, or so they think. That's just not right.

We all believe in a free market system. We all see that capitalism produces jobs and creates capital, and that is important. It creates wealth and that's important to the success of our economy, creating jobs especially. But it isn't right, it just simply isn't right, when there is a reward, a spelled-out-in-advance reward, for those who will take undue risk and when they fail, they get a bonus; the taxpayer gets the bill. This must end.

And today with these two resolutions, I think that we are making two important statements. One is that the administration should continue in its efforts to recover the money and prevent these bonuses from going forward. And the other is that we want our money back and we want our money back now for the taxpayers. This isn't that complicated. It isn't that complicated.

There are other steps that we can take, and in working in a bipartisan way on the committees of jurisdiction, the Financial Services Committee for one, we will have other pieces of legislation which will ensure that this can never happen again. We're working with the Judiciary Committee to say when is the national interest so offended that it is okay, then, to revisit a contract?

You hear all this talk about, oh, we can't revisit contracts. It's the Constitution. And we respect that, and we would not do so unless we would do so very carefully. But nobody seems to have a problem saying to auto workers in Michigan that their contracts must be revisited, that they have to take a deep cut in order to sustain an industry because that industry is important to our national security; we must have a manufacturing base and we cannot have it be undermined. So if the workers contracts are so subject to review and revision, why is it that when somebody gives a contract for a bonus to somebody for failure which is known not to be in the national interest that you can't even bring up the subject?

Well, that isn't the subject for today in terms of legislation, but the subject of fairness and justice is. And I would hope that going forth from today, we could work strongly in a bipartisan way to address the real challenges to our economy and the challenge that the fragility of our financial institutions poses. We have to really say is it worth it to us to transfer hundreds of billions of taxpayer money, as Secretary Paulson asked us to do on September 18 when he and Chairman Bernanke visited the Congress? What are the results? Where is the credit circulating on Main Street?

Just getting back to the bonuses for a minute, because of the failure of AIG and the downturn for so many other financial institutions in our country, our people do not have job security. They're afraid of losing their jobs, their homes, their pensions, the college education of their children. It's just not right. There is a direct connection between this nationalizing the risk and privatizing the gain and the economic security of America's families and the strength of Main Street.

So let's take a step and say we want our money back. Here's one way to get it. And then let's work together to do more in that regard to bring justice to the system but, more importantly, to work together to bring stability to our economy.

With that, I urge our colleagues to support the resolutions before us.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to a gentleman now who also wants to get the money back but also wants to find out how we got to this place in the first place, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee because apparently I wasn't riveting enough when I was chatting before. And I'm happy to restate my question, and if the distinguished Speaker hasn't left the floor, she as well, I assume, had a representative in the conference committee.

My question was simple. These bonuses were not blocked as a result of this paragraph in the stimulus bill. Now, 2 days before we voted on it, every Democrat in the House voted to give us 48 hours to do it. You didn't do it. You gave us 90 minutes. You said 90 minutes is plenty of time. So I assume the Democrats read it. I assume the conferees who were in the room when this paragraph was inserted read it.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. LATOURETTE. My question, Mr. Chairman: How did this get in the bill?

I have the same answer, but I'm glad at least we have now heard the question.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Ohio that last remark was kind of bewildering. It wasn't my time. He was out of time. He seemed to be annoyed that I hadn't answered his question, but how I don't know how I could have done that except by sign language, in which I am not proficient. In my time I will address the question. For him to ask me a question as his time expires and then express indignation at my failure to answer it puzzles me.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give the chairman 15 seconds to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I'm not

going to be told I have only 15 seconds to answer a question.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent to give the chairman 1 minute to answer the gentleman from Ohio's question.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has an additional 1 minute added to his time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I will use it and then reserve the balance of my time.

I was not a member of the conference committee. The Financial Services Committee was not directly involved in this. We were more constrained by what we thought was the germaneness to the recovery bill. So the answer is I am not familiar with whatever the reasons were as to why this was put in.

I will say this: If there had been no language whatsoever, we still wouldn't have had the authority. In other words, what did survive was additional authority. Now, if there had been no bill whatsoever, we wouldn't have come even this close. But as to the specific question, the answer is I was not involved.

I would also just say, as chairman of the Financial Services Committee, I monitor pretty closely what goes on. I am not aware of any Republican member of the Financial Services Committee who has approached us and asked us to toughen up compensation restrictions. This interest in compensation restrictions is a fairly new interest. I commend people. I think later in life, it's good to take up new things so you don't get stale. But I do want to note that it is a fairly newfound hobby of my colleagues on the other side. In fact, in September when the Bush administration said they were going to make the loan with no restrictions and we pushed for it——

Mr. BACHUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. We're talking about this February. This resolution deals with your resolution that the President in February acted appropriately.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, we now have the nub of it. How dare I mention September of 2008. We're talking about February. I thought the world began on January 20. Apparently it started on February 1.

The fact is that you cannot look at this out of context. It was under the Bush administration that they initiated this loan to AIG. It was under the Bush administration that they asked for TARP and for our efforts to try to restrict compensation.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time remains on both sides, and was that time that just used then in excess of the 1 minute that was yielded to the gentleman by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was.

The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas who knows as well as RON PAUL does that the Federal Reserve was created during a Democrat administration.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I heard the chairman a moment ago saying Bush was in charge in September. And that's correct. I was glad to hear that.

But some of us back in September were begging the majority and people on this side of the aisle don't give $700 billion in this fashion to anybody, not Paulson, not Geithner, not anybody. But it passed with the majority of the majority voting for it.

So it's a little difficult to come in here and say the President has done everything he can when President Obama's defense apparently is, well, Bush was bad, he used maybe $300 billion of the $700 billion; so we've got Obama $1.5 trillion, $1.6 trillion.

Look, if we want to fix this so the President can do all he can, somebody needs to put in the teleprompter that he's directing Geithner to put this outfit in receivership and then go get 100 percent of the bonuses. Then we can talk about doing all he can.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

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

A couple of minutes ago we heard from the gentlewoman from California, the Speaker of the House. She said this isn't complicated. And you know what? It's really not complicated.

It was just a few short weeks ago that the House Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, came out here with, I don't know, was it a thousand pages? It was a whole lot of pages in the stimulus package. And he gave a poignant observation, and he made a challenge and he said nobody on that side of the aisle has read this bill. He dropped it, and like a thug those pages hit. And there was silence on the other side because you know what? The other side, Mr. Speaker, could hardly give you eye contact because they hadn't read the bill. And now, lo and behold, we come up with one shuffling answer after another as to how it is that this policy gives AIG the ability to walk away with taxpayer money. The list of excuses knows no end.

So the Speaker is right. This isn't complicated. This is what happens when we abrogate responsibility, when the Congress doesn't read bills, and when we create what my predecessor calls the ''greased chute of government.''

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are essentially here today on a resolution that does nothing much more than to say congratulations to this administration.

When you think about all the outrage across the country, and Americans should be outraged. We all want to get our money back and we will do everything in our power to get our money back. But the Americans are not only outraged at these bonuses, they are not only outraged at AIG and that they paid them out, but they are also outraged that we got here in the first place. And they know the fact that it was Secretary Geithner who was the architect of this. They know that TARP 1, 2, and 3 passed under the leadership of this Democrat House without absolute any strings attached whatsoever. And they know that it was under the leadership of this House that a bill passed that pulled out the restrictions. And so there is no reason why we should be commending this administration on this matter.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have passed from creationism to fantasy. It's interesting.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) was very critical, in fact, of the actions of the Republican leader. He said we begged people not to vote for the TARP. The Republican leader in the House last fall worked very hard to get it passed. So did the other members of his leadership.

□ 1415

So did the other Members of his leadership, and now he is being denounced for that. So I guess he broke even on his side, which these days, if you are in the minority, may be a pretty good day.

But the fact is this, the gentleman from New Jersey says, well, the Democrats were in the majority—though he said Democrat majority. Pardon me, for not getting his inflection absolute. Yes, the President of the United States, George Bush, came and asked us to do this, and his two top economic advisers said if you don't do it, there will be a crisis.

But, in fact, that's not directly relevant to the AIG issue. AIG was granted money.

And, by the way, the gentleman from New Jersey again misstates the relevant statute. The statute that we are referring to, that the gentleman from Texas referred to, is not the original one creating the Federal Reserve, it's the 1932 statute that gave them the power to lend money as they wish, signed by another great Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

But the point is that it was the Republican administration that said we had to do this. Yes, there was cooperation, the Republican leadership in the

House, the majority in the Senate, believing that there would have been a terrible problem if it wasn't there.

I do want to reiterate that I am now pleased, as Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, that there is this interest on the Republican side in restricting compensation. It has not previously been a strong part of their argument.

However, we will return to the subject of this resolution. The resolution isn't binding, but it is a forerunner of what will be binding.

The Committee on Financial Services will vote next week on binding legislation, and it will bring it to the floor the week after, which will embody much of this, and it will include an effort to deal with this retroactively. There will be legal questions raised, but the fact is that we will have binding legislation to embody this.

This is an important statement. I would say this in closing, Mr. Speaker. We have people now at AIG deciding whether or not they are going to give their money back. The more they give back to us, the better we will be. It won't be totally conclusive.

But to defeat this resolution because it says nice things about President Obama would be a grave error.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of this resolution because no company should pay large bonuses to employees after receiving taxpayer funds under the Troubled Assets Relief Program. I agreed to the stated "sense of Congress" that the President is appropriately exercising all powers available to him because I have no reason to conclude otherwise. But I acknowledge the possibility that the President may not be doing all he can to recover the AIG bonuses. No Representative can know everything an Administration is doing so it is therefore possible that more can be done. If more can be done, it should be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 76.

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. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1586, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 76, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1216, de novo.

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

TAXING EXECUTIVE BONUSES PAID BY COMPANIES RECEIVING TARP ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1586 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1586.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 328, nays 93, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—328

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
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 (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—93

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Bean
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Fallin
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMahon
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Mitchell
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—10

Boustany
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Delahunt
Hinchey
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Olson
Radanovich
Souder

□ 1444

Messrs. MINNICK and McKEON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. THOMPSON of California, YOUNG of Alaska, REHBERG, ALEXANDER, LEWIS of California, WHITFIELD, YOUNG of Florida, BROWN of South Carolina, FLEMING,

and FATTAH changed their vote from ''nay'' to yea.''

Mr. KISSELL changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 143 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1586—Additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients. We must protect taxpayers' money and ensure TARP funds are not being abused by executives. Executives of TARP funded companies should not receive bonuses for the work they have done that has caused us to arrive at our current economic situation.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BONUSES PAID BY AIG AND OTHER COMPANIES RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 76, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 76.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 255, nays 160, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—255

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)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gallegly
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
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
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—160

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

NOT VOTING—16

Boustany
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Delahunt
Doyle
Hinchey
Linder
McNerney
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Olson
Pascrell
Radanovich
Slaughter
Souder
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1453

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 144 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 76—Expressing the sense of the Congress regarding executive and employee bonuses paid by AIG and other companies assisted with taxpayer funds provided under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) of the Secretary of the Treasury. It is absurd that AIG has received $180 billion in TARP assistance while giving $165 million in bonuses to the very people who have brought us to our current economic state. We cannot allow the executives of these companies to benefit at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today my vote in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 76, which was rollcall No. 144, was not properly recorded due to an electronic error. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted ''yea'' on this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 143 and 144, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

LANCE CORPORAL MATTHEW P. PATHENOS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1216.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1216.

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.

□ 1500

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the minority whip for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday no votes are expected.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions, as is the tradition, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 and H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman that, in reference to his mention of the public lands omnibus bill, and that will be coming back to the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman, will our side, the Republicans, be given a motion to recommit or an opportunity to amend this bill?

Mr. HOYER. The bill comes back, of course, it is a House bill being returned with amendments as the gentleman, I'm sure, knows, and under those circumstances, of course, we consider that there is not a motion to recommit on that kind of a procedure. So the answer there would be it would not be a motion to recommit. As the gentleman also knows, this bill came two votes short of a two-thirds majority with very significant Republican and Democratic support of the bill. This bill has been hanging around for a long period of time. It is composed largely, although not exclusively, of bills that have passed the House largely on suspension.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is we believe there has been demonstrated overwhelming support for the substance of this bill. It has been hanging around a long time. We want to see it get passed. And the answer is probably not.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, certainly there are procedures in place to waive the rules so that we can, on the minority side, have a voice in the passage of this legislation consistent with what President Obama has continued to say, which is that we should change the way this town works and continue to allow all sides to have a voice in what Congress does. I think, as we saw over the last week, evidence or results of rushing things through the House and disallowing our side to have a say in legislation may very well end up with wrong results. So I am saddened to hear that we will not be having an opportunity to offer an amendment to that bill.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman, I'm sure, knows, many, many of the provisions, I don't know that I have the specific count, are Republican-sponsored bills in this, what the Senate packaged, as you know, so that a large percentage, I don't know exactly what the percentage is, whether it is 30 percent or 35 percent, are Republican-sponsored pieces of legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I think that the percentage would probably be reflected in the fact that there may be 17 or so Republican provisions in the bill out of 140 or so. So I wouldn't necessarily say, Mr. Speaker, that that would reflect what our side would amend or hope to amend the bill with. But I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that last week he was on the floor and he mentioned that a stem-cell bill will be coming to the floor prior to recess. And since the gentleman has not noticed the bill for next week, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell us if he expects it on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. It is possible. I wouldn't send out an expectation. It is being worked on. There is a strong feeling by the sponsors of the legislation, as you know, that passed in the last Congress through this House, handily, that I think in agreement with the administration that, in addition to the administration's Executive Order, legislation is necessary to give certainty to what can and cannot be done by researchers. And we obviously want to make sure that researchers understand what the law is, what the opportunities are, and what the prohibitions are so that legislation is possible. But I want to tell my friend that I did not announce it for next week. I don't expect legislation next week. I think it is possible for the week following, but I don't want to go beyond that. We will certainly let the gentleman know as soon as I know.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask further questions of the gentleman, as we have been told that the budget will be marked up next week, and I am wondering from the gentleman, number one, if he expects the budget on the floor the following week? In addition to that, I am curious, as are the Members on our side of the aisle, about the subject of your discussions with Chairman SPRATT as to the direction of the budget. There has been a lot of discussion publicly as well as in these halls, about the proposed cap-and-tax proposal, where some economists, those from MIT and others, predict that if we are to provide for the cap-and-tax proposal, that it will cost American families at least $3,100 every year. That, to me, is a great cause for alarm, especially given the economic times and the struggle that the working families of this country are encountering.

It was also revealed this week that the number provided for in the proposed budget has underestimated the real cost of cap-and-tax. And if that is the case, that is even more alarming given the fact that if we are looking at an over $3,000 per family tax, what is it that we are doing if we are putting that cost on anybody who pays an electric bill, anyone who pays a gas bill, anyone who buys anything manufactured in this country? So I ask the gentleman if he is contemplating that the budget proposal that will come to the floor will have that in it.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My presumption is that you have now come up with a new phrase on your side of the aisle. I do know about cap-and-trade. It is talked about regularly. But maybe that is not as politically salient as ''cap-and-tax.'' It seems innovative. But if the gentleman, as I presume he is, is referring to what is commonly known by everybody else as ''cap-and-trade,'' let me say this: The Budget Committee obviously will mark up on the 25th, that is next Wednesday, we expect to bring the budget bill to the floor the following week, the last week before the Easter break. My expectation is there will be provisions in there for energy and global warming consideration. But my further expectation is it will not adopt a premise of one alternative over another, that that will be subject to the legislative process, and that one will not be chosen in the budget itself, so that voting on the budget would not be giving precedent to one alternative over another.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask whether the gentleman can tell us as to the prospect for reconciliation instructions to be included in the budget. We have heard this week that the White House has told leaders on your side of the aisle to pursue health reform through reconciliation as well. And to us, this seems like a straight-up partisan approach, something I don't think that the American people are looking for right now, especially when it comes to items such as taxes and items like health care that everyone is concerned with. There is no distinction made between hardship on health care between Republican and Democrat.

So I would like to ask the gentleman, will the budget be coming through with reconciliation instructions?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the gentleman indicated that ''we have been told by the White House.'' I had some comments on how the Republican majority responded, from my perspective, without fail to

the Bush administration. We have discussions with our White House. We don't tell them. They don't tell us. We have discussions, positive discussions, on how we, together, can move this country forward.

Those discussions clearly have had reconciliation as a subject of discussions. But I will tell the gentleman that those decisions by the Budget Committee have not been made, nor have they been made by the chairman of the Budget Committee. But they clearly are part of the discussion. Reconciliation, as the gentleman knows, has been in our rules for a very long period of time. When the Republicans were in power, reconciliation was something that they used. They are in the process to facilitate the adoption of the budget and policies consistent with the budget; i.e., to reconcile the budget with the authorization and the policy with the budget that has been adopted. So I say to the gentleman that that is certainly under consideration, but no decision on that has been made.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman would also share the attitude of discussing with us the direction, just as you indicate that the White House discusses but doesn't tell you what to do. So I like that spirit of cooperation.

I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, further, about any insight you can give us as to TARP 2 budgeting. As we all know, if we do not get the banking system fixed, we won't have the credit system fixed for the small businesses of this country, and we won't see the economy get back on the path to growth. So I would ask the gentleman, is he contemplating a number in the budget? Does your conversation with Chairman SPRATT indicate what we could expect there?

And I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to anticipate what the Budget Committee will do. The gentleman is referring to the placeholder that the administration suggested in the budget. They did so because they wanted to present a budget that did, in fact, anticipate possible costs. To that extent, it was probably one of the most honest budgets that we received, honest in the sense that it included the prospective costs. As you know, we have been somewhat critical in the past of costs that we knew were coming down the pike but which were not included. So the administration did that.

Now whether or not the Budget Committee itself decides to include those costs, I don't know. But I do know this, that there has been no decision on an additional TARP appropriation or authorization. Clearly, we are hopeful that we will stabilize the economy. We have moved forward in many respects on a bipartisan basis on this, certainly not in every respect.

We have done some tough things because we thought the crisis that confronted our country demanded action. We have all been very disappointed with some of the manifestations of that. And I think we are going to continue to look at this very carefully. The Financial Services Committee is marking up a bill this coming week, which I expect to have on the floor the following week, dealing with constraints on those who receive funds from the Federal Government, from the taxpayer, to shore up our economy, not to shore up those businesses, but to shore up the businesses as they relate to the impact their failure would have on the economy.

I think that the gentleman and I share a view that we certainly need to have knowledge, and we will have knowledge if the administration believes that it needs additional resources and that Congress will have that to consider. I would say that the environment for such a piece of legislation right now is not particularly good.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman further on that note about a markup in the Financial Services Committee. I take it to mean that the Financial Services Committee will be working on a piece of legislation, not necessarily aimed at a bank fix and making sure we can get the impaired assets out of the market, but instead, from what I hear the gentleman say, that it is a bill aimed at providing a structure for those businesses, those institutions receiving TARP funds.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think that is accurate.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And one additional question along those lines, Mr. Speaker, could we expect then the following week for that bill to be coming to the floor?

Mr. HOYER. That is my expectation, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, we heard an announcement from the President of a plan to support small businesses. And as the gentleman knows, the Republican plan for stimulus was focused like a laser on the job creators, which are the small businesses of this economy. We know that 70 percent of the jobs come from small businesses, entrepreneurs and the self-employed. So we were very delighted to see the announcement—and I know the gentleman himself had some public comments to make, as well—lauding the move towards finally saying, if we are going to create jobs, we had better focus on small business. But my concern is, Mr. Speaker, that when you're talking about small business and the SBA, truly nine out of 10 small businesses in this country have not had any encounter with the SBA, nor do they intend to or want to.

I will tell the gentleman, in my district, I had a small business forum last week. I spoke to 25 small business people. What they are asking for is access to credit. They are looking for the banking system to work. They want their own community banks, not necessarily government strings attached to loans.

□ 1515

They also are looking for relief from the tax code. As we have noted on the floor several times, Mr. Speaker, the budget that was proposed by the White House actually impacts small businesses more than anyone else. In fact, 50 percent of those receiving a tax hike in accordance with the President's budget are small businesses.

So with that in mind, and given that the gentleman has applauded the move on the part of the White House to help provide relief to small businesses, I would ask the gentleman if there are any plans to include tax relief for small businesses in the majority's budget as it works its way through committee and then to the floor next week?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. As you point out, on this side of the aisle we certainly have great concern for small businesses.

Although I don't want to be argumentative, the situation we find ourselves in was inherited. It was inherited from a previous administration that believed in a number of things, particularly the policies that you have offered to once again pursue, which we didn't think would work and, we think, frankly, have in some respects been a cause of the crisis that confronts this country.

Furthermore, we think that the administration's focus on deregulation and taking the regulators out of circulation was a significant cause. We also think that the failure of the Federal Reserve to enforce the 1994 law that was passed by the Congress and which was enforced by Chairman Bernanke in 2007 when he took office, which allowed the Federal Reserve the authority to oversee the subprime market, and the theory that Mr. Greenspan had that the market would regulate itself. In point of fact, we see from AIG that the market did not regulate itself. It went on a binge of irresponsibility and greed.

So I want to make it clear that while we are very concerned about small businesses, it is huge businesses that have put them in the trick bag. It was huge businesses that weren't overseen properly by the previous administration and need to be properly overseen by this administration.

Furthermore, let me say to my friend that the budget that the President has proposed eliminates the capital gains tax for individuals on the sale of certain small business stocks. It makes the research and experimentation tax credit permanent. Ninety-seven percent of small businesses will receive no tax increase in 2010. There is $28 billion in loan guarantees to expand credit availability for small businesses, and support for $1.1 billion in direct disaster loans for businesses, homeowners and renters.

Furthermore, the administration has, which you just saw them take action on, a small business lending initiative, not to the big banks, not to the

huge organizations, but to small businesses. It is focused on unlocking credit for small businesses. You and I have absolute agreement on that. We need to do that. You talk to your small businesses; all of us do.

I had a meeting with my Chamber of Commerce, and we probably had a hundred small businesses in the auditorium at that point in time. You are absolutely right, they are having real trouble getting credit. I talked to a county commissioner who has a small business in Calvert County. Normally he could go into his bank and get a loan on a handshake for $30,000 or $40,000 to expand his business. This time he was looking for $40,000. He has dealt with this bank for 35 years, and they said, I don't know whether they said Mr. Clark or Mr. Commissioner, but they said, yes, but fill out the form. And it took him 30 days. Now he got it, but he has done business with that small bank for that period of time. So we share that view.

By the end of the month, the Treasury Department will start making direct purchases of up to $15 billion in securities backed by SBA loans to get the credit market for small businesses moving again.

In addition, in the Recovery Act, we eliminated, as I am sure the gentleman knows, all SBA-backed fees on SBA-backed loans, again to try to facilitate small businesses getting credit.

And it raises from 85 to 90 percent the proportion of loans that the Small Business Administration will guarantee.

Lastly, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has endorsed these steps to unlock the credit markets for small businesses.

So we are very pleased at the definitive action that we have taken to further the interest you and I share of making sure that small businesses can make it in this extraordinarily bad time which we believe previous policies have caused and which we have inherited.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, how I would respond to that is let's take a step back and look at sort of the events that transpired that led up to the need for today's vote on the AIG bonus payments, okay. I think that the events if we follow them teach us a lesson.

The stimulus bill that included a provision prohibiting the government from disallowing the bonus payments was in that 1,100-page bill. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, no one in this House read the bill in its entirety. Nor did the public have its right to know realized. I think that ought to give us the sense that we need to be much more deliberative and open about this process.

These ideas, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is proposing to help small business, most of which we probably do agree on, but, frankly, the better way to ensure success and a positive result is to have an open process where we all have the ability to offer our ideas, that the ideas and the policies are not just handed down from the majority leader or the Speaker's office and imposed upon the will of the people of this country.

So I would just reiterate to the gentleman that if we can see our way forward to allow the minority the ability to offer up real, positive alternatives if we disagree, it would all behoove us to work in that fashion. We can end up avoiding the type of result that came from the rushed way that so-called stimulus bill passed this house.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields back, I just want to make an observation.

I understand what the gentleman said, but the gentleman will recall, of course, that your party had a substitute that it offered that lost on a bipartisan vote, as you recall. So the gentleman did have the opportunity, his party had the opportunity, to offer a substitute which a significant number in his party did not agree with and certainly an overwhelming majority of our party did not agree with, in part because we perceived it as creating far fewer jobs. There is a difference of opinion on that, I understand that, but our perception was that it created about a third of the jobs or saved about a third of the jobs that our bill did.

But that aside, putting aside that disagreement on the figures, the fact is there is no disagreement that you had a substitute. You offered it, and it was defeated.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. How I would just respond before I yield back my time is that there was a stronger bipartisan vote in favor of our substitute than there was in support of the actual bill that passed. I think that we can take that as a signal that this House ought to be open, ventilated, and available for debate.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 76.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 146. An act to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes.

REPUBLICANS WANT TAXPAYER DOLLARS BACK

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats today chose to introduce an unconstitutional joke of a bill in order to clean up the AIG mess Democrats alone created. It was a Democrat spending bill, Democrat language, and only Democrat votes that authorized AIG to hand out bonuses. Democrats wrote the bill alone, secretly, and yet they act surprised.

Republicans have offered a bipartisan solution to get 100 percent of the taxpayers' dollars back, not 90 percent like our Democrat colleagues seek. The American people deserve to have all of that bonus money back, money authorized and spent by Democrat leadership.

The American taxpayers are justly outraged that their tax dollars are lining the pockets of AIG executives. Republicans have a solution to fix this problem, but Democrats don't want to talk about it. Democrats don't want to talk about the mistakes that they have made. American taxpayers deserve better.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

VETERAN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, approximately 150,000 veterans live in Nebraska, many of whom live in my Third District. I am grateful for their sacrifice and certainly honored to represent them here in the United States House of Representatives.

I rise today to expression extreme disappointment, but also some gratitude for a policy that was made and then rescinded. I am grateful it was rescinded because it would cause a great burden for our veterans who have served us so admirably with sacrifice when they would have to go through the private sector health insurance rather than the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again to express my gratitude because our veterans deserve better than that. They shouldn't be burdened with such a bureaucratic

process. They need a streamlined process so they can experience their health care in a more effective manner.

□ 1530

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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.)

VETERANS' HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose a policy proposal by the Obama administration that would break with our country's obligation to its veterans. As we know, our veterans have sacrificed to protect our way of life and deserve the promises that we made to them being kept.

Yesterday, I joined my fellow Republican members of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs and House Republican leaders in sending communications to President Obama in strong opposition to an ill-conceived plan. The administration's plan would bill veterans' private insurance for care related to service-connected injuries. It would permit the Department of Veterans Affairs, the VA, to ignore its core responsibility ''to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.'' Our country has a binding obligation to provide this care, particularly to those who have become disabled as a result of their service.

It is wrong to shift this responsibility to private insurers—which actually the veterans will pay for in premiums—and to our disabled veterans themselves. Additionally, billing veterans' private insurance could result in higher premiums for the veterans to cover the cost of treating the service-connected injuries. Some disabled veterans may expend their insurance benefits on treatment of service-connected conditions, leaving no benefits for their family. This policy may also discourage employers from hiring disabled veterans.

I encourage, in the strongest possible terms, the administration to shelve this proposal permanently. While we must look for ways to save taxpayer dollars and tackle our runaway budget deficit, we should not ask those who have already sacrificed so much to pay the bill.

We must never forget that our country has a responsibility to its veterans. Congress should honor this obligation by providing the funding necessary for the VA to maintain health care services to our men and women who have served us in uniform.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, 111TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of House Rule XI, I hereby submit the Rules of Procedure of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the 111th Congress, as adopted by the Committee on February 12, 2009.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, FOR THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 111TH CONGRESS

1. MEETING DAY

Regular Meeting Day for the Full Committee. The regular meeting day of the Committee for the transaction of Committee business shall be the first Wednesday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chair.

2. NOTICE FOR MEETINGS

(a) Generally. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, the Chief Clerk of the Committee shall provide reasonable notice to every member of the Committee. Such notice shall provide the time and place of the meeting.

(b) Definition. For purposes of this rule, ''reasonable notice'' means:

(1) Written notification;

(2) Delivered by facsimile transmission, regular mail, or electronic mail that is:

(A) Delivered no less than 24 hours prior to the event for which notice is being given, if the event is to be held in Washington, D.C.; or

(B) Delivered no less than 48 hours prior to the event for which notice is being given, if the event is to be held outside Washington, D.C.

(c) Exception. In extraordinary circumstances only, the Chair may, after consulting with the Ranking Minority Member, call a meeting of the Committee without providing notice, as defined in subparagraph (b), to members of the Committee.

3. PREPARATIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Generally. Designated Committee Staff, as directed by the Chair, shall brief members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting in order to:

(1) Assist Committee members in preparation for such meeting; and

(2) Determine which matters members wish considered during any meeting.

(b) Briefing Materials.

(1) Such a briefing shall, at the request of a member, include a list of all pertinent papers, and such other materials, that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting; and

(2) The Staff Director shall also recommend to the Chair any testimony, papers, or other materials to be presented to the Committee at the meeting of the Committee.

4. OPEN MEETINGS

(a) Generally. Pursuant to House Rule XI, but subject to the limitations of subsections (b) and (c), Committee meetings held for the transaction of business and Committee hearings shall be open to the public.

(b) Meetings. Any meeting or portion thereof, for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or any hearing or portion thereof, shall be closed to the public, if the Committee determines by record vote in open session, with a majority of the Committee present, that disclosure of the matters to be discussed may:

(1) Endanger national security;

(2) Compromise sensitive law enforcement information;

(3) Tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; or

(4) Otherwise violate any law or Rule of the House.

(c) Hearings. The Committee may vote to close a Committee hearing pursuant to clause 11(d)(2) of House Rule X, regardless of whether a majority is present, so long as at least two members of the Committee are present, one of whom is a member of the Minority and votes upon the motion.

(d) Briefings. Committee briefings shall be closed to the public.

5. QUORUM

(a) Hearings. For purposes of taking testimony, or receiving evidence, a quorum shall consist of two Committee members, at least one of whom is a member of the Majority.

(b) Other Committee Proceedings. For purposes of the transaction of all other Committee business, other than the consideration of a motion to close a hearing as described in rule 4(c), a quorum shall consist of a majority of members.

6. PROCEDURES FOR AMENDMENTS AND VOTES

(a) Amendments. When a bill or resolution is being considered by the Committee, members shall provide the Chief Clerk in a timely manner with a sufficient number of written copies of any amendment offered, so as to enable each member present to receive a copy thereof prior to taking action. A point of order may be made against any amendment not reduced to writing. A copy of each such amendment shall be maintained in the public records of the Committee.

(b) Reporting Record Votes. Whenever the Committee reports any measure or matter by record vote, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of, and the votes cast in opposition to, such measure or matter.

(c) Postponement of Further Proceedings. In accordance with clause 2(h) of House Rule XI, the Chair is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(d) Availability of Record Votes on Committee Website. In addition to any other requirement of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall make the record votes on any measure or matter on which a record vote is taken, other than a motion to close a Committee hearing, briefing, or meeting, available on the Committee's website not later than 2 business days after such vote is taken. Such record shall include an unclassified description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting in favor of, and each member voting in opposition to, such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

7. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Generally.

(1) Creation of subcommittees shall be by majority vote of the Committee.

(2) Subcommittees shall deal with such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct.

(3) Subcommittees shall be governed by these rules.

(4) For purposes of these rules, any reference herein to the ''Committee'' shall be interpreted to include subcommittees, unless otherwise specifically provided.

(b) Establishment of Subcommittees. The Committee establishes the following subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence;

(3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and,

(4) Subcommittee on Intelligence Community Management.

(c) Subcommittee Membership.

(1) Generally. Each member of the Committee may be assigned to at least one of the four subcommittees.

(2) Ex Officio Membership. In the event that the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee do not choose to sit as regular voting members of one or more of the subcommittees, each is authorized to sit as an ex officio member of the subcommittees and participate in the work of the subcommittees. When sitting ex officio, however, they:

(A) Shall not have a vote in the subcommittee; and

(B) Shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(d) Regular Meeting Day for Subcommittees. There is no regular meeting day for subcommittees.

8. PROCEDURES FOR TAKING TESTIMONY OR RECEIVING EVIDENCE

(a) Notice. Adequate notice shall be given to all witnesses appearing before the Committee.

(b) Oath or Affirmation. The Chair may require testimony of witnesses to be given under oath or affirmation.

(c) Administration of Oath or Affirmation. Upon the determination that a witness shall testify under oath or affirmation, any member of the Committee designated by the Chair may administer the oath or affirmation.

(d) Questioning of Witnesses.

(1) Generally. Questioning of witnesses before the Committee shall be conducted by members of the Committee.

(2) Exceptions.

(A) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may determine that Committee Staff will be authorized to question witnesses at a hearing in accordance with clause (2)(j) of House Rule XI.

(B) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are each authorized to designate Committee Staff to conduct such questioning.

(e) Counsel for the Witness.

(1) Generally. Witnesses before the Committee may be accompanied by counsel, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).

(2) Counsel Clearances Required. In the event that a meeting of the Committee has been closed because the subject to be discussed deals with classified information, counsel accompanying a witness before the Committee must possess the requisite security clearance and provide proof of such clearance to the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at which the counsel intends to be present.

(3) Failure to Obtain Counsel. Any witness who is unable to obtain counsel should notify the Committee. If such notification occurs at least 24 hours prior to the witness' appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain counsel, however, will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(4) Conduct of Counsel for Witnesses. Counsel for witnesses appearing before the Committee shall conduct themselves ethically and professionally at all times in their dealings with the Committee.

(A) A majority of members of the Committee may, should circumstances warrant, find that counsel for a witness before the Committee failed to conduct himself or herself in an ethical or professional manner.

(B) Upon such finding, counsel may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

(5) Temporary Removal of Counsel. The Chair may remove counsel during any proceeding before the Committee for failure to act in an ethical and professional manner.

(6) Committee Reversal. A majority of the members of the Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chair to remove counsel for a witness.

(7) Role of Counsel for Witness.

(A) Counsel for a witness:

(i) Shall not be allowed to examine witnesses before the Committee, either directly or through cross-examination; but

(ii) May submit questions in writing to the Committee that counsel wishes propounded to a witness; or

(iii) May suggest, in writing to the Committee, the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses.

(B) The Committee may make such use of any such questions, or suggestions, as the Committee deems appropriate.

(f) Statements by Witnesses.

(1) Generally. A witness may make a statement, which shall be brief and relevant, at the beginning and at the conclusion of the witness' testimony.

(2) Length. Each such statement shall not exceed five minutes in length, unless otherwise determined by the Chair.

(3) Submission to the Committee. Any witness desiring to submit a written statement for the record of the proceeding shall submit a copy of the statement to the Chief Clerk of the Committee.

(A) Such statements shall ordinarily be submitted no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness' appearance before the Committee and shall be submitted in written and electronic format.

(B) In the event that the hearing was called with less than 24 hours notice, written statements should be submitted as soon as practicable prior to the hearing.

(g) Objections and Ruling.

(1) Generally. Any objection raised by a witness, or counsel for the witness, shall be ruled upon by the Chair, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee.

(2) Committee Action. A ruling by the Chair may be overturned upon a majority vote of the Committee.

(h) Transcripts.

(1) Transcript Required. A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during any hearing of the Committee.

(2) Opportunity to Inspect. Any witness testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of the hearing, and may be accompanied by counsel to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. Such counsel:

(A) May review the transcript only if he or she has the appropriate security clearances necessary to review any classified aspect of the transcript; and

(B) Should, to the extent possible, be the same counsel that was present for such classified testimony.

(3) Corrections.

(A) Pursuant to Rule XI of the House Rules, any corrections the witness desires to make in a transcript shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(B) Corrections may not be made to change the substance of the Testimony.

(C) Such corrections shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within 7 days after the transcript is made available to the witnesses.

(D) Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chair.

(4) Copy for the Witness. At the request of the witness, any portion of the witness' testimony given in executive session shall be made available to that witness if that testimony is: subsequently quoted or intended to be made part of a public record. Such testimony shall be made available to the witness at the witness' expense.

(i) Requests to Testify.

(1) Generally. The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee.

(2) Recommendations for Additional Evidence. Any person who believes that testimony, other evidence, or commentary, presented at a public hearing may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation may submit to the Committee, in writing:

(A) A request to appear personally before the Committee;

(B) A sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or commentary; or

(C) Proposed questions for the cross-examination of other witnesses.

(3) Committee Discretion. The Committee may take those actions it deems appropriate with respect to such requests.

(j) Contempt Procedures. Citations for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House only if:

(1) Reasonable notice is provided to all members of the Committee of a meeting to be held to consider any such contempt recommendations;

(2) The Committee has met and considered the contempt allegations;

(3) The subject of the allegations was afforded an opportunity to state either in writing or in person, why he or she should not be held in contempt; and

(4) The Committee agreed by majority vote to forward the citation recommendations to the House.

(k) Release of Name of Witness.

(1) Generally. At the request of a witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee, the name of that witness shall not be released publicly prior to, or after, the witness' appearance before the Committee.

(2) Exceptions. Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Chair may authorize the release to the public of the name of any witness scheduled to appear before the Committee.

9. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Commencing Investigations. The Committee shall conduct investigations only if approved by the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(b) Conducting Investigations. An authorized investigation may be conducted by members of the Committee or Committee Staff designated by the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to undertake any such investigation.

10. SUBPOENAS

(a) Generally. All subpoenas shall be authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or by vote of the Committee.

(b) Subpoena Contents. Any subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may compel:

(1) The attendance of witnesses and testimony before the Committee; or

(2) The production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other tangible item.

(c) Signing of Subpoena. A subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be signed by the Chair, or by any member of the Committee designated to do so by the Committee.

(d) Subpoena Service. A subpoena authorized by the Chair of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be served by any person designated to do so by the Chair.

(e) Other Requirements. Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of these rules.

11. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Definition. For the purpose of these rules, ''Committee Staff'' or ''Staff of the Committee'' means:

(1) Employees of the Committee;

(2) Consultants to the Committee;

(3) Employees of other Government agencies detailed to the Committee; or

(4) Any other person engaged by contract, or otherwise, to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee.

(b) Appointment of Committee Staff and Security Requirements.

(1) Chair's Authority. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Committee Staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) Staff Assistance to Minority Membership. Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), and except as otherwise provided by Committee Rules, the Committee Staff provided to the Minority Party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) Security Clearance Required. All offers of employment for prospective Committee Staff positions shall be contingent upon:

(A) The results of a background investigation; and

(B) A determination by the Chair that requirements for the appropriate security clearances have been met.

(4) Security Requirements. Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Chair shall supervise and direct the Committee Staff with respect to the security and nondisclosure of classified information. Committee Staff shall comply with requirements necessary to ensure the security and nondisclosure of classified information as determined by the Chair in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

12. LIMIT ON DISCUSSION OF CLASSIFIED WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

(a) Prohibition.

(1) Generally. Except as otherwise provided by these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, members of the Committee and Committee Staff shall not at any time, either during that person's tenure as a member of the Committee or as Committee Staff, or anytime thereafter, discuss or disclose, or cause to be discussed or disclosed:

(A) The classified substance of the work of the Committee;

(B) Any information received by the Committee in executive session;

(C) Any classified information received by the Committee from any source; or

(D) The substance of any hearing that was closed to the public pursuant to these rules or the Rules of the House.

(2) Non-Disclosure in Proceedings.

(A) Members of the Committee and the Committee Staff shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during the person's tenure as a member of the Committee, or of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(B) In the event of the termination of the Committee, members and Committee Staff shall be governed in these matters in a manner determined by the House concerning discussions of the classified work of the Committee.

(3) Exceptions.

(A) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose those matters described in subsection (a)(1) with:

(i) Members and staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence designated by the chair of that committee;

(ii) The chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and staff of those committees designated by the chairmen of those committees;

(iii) The chair and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chair of that subcommittee; and

(iv) Members and staff of the Intelligence Oversight Panel of the House Appropriations Committee as designated by the chair of that panel.

(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of the annual defense authorization bill with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and the staff of those committees as designated by the chairmen of those committees.

(C) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss with and disclose to the chair and ranking minority member of a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee with jurisdiction over an agency or program within the National Intelligence Program (NIP), and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chair of that subcommittee, only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of an appropriations bill within which is included an appropriation for an agency or program within the NIP.

(D) The Chair may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, upon the written request to the Chair from the Inspector General of an element of the Intelligence Community, grant access to Committee transcripts or documents that are relevant to an investigation of an allegation of possible false testimony or other inappropriate conduct before the Committee, or that are otherwise relevant to the Inspector General's investigation.

(E) Upon the written request of the head of an Intelligence Community element, the Chair may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, make available Committee briefing or hearing transcripts to that element for review by that element if a representative of that element testified, presented information to the Committee, or was present at the briefing or hearing the transcript of which is requested for review.

(F) Members and Committee Staff may discuss and disclose such matters as otherwise directed by the Committee.

(b) Non-Disclosure Agreement.

(1) Generally. All Committee Staff must, before joining the Committee Staff, agree in writing, as a condition of employment, not to divulge or cause to be divulged any classified information which comes into such person's possession while a member of the Committee Staff, to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(2) Other Requirements. In the event of the termination of the Committee, members and Committee Staff must follow any determination by the House of Representatives with respect to the protection of classified information received while a member of the Committee or as Committee Staff.

(3) Requests for Testimony of Staff.

(A) All Committee Staff must, as a condition of employment, agree in writing to notify the Committee immediately of any request for testimony received while a member of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, concerning any classified information received by such person while a member of the Committee Staff.

(B) Committee Staff shall not disclose, in response to any such request for testimony, any such classified information, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(C) In the event of the termination of the Committee, Committee Staff will be subject to any determination made by the House of Representatives with respect to any requests for testimony involving classified information received while a member of the Committee Staff.

13. CLASSIFIED MATERIAL

(a) Receipt of Classified Information.

(1) Generally. In the case of any information that has been classified under established security procedures and submitted to the Committee by any source, the Committee shall receive such classified information as executive session material.

(2) Staff Receipt of Classified Materials. For purposes of receiving classified information, the Committee Staff is authorized to accept information on behalf of the Committee.

(b) Non-Disclosure of Classified Information. Any classified information received by the Committee, from any source, shall not be disclosed to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, or otherwise released, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(c) Exception for Non-Exclusive Materials.

(1) Non-Exclusive Materials. Any materials provided to the Committee by the executive branch, if provided in whole or in part for the purpose of review by members who are not members of the Committee, shall be received or held by the Committee on a non-exclusive basis. Classified information provided to the Committee shall be considered to have been provided on an exclusive basis unless the executive branch provides a specific, written statement to the contrary.

(2) Access for Non-Committee Members. In the case of materials received on a non-exclusive basis, the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may grant non-Committee members access to such materials in accordance with the requirements of Rule 14(f)(4), notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of Rule 14.

14. PROCEDURES RELATED TO HANDLING OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Security Measures.

(1) Strict Security. The Committee's offices shall operate under strict security procedures administered by the Director of Security and Registry of the Committee under the direct supervision of the Staff Director.

(2) U.S. Capitol Police Presence Required. At least one U.S. Capitol Police officer shall

be on duty at all times outside the entrance to Committee offices to control entry of all persons to such offices.

(3) Identification Required. Before entering the Committee's offices all persons shall identify themselves to the U.S. Capitol Police officer described in paragraph (2) and to a member of the Committee or Committee Staff.

(4) Maintenance of Classified Materials. Classified documents shall be segregated and maintained in approved security storage locations.

(5) Examination of Classified Materials. Classified documents in the Committee's possession shall be examined in an appropriately secure manner.

(6) Prohibition on Removal of Classified Materials. Removal of any classified document from the Committee's offices is strictly prohibited, except as provided by these rules.

(7) Exception. Notwithstanding the prohibition set forth in paragraph (6), a classified document, or copy thereof, may be removed from the Committee's offices in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures shall govern the handling of any classified documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(b) Access to Classified Information by Members. All members of the Committee shall at all times have access to all classified papers and other material received by the Committee from any source.

(c) Need-to-know.

(1) Generally. Committee Staff shall have access to any classified information provided to the Committee on a strict ''need-to-know'' basis, as determined by the Committee, and under the Committee's direction by the Staff Director.

(2) Appropriate Clearances Required. Committee Staff must have the appropriate clearances prior to any access to compartmented information.

(d) Oath.

(1) Requirement. Before any member of the Committee, or the Committee Staff, shall have access to classified information, the following oath shall be executed:

''I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose or cause to be disclosed any classified information received in the course of my service on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, except when authorized to do so by the Committee or the House of Representatives.''

(2) Copy. A copy of such executed oath shall be retained in the files of the Committee.

(e) Registry.

(1) Generally. The Committee shall maintain a registry that:

(A) Provides a brief description of the content of all classified documents provided to the Committee by the executive branch that remain in the possession of the Committee; and

(B) Lists by number all such documents.

(2) Designation by the Staff Director. The Staff Director shall designate a member of the Committee Staff to be responsible for the organization and daily maintenance of such registry.

(3) Availability. Such registry shall be available to all members of the Committee and Committee Staff.

(f) Requests by Members of Other Committees. Pursuant to the Rules of the House, members who are not members of the Committee may be granted access to such classified transcripts, records, data, charts, or files of the Committee, and be admitted on a non-participatory basis to classified hearings of the Committee involving discussions of classified material in the following manner:

(1) Written Notification Required. Members who desire to examine classified materials in the possession of the Committee, or to attend Committee hearings or briefings on a non-participatory basis, must notify the Chief Clerk of the Committee in writing. Such notification shall state with specificity the justification for the request and the need for access.

(2) Committee Consideration. The Committee shall consider each such request by non-Committee members at the earliest practicable opportunity. The Committee shall determine, by record vote, what action it deems appropriate in light of all of the circumstances of each request. In its determination, the Committee shall consider:

(A) The sensitivity to the national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States of the information sought;

(B) The likelihood of its being directly or indirectly disclosed;

(C) The jurisdictional interest of the member making the request; and

(D) Such other concerns, constitutional or otherwise, as may affect the public interest of the United States.

(3) Committee Action. After consideration of the member's request, the Committee may take any action it deems appropriate under the circumstances, including but not limited to:

(A) Approving the request, in whole or part;

(B) Denying the request;

(C) Providing the requested information or material in a different form than that sought by the member; or

(D) Making the requested information or material available to all members of the House.

(4) Requirements for Access by Non-Committee Members. Prior to a non-Committee member being given access to classified information pursuant to this subsection, the requesting member shall:

(A) Provide the Committee a copy of the oath executed by such member pursuant to House Rule XXIII, clause 13; and

(B) Agree in writing not to divulge any classified information provided to the member, pursuant to this subsection, to any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as otherwise authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(5) Consultation Authorized. When considering a member's request, the Committee may consult the Director of National Intelligence and such other officials it considers necessary.

(6) Finality of Committee Decision.

(A) Should the member making such a request disagree with the Committee's determination with respect to that request, or any part thereof, that member must notify the Committee in writing of such disagreement.

(B) The Committee shall subsequently consider the matter and decide, by record vote, what further action or recommendation, if any, the Committee will take.

(g) Advising the House or Other Committees. Pursuant to Section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413), and to the Rules of the House, the Committee shall call to the attention of the House, or to any other appropriate committee of the House, those matters requiring the attention of the House, or such other committee, on the basis of the following provisions:

(1) By Request of Committee Member. At the request of any member of the Committee to call to the attention of the House, or any other committee, executive session material in the Committee's possession, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity to consider that request.

(2) Committee Consideration of Request. The Committee shall consider the following factors, among any others it deems appropriate:

(A) The effect of the matter in question on the national defense or the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) Whether the matter in question involves sensitive intelligence sources and methods;

(C) Whether the matter in question otherwise raises questions affecting the national interest; and

(D) Whether the matter in question affects matters within the jurisdiction of another Committee of the House.

(3) Views of Other Committees. In examining such factors, the Committee may seek the opinion of members of the Committee appointed from standing committees of the House with jurisdiction over the matter in question, or submissions from such other committees.

(4) Other Advice. The Committee may, during its deliberations on such requests, seek the advice of any executive branch official.

(h) Reasonable Opportunity to Examine Materials. Before the Committee makes any decision regarding any request for access to any classified information in its possession, or a proposal to bring any matter to the attention of the House or another committee, members of the Committee shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, documents, or other materials in the Committee's possession that may inform their decision on the question.

(i) Notification to the House. The Committee may bring a matter to the attention of the House when, after consideration of the factors set forth in this rule, it considers the matter in question so grave that it requires the attention of all members of the House, and time is of the essence, or for any reason the Committee finds compelling.

(j) Method of Disclosure to the House.

(1) Should the Committee decide by record vote that a matter requires the attention of the House as described in subsection (i), it shall make arrangements to notify the House promptly.

(2) In such cases, the Committee shall consider whether:

(A) To request an immediate secret session of the House (with time equally divided between the Majority and the Minority); or

(B) To publicly disclose the matter in question pursuant to clause 11(g) of House Rule X.

(k) Requirement to Protect Sources and Methods. In bringing a matter to the attention of the House, or another committee, the Committee, with due regard for the protection of intelligence sources and methods, shall take all necessary steps to safeguard materials or information relating to the matter in question.

(l) Availability of Information to Other Committees. The Committee, having determined that a matter shall be brought to the attention of another committee, shall ensure that such matter, including all classified information related to that matter, is promptly made available to the chair and ranking minority member of such other committee.

(m) Provision of Materials. The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall provide a copy of these rules, and the applicable portions of the Rules of the House of Representatives governing the handling of classified information, along with those materials determined by the Committee to be made available to such other committee of the House or non-Committee member.

(n) Ensuring Clearances and Secure Storage. The Director of Security and Registry shall ensure that such other committee or non-Committee member receiving such classified materials may properly store classified materials in a manner consistent with all

governing rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and statutes.

(o) Log. The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall maintain a written record identifying the particular classified document or material provided to such other committee or non-Committee member, the reasons agreed upon by the Committee for approving such transmission, and the name of the committee or non-Committee member receiving such document or material.

(p) Miscellaneous Requirements.

(1) Staff Director's Additional Authority. The Staff Director is further empowered to provide for such additional measures, which he or she deems necessary, to protect such classified information authorized by the Committee to be provided to such other committee or non-Committee member.

(2) Notice to Originating Agency. In the event that the Committee authorizes the disclosure of classified information provided to the Committee by an agency of the executive branch to a non-Committee member or to another committee, the Chair may notify the providing agency of the Committee's action prior to the transmission of such classified information.

15. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

(a) Generally. The Chief Clerk, under the direction of the Staff Director, shall maintain a printed calendar that lists:

(1) The legislative measures introduced and referred to the Committee;

(2) The status of such measures; and

(3) Such other matters that the Committee may require.

(b) Revisions to the Calendar. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes.

(c) Availability. A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each member, upon request.

(d) Consultation with Appropriate Government Entities. Unless otherwise directed by the Committee, legislative measures referred to the Committee may be referred by the Chief Clerk to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

16. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House.

17. MOTIONS TO GO TO CONFERENCE

In accordance with clause 2(a) of House Rule XI, the Chair is authorized and directed to offer a privileged motion to go to conference under clause 1 of House Rule XXII whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

18. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

(a) Authority. The Chair may authorize members and Committee Staff to travel on Committee business.

(b) Requests.

(1) Member Requests. Members requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request directly to the Chair.

(2) Committee Staff Requests. Committee Staff requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request through their supervisors to the Staff Director and the Chair.

(c) Notification to Members.

(1) Generally. Members shall be notified of all foreign travel of Committee Staff not accompanying a member.

(2) Content. All members are to be advised, prior to the commencement of such travel, of its length, nature, and purpose.

(d) Trip Reports.

(1) Generally. A full report of all issues discussed during any travel shall be submitted to the Chief Clerk of the Committee within a reasonable period of time following the completion of such trip.

(2) Availability of Reports. Such report shall be:

(A) Available for review by any member or appropriately cleared Committee Staff; and

(B) Considered executive session material for purposes of these rules.

(e) Limitations on Travel.

(1) Generally. The Chair is not authorized to permit travel on Committee business of Committee Staff who have not satisfied the requirements of subsection (d) of this rule.

(2) Exception. The Chair may authorize Committee Staff to travel on Committee business, notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (d) and (e) of this rule,

(A) At the specific request of a member of the Committee; or

(B) In the event there are circumstances beyond the control of the Committee Staff hindering compliance with such requirements.

(f) Definitions. For purposes of this rule the term ''reasonable period of time'' means:

(1) No later than 60 days after returning from a foreign trip; and

(2) No later than 30 days after returning from a domestic trip.

19. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

(a) Generally. The Committee shall immediately consider whether disciplinary action shall be taken in the case of any member of the Committee Staff alleged to have failed to conform to any rule of the House of Representatives or to these rules.

(b) Exception. In the event the House of Representatives is:

(1) In a recess period in excess of 3 days; or

(2) Has adjourned sine die; the Chair of the full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may take such immediate disciplinary actions deemed necessary.

(c) Available Actions. Such disciplinary action may include immediate dismissal from the Committee Staff.

(d) Notice to Members. All members shall be notified as soon as practicable, either by facsimile transmission or regular mail, of any disciplinary action taken by the Chair pursuant to subsection (b).

(e) Reconsideration of Chair's Actions. A majority of the members of the full Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chair to take disciplinary action pursuant to subsection (b).

20. BROADCASTING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, a majority of the Committee may permit that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions and in accordance with the spirit of the purposes enumerated in the Rules of the House.

21. COMMITTEE RECORDS TRANSFERRED TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(a) Generally. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Notice of Withholding. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the full Committee for a determination of the question of public availability on the written request of any member of the Committee.

22. CHANGES IN RULES

(a) Generally. These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by vote of the full Committee.

(b) Notice of Proposed Changes. A notice, in writing, of the proposed change shall be given to each member at least 48 hours prior to any meeting at which action on the proposed rule change is to be taken.

THE IRAQ WAR: THE ROAD AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first let me rise to commend Congressman KEITH ELLISON and the Progressive Caucus for organizing Special Orders each and every week. In fact, later this evening there will be one held to talk about the 6-year anniversary of the war and occupation of Iraq. So I rise today to talk about this very briefly.

Six years ago, President George W. Bush launched our Nation into one of the most disastrous, misguided, and dangerous military actions in our history, the initial invasion and proceeding occupation of Iraq. Now, as the new administration seeks to withdraw troops from Iraq, it is essential that the media, the public, and those of us in elected office support these efforts.

However, this time, no matter how uncomfortable it may be for those of us who fully support President Obama—who himself opposed the invasion from the beginning—we must hold our Iraq policy accountable and demand answers to tough questions regarding how and when our occupation will end.

Last month, to his credit, and we applaud his efforts, President Obama laid forth a timeline for the withdrawal of our military presence in Iraq. His proposal would have two-thirds of our troops home by August of 2010, with the remaining force of approximately 35,000 to 50,000 scheduled to leave by the end of 2011, almost 3 years from now. His announcement received praise from both sides of the political aisle; however, I think that we still need to talk about and have an honest and frank discussion of its merits and potential faults.

Americans seem, collectively, to try to forget about Iraq, but we must remember that this is costing us $10 billion a month in this economic recession. And while we recognize, appreciate, and applaud the President's decision, his declaration allows us to move forward and focus on other issues. And so what we are trying to do is make sure that we are focused on our comprehensive foreign and military policy at the same time that we are working on our economic and domestic front. While this reaction, of course, is understandable because people are suffering each and every day as a result of the last 8 years, it is also dangerous. We cannot afford to ignore the enormous

risks and potential sacrifices that loom ahead.

As one of the founders of the Out of Iraq Caucus, along with Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, our position has been clear all along; we opposed the war and the occupation from the start, and we have worked day in and day out to end it.

We believe that ending the occupation of Iraq means redeploying all troops—and we mean all troops—and all military contractors out of Iraq. It also means leaving no permanent bases, and renouncing any claim upon Iraqi oil.

We remain concerned about the plan, which calls for 127,000 troops to stay in Iraq until the end of this year and for 35,000 to 50,000 troops to remain in Iraq for another 2½ years after that. We cannot imagine the need for such an enormous military commitment, and we have talked to military experts who also question that.

How did the military planners agree on such a large residual for us, one which is comparable in size to our force levels in South Korea at the height of the Cold War? What role does this transitional force play in the event that violence flares back up? And what steps are being taken to address the 190,000 American contractors in Iraq, and to dismantle our permanent bases? Some say we don't have permanent bases there, others believe that we do—I am one who believes that we do. And so these questions must be addressed before we can move forward. We respectfully wrote to the President and set forth a set of questions asking some of the looming concerns which some of us still have.

America's interests in Iraq and the region will best be advanced by reducing the size of our military footprint and making greater use of other assets of national power, including diplomacy, reconciliation, commerce, development assistance, and humanitarian aid.

As we solemnly mark the beginning of a seventh year—and it's hard to imagine we have been there 7 years—of the conflict in Iraq, we not only must reflect on the incredible sacrifices made by the men and women who serve in the military, but also, we have to demand an honest assessment of the potential future obstacles that their brothers and sisters in arms will face. As President Obama has said, ''We must be as careful getting out of Iraq as we were careless getting in.''

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ALLOWING PRESS AT DOVER AIR FORCE BASE WHEN FALLEN TROOPS RETURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our fallen heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation in Iraq, and to share a letter I recently received from his father, Robert Stokely. Robert's letter relates to a Department of Defense policy that directly affected his family, and most especially, Mr. Speaker, his son.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to read this letter, as I feel it is necessary for this body to fully understand this issue in order to protect the dignity of our troops. Robert Stokely is from Newnan, Georgia, my wife's hometown. And of course I represented that area and am very proud of the folks in Newnan.

Mr. Robert Stokely writes:

''I was alarmed at the question asked by Ed Henry at President Obama's address to the Nation on Monday, February 9, 2009, i.e., allowing media access and cameras at Dover Air Force Base where fallen military personnel arrive on their final trip home to an honorable rest. I am also alarmed by an AP news article that Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has ordered a review of the policy. Please take a moment and read my story of meeting my son, and hopefully you can have a vivid image of why it is important to keep the family first in this matter, for it is a very personal moment when a fallen hero arrives home.

''I met my son's body at Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport in Atlanta on August 24, 2005 as he arrived from Dover. I went alone as a special privilege to take his body to the funeral home, where the family would then be the first to see the most striking, vivid image of a fallen loved one, the flag-draped casket. I rode in the hearse to take him on a 25-mile ride, covering the roads that Mike and I had shared so many days as a divorced dad and son going to and from visitation on weekends, holidays, and summers. It was a 'last ride to take my boy home.' ''

And this is in bold font, Mr. Speaker.

''I wore a favorite blue blazer, trousers, and a red and blue striped tie, for my son deserved my respect. As they uncrated his casket and draped the American flag over him, I saluted from nearby, tears streaming down my cheeks, as a number of busy U.S. Air cargo employees suddenly stopped in stunned silence, only then realizing what was taking place.

''I held my salute, poor as it was for an untrained civilian, until the flag was completely draped and the edges evenly cornered out. Then I stepped outside to call my wife, Retta, who loved him like one of her own. And as she answered the telephone, with tears still streaming down my cheeks and with a quiver in my voice, I said, ''our boy is home.''

Mike Stokely was age 23 when he was killed by a roadside bomb in Iraq. While the political debate about Iraq or any other war may be had in a free country like this, such as we enjoy, there is no debate that our military personnel engage in of the politics of when, where, or how long a war is waged. They have a constitutional duty to obey the Commander in Chief's lawful orders.

Mike Stokely, and many others, did their constitutional duty, and in doing so, preserved our freedom. Mike, and those like him who haven't yet but will die for America, do not need to be a media spectacle at Dover Air Force Base.

''I was once asked what I thought the real cost of freedom is. There are many such costs, but for the Stokely family, and like many of us, the highest cost has been paid, a lifetime of love.

''Is it too much to ask, given what the fallen and their families have given America, for us to have that first moment of seeing the flag-draped casket to be ours and ours alone? Should we now be asked to give more so that something so private can be used to sell advertising, to ensure a media outlet's profitable bottom line? Black ink on the bottom line is usually a good thing, but it cannot be so when it comes at the cost of making a spectacle of our fallen, thus dishonoring their spilled red American blood. I hope your answer will be an unequivocal, unwavering, and unapologetic 'no,' and that you will fight to keep the honorable sanctity of Dover rather than allow it to become a media spectacle.

''Please protect our fallen and their families and the privacy of Dover, for our fallen have given their lives to protect the lifetime of love you and your family and millions of other Americans continue to live and enjoy.

''Proud dad of Sergeant Mike Stokely.''

Mr. Speaker, the policy of allowing media to photograph these caskets at Dover Air Force Base is a serious issue for many families that have been struck with the tragedy of losing a loved one in battle. The brave service men and women on their final journey home have given their lives for our freedom. We must ensure that not only are their remains handled with the utmost respect, but that the wishes of their families are given the respect they so richly deserve.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2008 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2009 THROUGH FY 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 301 and 302 of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009.

The term ''current level'' refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by S. Con. Res. 70. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which establishes a point of order against any measure that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for each authorizing committee with the ''section 302(a)'' allocations made under S. Con. Res. 70 for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and fiscal years 2009 through 2013. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which establishes a point of order against any measure that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure.

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 with the ''section 302(a)'' allocation of discretionary budget authority and outlays to the Appropriations Committee. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which establishes a point of order against any measure that would breach section 302(b) sub-allocations within the Appropriations Committee.

The fourth table gives the current level for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 for accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 302 of S. Con. Res. 70. This list is needed to enforce section 302 of the budget resolution, which establishes a point of order against appropriations bills that include advance appropriations that: (1) are not identified in the joint statement of managers; or (2) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2009 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN S. CON. RES. 70

[Reflecting action completed as of March 11, 2009—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—		
	2008 [1]	2009 [2]	2009–2013
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	2,564,244	2,543,213	n.a.
Outlays	2,466,685	2,574,566	n.a.
Revenues	1,875,401	2,033,460	11,813,119
Current Level:			
Budget Authority	2,455,102	2,507,220	n.a.
Outlays	2,435,528	2,532,975	n.a.
Revenues	1,878,433	1,986,073	12,046,832
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	−109,142	−35,993	n.a.
Outlays	−31,157	−41,591	n.a.
Revenues	3,032	−47,387	233,713

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

[1] Notes for 2008:

Current resolution aggregates include $108,056 million in budget authority and $28,901 million in outlays covered by section 301(b)(1) (overseas deployments and related activities) that has not been allocated to a committee. The section was not triggered by Appropriations action.

[2] Notes for 2009:

Current resolution aggregates include $70,000 million in budget authority and $74,809 million in outlays covered by section 301(b)(1) (overseas deployments and related activities) that has not been allocated to a committee. The section has not been triggered to date in Appropriations action.

Current resolution aggregates do not include Corps of Engineers emergency spending assumed in the budget resolution, which will not be included in current level due to its emergency designation (section 301(6)(2)).

Current level does not include costs associated with Division A of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act. CBO was not able to estimate the cost of those provisions at the time the bill was enacted. CBO has produced estimates for their January, 2009 baseline incorporating the latest information on operations of the program as well as their most recent economic forecast. Although the full cost of Division A under these assumptions is not available, CBO has provided an estimate that the TARP will cost $184 billion in 2009.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2009 in excess of $35,993 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2009 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 70.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2009 in excess of $41,591 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2009 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 70.

REVENUES

Revenues for FY 2009 are below the appropriate levels set by S. Con. Res. 70.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013 in excess of $233,713 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by S. Con. Res. 70.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MARCH 11, 2009

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2008		2009		2009–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	1	8	0	0
Difference	0	0	1	8	0	0
Armed Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	−27	7	−1	−7
Difference	0	0	−27	7	−1	−7
Education and Labor:						
Allocation	−10	0	−9	−114	36	−60
Current Level	−10	0	−9	−114	−419	−515
Difference	0	0	0	0	−455	−455
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	89	81	11,505	3,234	53,213	35,965
Current Level	89	81	11,505	3,234	53,194	35,946
Difference	0	0	0	0	−19	−19
Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	4,309	390	24,973	25,643	33,670	36,858
Difference	4,309	390	24,973	25,643	33,670	36,858
Foreign Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	8	8
Difference	0	0	0	0	8	8
Homeland Security:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	1	1
Difference	0	0	0	0	1	1
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Resources:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	−2	−2
Difference	0	0	0	0	−2	−2
Oversight and Government Reform:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science and Technology:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MARCH 11, 2009—Continued

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2008		2009		2009–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	395	0	1,499	3	4,197	21
Current Level	0	0	498	3	2,496	21
Difference	−395	0	−1,001	0	−1,701	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	−6	−6	−23	−23
Difference	0	0	−6	−6	−23	−23
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	1,853	1,843	5,794	5,714	−6,724	−5,034
Current Level	1,853	1,843	15,919	15,835	5,615	7,272
Difference	0	0	10,125	10,121	12,339	12,306

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(B) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of July 8, 2008 (H. Rpt. 110–747)		Current level reflecting action completed as of Sept. 30, 2008		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,302	20,765	19,302	20,765	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	53,873	53,545	53,873	53,545	0	0
Defense	546,468	538,595	546,468	538,595	0	0
Energy and Water Development	30,891	30,756	30,891	30,756	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,162	21,150	21,162	21,150	0	0
Homeland Security	40,665	40,785	40,665	40,785	0	0
Interior, Environment	27,425	29,118	27,425	29,118	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	146,064	147,647	146,064	147,647	0	0
Legislative Branch	3,969	4,076	3,969	4,076	0	0
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	63,916	54,441	63,916	54,441	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	35,187	36,452	35,187	36,459	0	7
Transportation, HUD	56,556	114,961	56,556	114,961	0	0
Unassigned (full committee allowance)	5,000	2,653	0	0	−5,000	−2,653
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	1,050,478	1,094,944	1,045,478	1,092,298	−5,000	−2,646

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of July 8, 2008 (H. Rept. 110–746)		Current level reflecting action completed as of March 11, 2009		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	20,623	22,000	20,456	21,530	−167	−470
Commerce, Justice, Science	56,858	57,000	57,652	57,372	794	372
Defense	487,737	525,250	487,737	525,280	0	30
Energy and Water Development	33,265	32,825	33,261	32,270	−4	−555
Financial Services and General Government	21,900	22,900	22,697	22,890	797	−10
Homeland Security	42,075	42,390	42,164	42,625	89	235
Interior, Environment	27,867	28,630	27,579	28,659	−288	29
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	152,643	152,000	152,255	151,758	−388	−242
Legislative Branch	4,404	4,340	4,402	4,330	−2	−10
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	72,729	66,890	72,863	66,881	134	−9
State, Foreign Operations	36,620	36,000	36,620	36,242	0	242
Transportation, HUD	54,997	114,900	55,000	114,663	3	−237
Unassigned (full committee allowance)	0	987	0	0	0	−987
Subtotal (Section 302(b) Allocations)	1,011,718	1,106,112	1,012,686	1,104,500	968	−1,612
Unallocated portion of Section 302(a) Allocation	968	892	0	0	−968	−892
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	1,012,686	1,107,004	1,012,686	1,104,500	0	−2,504

2010 and 2011 advance appropriations under section 302 of S. Con. Res. 70

[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

	2010
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	1,772
Job Corps	691
Education for the Disadvantaged	10,841
School Improvement	1,681
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	—
Special Education	8,593
Career, Technical and Adult Education	791
Payment to Postal Service	83
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	4,000
Project-based Rental Assistance	400
Subtotal, enacted advances	28,852
	2011
Appropriate Level[1]	n.a.
Enacted advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	430

[1] S. Con. Res. 70 does not provide a dollar limit for 2011.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2009

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2008 budget and reflects activity through September 30, 2008. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Since the last letter, dated September 9, 2008, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 110–329). Division B of the act provided $22.9 billion for disaster relief and recovery for 2008; the entire amount was designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to Sec. 301(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 70. Amounts so designated are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report).

This is the final current level letter for fiscal year 2008.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2008 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2008

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted [1]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,879,400
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,441,017	1,394,894	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,604,649	1,635,118	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−596,805	−596,805	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	2,448,861	2,433,207	1,879,400
Enacted 110th Congress, second session			
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110–252) [2]	0	7	0
Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–275)	1,942	1,924	1
Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Pl. 110–289)	4,309	390	−968
Higher Education Opportunity Act (P.L. 110–315)	−10	0	0
Total, enacted 110th Congress, second session	6,241	2,321	−967
Total Current Level [3]	2,455,102	2,435,528	1,878,433
Total Budget Resolution [4]	2,564.244	2,466,685	1,875,401
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	3,032
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	109,142	31,157	n.a.

[1] Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during the second session of the 110th Congress, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181). Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–185), Andean Trade Preference Extension Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–191), Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–227), Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–229), Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–232). Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–234), SAFETEA–LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–244), and Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–245).

[2] Pursuant to section 301(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 70, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2008, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110–252)	115,808	35,350	n.a.
Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing AppropriationsAct, 2009 (P.L. 110–329)	22,859	0	n.a.
xl	138,667	35,350	n.a.

[3] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level excludes these items.

[4] Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in S. Con. Res. 70, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Budget Resolution	2,563,262	2,465,711	1,875,392
Revisions:			
For the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act of 2008 (section 323(d))	−950	−950	0
For the Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008 (section 323(d))	0	0	8
For the Medicare Improvement for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (sections 210 and 212(b))	1,942	1,924	1
For the Higher Education Opportunity Act (section 208)	−10	0	0
Revised Budget Resolution	2,564,244	2,466,685	1,875,401

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.
Note: n.a. not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2009.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2009 budget and is current through March 11, 2009. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Pursuant to section 301(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 70, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes those amounts (see footnote 3 of the report).

Since the last letter, dated September 9, 2008, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, and revenues for fiscal year 2009:

SSI Extension for Elderly and Disabled Refugees Act (Public Law 110–328);

Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 110–329);

Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act of 2008, Part II (Public Law 110–330);

An act to provide authority for the Federal Government to purchase and insure certain types of troubled assets . . . and for other purposes (Public Law 110–343);

Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–351);

QI Program Supplemental Funding Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–379);

Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–389);

An act to amend the commodity provisions of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 . . . and for other purposes (Public Law 110–398);

Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417);

Inmate Tax Fraud Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–428);

Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–432);

An act to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, and for other purposes (Public Law 110–436);

Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449);

Worker, Retiree, and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–458);

Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–3);

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5); and

Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–8).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2009 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH MARCH 11, 2009

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted [1]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,097,399
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,485,953	1,436,774	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	n.a.	471,581	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−587,749	−587,749	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	898,204	1,320,606	2,097,399

FISCAL YEAR 2009 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH MARCH 11, 2009—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted 110th Congress, second session			
Authorizing Legislation:			
Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–275)	6,633	6,516	9
A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (P.L. 110–287)	0	0	−2
Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–289)	24,973	25,643	11,037
Higher Education Opportunity Act (P.L. 110–315)	−9	−114	0
SSI Extension for Elderly and Disabled Refugees Act (P.L. 110–328)	34	34	0
Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act of 2008, Part II (P.L. 110–330)	495	0	0
An act to provide authority for the Federal Government to purchase and insure certain types of troubled assets. . .and for other purposes (P.L. 110–343)[2]	4,409	4,409	−103,988
Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–351)	−19	−23	1
QI Program Supplemental Funding Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–379)	45	45	0
Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–389)	−6	−6	0
An act to amend the commodity provisions of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 110–398)	1	8	0
Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110–417)	−27	7	8
Inmate Tax Fraud Prevention Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–428)	1	1	0
Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–432)	3	3	6
An Act to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, and for other purposes (P.L. 110–436)	0	0	−728
Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–449)	5,700	5,700	0
Worker, Retiree, and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–458)	0	0	577
Total, authorization legislation enacted in the 110th Congress, second session	42,233	42,223	−115,154
Appropriation Acts:			
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110–252)[3]	0	23	27
Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 110–329)[3]	653,025	438,747	0
Total, appropriation acts enacted in the 110th Congress, second session	653,025	438,770	27
Enacted 111th Congress, first session			
Authorizing Legislation:			
Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 111–3)	10,621	2,387	3,801
Appropriation Acts:			
Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111–8)	964,622	772,058	0
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	−61,485	−43,069	0
Total Current Level[2 3 5 6]	2,507,220	2,532,975	1,986,073
Total Budget Resolution[6 7]	2,548,974	2,575,718	2,033,460
Adjustment to budget resolution pursuant to section 301(b)(2)[8]	−5,761	−1,152	n.a.
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,543,213	2,574,566	2,033,460
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	35,993	41,591	47,387
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2009–2013:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	12,046,832
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	11,813,119
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	233,713
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

[1] Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during the second session of the 110th Congress, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181), Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–185), Andean Trade Preference Extension Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–191), Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–227), Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–229), Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–232), Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–233), Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–234), SAFETEA–LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Pl. 110–244), and Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–245).

[2] At the time of enactment of P.L. 110–343, and thus for the purposes of current level, the Congressional Budget Office could not estimate the direct spending for Division A of this Act, the largest part of which is the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP). CBO's January 2009 baseline includes an estimate of $184 billion in budget authority and outlays for the TARP,

[3] Pursuant to section 301(6)(2) of S. Con. Res. 70, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2009, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110–252)	85,155	87,211	n.a.
Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 110–329)	10,748	6,770	n.a.
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–5)	379,042	120,087	−64,821
Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111–8)	99	85	n.a.
Total, enacted emergency requirements	475,044	214,153	−64,821

[4] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level excludes these items.

[5] The scoring for P.L. 110–318, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the Highway Trust Fund, does not change current level totals. P.L. 110–318 appropriated approximately $8 billion to the Highway Trust Fund. The enactment of this bill followed an announcement by the Secretary of Transportation on September 5, 2008, of an interim policy to slow down payments to states from the Highway Trust Fund. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that P.L. 110–318 will reverse this policy and restore payments to states at levels already assumed in current level. Thus, no change is required.

[6] Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in S. Con. Res. 70, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Budget Resolution	2,530,703	2,565,903	2,029,612
Revisions:			
For the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act of 2008 (section 323(d))	950	950	0
For the Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008 (section 323(d))	28	28	32
For the Medicare Improvement for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (sections 210 and 212(b))	6,633	6,516	9
For the Higher Education Opportunity Act (section 208)	−9	−114	0
for the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (sec. 204)	3	3	6
For the Q1 Program Supplemental Funding Act of 2008 (sec. 212(b))	45	45	0
For the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (sec. 201)	10,621	2,387	3,801
Revised Budget Resolution	2,548,974	2,575,718	2,033,460

[7] In previous current level reports, the House Committee on the Budget directed CBO to exclude funding for overseas deployment and related activities of $70 billion in budget authority and about $75 billion in outlays from the budget resolution totals. Although this funding is not available under any committee's 302(a) allocation, it is technically available under section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70. Therefore, the committee has withdrawn the direction to exclude the funding in this report.

[8] S. Con. Res. 70 assumed emergency amounts of $5,761 million in budget authority and $1,152 million in outlays for the Corps of Engineers. Because section 301(b)(2) requires that the current level exclude amounts for emergency needs, the House Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.

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.)

AIG SCANDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, today was 6 months overdue here in the House. Last fall, when President George Bush and Secretary Henry—''Hank,'' as people like to call him—Paulson—just a regular guy from Wall Street who earned $750 million in 1 year before he left Wall Street to come here and be Secretary of the Treasury, protecting Main Street interests under the Bush administration—panics the Congress, said the world was on the verge of collapse, and submitted, on a Friday

evening, a three-page bill asking that we appropriate $700 billion and give it to Henry ''Hank'' Paulson and let him spend it however he deemed fit.

□ 1545

Unfortunately, Congress didn't really improve too much on that original draft. Congress got stampeded. I didn't. I voted against it. And for one glorious moment, one night, one day, we stunned the world by stopping that bill here in the House and saying there are not enough protections for American taxpayers in this bill. There's no guarantee we'll get paid back. There's no real restraint on how Henry ''Hank'' Paulson of Wall Street is going to spend the money. We fear it will go to bonuses, it will go to waste, it will go to his buddies on Wall Street and he'll use it to penalize his enemies on Wall Street. And that's exactly what happened.

And here we are now, at least $350 billion later of that $700 billion. It's estimated, by one group that does weekly estimates, we've lost about a third of the money. The American taxpayers are being told they'll have to pay that back over the next 30 years.

In the meantime, many of these companies and these lords are rewarding themselves with bonuses. We're told, well, these are certifiably smart people. I mean, how can these firms continue to exist without them?

Well, the firms like AIG don't exist anymore except for the largesse from the American taxpayer. They bankrupted their companies. How could anybody think they deserve a performance bonus or a retention bonus of any sort? What they need is a bonus push out the door. And that should have happened a long time ago. And I've got to say the Obama administration is trying. A big hole was dug here. They are trying to make some sense out of what Bush and Paulson did.

But I am not impressed by our Treasury Secretary, Mr. Geithner, and I think that President Obama should rethink whether or not he is the man for the job at this time. When did Secretary Geithner know about these bonuses that were coming due at AIG? He was head of the New York Fed. He was very involved in bailing out AIG through the Federal Reserve last fall. Did he just find out or has he known? And did he neglect to tell the President, did he neglect to tell the Congress that these bonuses were pending? I don't know for sure. But we need to have that question answered.

Geithner was hired because he said, well, Wall Street's comfortable with him. I'll tell you what. I'd like a Secretary of the Treasury who Wall Street doesn't like because that person is protecting Main Street Americans and the taxpayers of this country instead of coddling these fat, overpaid people on Wall Street who have bankrupted their own companies and are trying to bankrupt America and have caused nationally and worldwide an economic collapse. These certifiably smart people.

So today we began to correct the mistakes that were made here last fall under pressure from Bush and Paulson. But people need to be brought to account. We need to hire the 1,100 agents that the FBI has been asking for for 4 years to fill out their financial fraud and crimes unit. We need to hire those 1,100 people and maybe give some of these people who today are getting bonuses Federal hospitality in the future, a little uniform and a nice warm place to sit behind bars.

We need those investigators. We need that budget. We need to thoroughly review everything that's gone on. And we really need to question the leadership of Secretary Geithner in these matters.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Persons in the gallery are reminded to refrain from audible manifestations of approval or disapproval of the proceedings of the House.

THE AIG BONUS BILL IS A LEGISLATIVE COVERUP

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. Mr. Speaker, today leaders in this Congress have hastily pushed through a bill with the direct intent of correcting a mistake, a mistake that could have been prevented in the first place. Let me repeat that. A mistake that could have been prevented in the first place.

We've all seen the devastation that occurs following congressional knee-jerk reactions, and I am afraid that today's AIG bonus bill will not be an exception to that rule.

I have serious constitutional concerns about our government's targeting such a narrow group of citizens with a retroactive tax hike. Regulating the pay of thousands of private citizens because of a mistake made by the leadership of this Congress starts us down a slippery constitutional slope. And what are our constitutional leaders planning to do with the taxes that they collect from this bill? It will probably all go back to AIG in their next bailout payment.

My mama always taught me that two wrongs do not make a right, and this bill is no more than a legislative coverup by the leadership of this Congress. It's time for this body to instead address the problem that got us here in the first place: the lack of transparency. Lack of transparency is the true perpetrator in this high crime against the taxpayers. Ultimately, the taxpayers are not only the defendant in this case, but also the jury. And I think the taxpayers must serve congressional leaders with a clear verdict.

It's congressional leadership who relinquished their promises for a more transparent government and instead steamrolled the ''nonstimulus'' stimulus bill down our throats, bypassing the regular committee process and refusing input from the minority party.

Why are my colleagues on the other side acting surprised to find that a provision was ripped out of this bill that would have prevented these bonuses in the first place? In fact, that was even introduced by a Democratic U.S. Senator. They finally made the 1,000-page bill public in the middle of the night and then steamrolled it through Congress only a few hours later, all without adequate public or congressional scrutiny. This is absolutely outrageous. The American people deserve better and must demand better.

They say that making legislation is like making sausage; you don't want to see it. But I beg to differ because these are trillion-dollar hot dogs that are being slammed and shoved down the throats of the taxpayers, and the taxpayers have to swallow it. It's time for congressional leaders to let taxpayers into the sausage factory. It's time for taxpayers to see what goes on here in Congress and goes into the sausage, and what's left out. Then and only then will we avoid coming back to fix mistakes that shouldn't have been made in the first place.

We have seen bill after bill shoved down the taxpayers' throats. It's a steamroll of socialism that's being shoved down our throats. It's going to strangle the American economy, and it's going to choke the American taxpayers.

Taxpayers deserve better. Taxpayers have to demand better. Taxpayers are not being treated fairly. We've seen bill after bill that's going to hurt the economy. It's going to cost jobs. It's going to create a longer and a deeper recession, maybe even a depression. We have seen people on the other side blame President Bush and they show righteous indignation, and it's totally misplaced because in this last Congress, 110th, now in the 111th, and with this administration, we have seen bill after bill that's going to hurt the economy, that's going to hurt the American taxpayer, that's going to cost jobs. It spends too much, it taxes too much, it borrows too much, and it's going to kill our economy.

We have got to demand more and better from this leadership and this Congress. The steamroll of socialism is being driven by NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID and this administration, and it must stop because it's going to destroy America economically.

COMMUNICATION FROM FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE WALLY HERGER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from David Meurer, Field Representative, the Honorable WALLY HERGER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued in the Superior Court of California, County of Shasta for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DAVID MEURER,
Field Representative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AIG: THE REAL STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Do you want to know why AIG went broke, threatening to bring down the whole U.S. economy? It's actually easy to find out. All you have to do is wade through 500-plus pages in the form 10–K that AIG filed 2 weeks ago. It's all in there, and I read it.

Now, derivatives certainly contributed to the problem. That's why the ''stress test'' on Page 178 says that AIG owes $500 billion, yes, $500 billion, if long-term interest rates go up by just 1 percent, as opposed to only $5 billion, according to Page 183, if San Francisco is destroyed in an earthquake. So now we know why the Federal Reserve has been buying long-term bonds just as fast as the Chinese sell them: to keep its ward AIG from being liable for $500 billion, because $500 billion is a lot of money, even to the Federal Reserve.

And to whom would AIG owe that money? The answer is on Page 176. AIG's largest credit exposure, which is 160 percent of its shareholder equity, is to ''Money Center/Global Bank Groups.'' In other words, Wall Street. And almost half of that amount is owed to only five banks.

But the real AIG losses have come not from derivatives but rather from AIG's basic business model. In a news release last Monday, AIG said that it had to make payouts of $43.7 billion to ''securities lending counterparties.'' That's the phrase: ''securities lending counterparties.'' The news release doesn't explain what that is, but AIG's 10–K does.

The standard insurance business model is as follows: You make money from minimizing your claim payments, and you make more money from your investments. Warren Buffett has explained this countless times in Berkshire Hathaway's 10–Ks. It's a stable, steady business. Indeed, AIG's insurance subsidiaries took in premiums, AIG invested them, and AIG paid out on claims.

But that's when things went horribly wrong. According to AIG's 10–K, AIG's parent company sucked the investment assets out of its insurance subsidiaries and lent them to Wall Street and foreign banks in return for cash. AIG then took this borrowed cash and invested it—are you ready for this?—in mortgage-backed securities.

It's not in AIG's 10–K, but the counterparties, that is, its friends on Wall Street, undoubtedly took the stocks and bonds borrowed from AIG and sold them short. That's why institutions borrow securities: to sell them, buy them back later at a lower price, return them, and claim the profit. So as the markets dropped, AIG's counterparties laughed all the way to the bank. Except they are banks.

And what about AIG? According to the first few pages of AIG's 10–K, when the counterparties returned the securities to AIG, AIG had trouble coming up with the cash because, first of all, the mortgage-backed securities market had blown up, and, secondly, the securities that AIG had lent out were actually worth far less at that point. Hence the Federal bailout at $150 billion and counting. And this money, by the way, this money that the Federal Government is giving to AIG, AIG implausibly lists that money as ''shareholders' equity'' and not loans on its own financial statements.

Now, why would AIG do something as convoluted and nutty as this? To goose its profit a few points by counting both the returns on the lent securities and the returns on the mortgage-backed securities both as its profit. In other words, the motive was greed.

Obviously, AIG shouldn't have done this, and no insurance company ever should be able to do it in the future. This is the kind of financial innovation that brings into focus why we need to regulate in order for this country to survive. The choice is not between regulation and freedom; the choice is between regulation and chaos.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TURN THIS ECONOMY AROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about America's economy and where Americans are at right now. We have seen a lot of trouble over the last 2 years, and it needn't be that way.

We could turn this American economy around next quarter. We could truly bring hope and change to the American people if we would put into place a positive solution that would give people certainty about where they are going to go in this economy, and we can. We know it's possible. It's really fairly simple.

All we need to do is this: we need to get people investing in the economy, and you do that by making incentives for that. I am a former Federal tax lawyer. I have lived this life, I know how it works.

Right now we have a high rate on our capital gains tax. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is looking at increasing that tax. We need to go just in the opposition direction. We need to cut the investment tax called capital gains down to zero. The best thing we could do is make that tax permanent to the investor community.

Let Americans know, if you take your money, and if you put it at risk opening a business, hiring people for jobs, in the next 4 years your risk will be paid off because you will have a 0 percent interest rate. That's capital gains.

If we would permanently lower the capital gains to zero for 4 years, we would have incredible domestic investment, as well as foreign investment. Even better, we can take the business tax rate—the United States today has the second highest business tax rate in the world, 34 percent.

America is not an attractive place to invest money. We can change that. We can go from 34 percent on our business tax and bring that down to 9 percent, make it permanent.

What are foreign investors looking for? A safe haven for investment. They want to invest in the United States, but we have a very punitive investment climate.

If we would bring down that business tax rate to 9 percent, we would be able to bring foreign money into the United States and invest and create jobs. Rather than seeing jobs flee the United States to other countries, we will see them come right back into the United States.

That's what we need now, more jobs, more stability, more certainty. We have had enough with economic uncertainty from 2008 to the present. Let's change that equation. We can have a positive alternative.

First, zero capital gains. Second, lower the business tax rate to be one of the lowest in the world.

Third, cut every American's tax rate down by at least 5 percent. We can do that, and that will help Americans keep more of their money.

Fourth, we need to kill the death tax once and for all. If even one American pays the death tax, it's immoral. Why in the world should Uncle Sam be able to reach in the coffin after death and still try to pull the wallet out of an

American who is deceased? This is immoral. It shouldn't be.

Then, finally, the alternative minimum tax, we should zero out the alternative minimum tax, which is putting a second tax burden on already overtaxed middle-class Americans.

Also, Sarbanes-Oxley, Sarbanes-Oxley has actually chased capital out of New York City over to London. We need to get that investment capital back in the United States.

That's a pretty simple plan. If we would stay here for the rest of the day, and if we would stay here tomorrow, as Members of Congress, we could very quickly and simply pass this commonsense legislation that has worked time and time again.

Don't just take my word for it, a woman from Minnesota—take a look at Harvard. Harvard did a study back in 2002 that examined 18 different world economies, and they showed the same thing. They said, what do you do to make economies work, and what do you do that makes economies not work?

Here is what you do, you lower the wages of government employees, you lower transfer payments, welfare payments, and you lower the tax rates. That's what you do, the study concluded, to make economies revive.

What you don't do is increase government spending. What you don't do is increase taxes.

What we have seen in the last 60 days is what you do to make an economy not work or bring more uncertainty into our economy.

The American people deserve a positive solution, and we have got one. Let's get to work, let's stay here, let's make it happen. Instead, what are we seeing happen? We are seeing more spending and higher taxes.

And what did the Federal Reserve try to do this week? They announced that they are going to do another $1 trillion in purchases. And they just announced today another $300 billion in buying up long-term Treasury securities. They have already lowered the interest rates to zero, so now they want to flood more money into the money supply, but this reduces the value of dollar.

There is so much we can do to change the economy. Let's get busy.

HONOR THE WISH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the sixth anniversary of the Iraq war. We Americans need to remember all those who have made sacrifices because of this war, the 4,259 service men and service women who have given their lives in this conflict.

One of the soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice was Specialist Christopher Fox of Memphis, a constituent of mine, who was based in Fort Carson, Colorado.

Only 21 years old, he was on a second tour in Iraq, was due to be discharged from the Army in July of this year. He was looking forward to attending the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, possibly to play football and to study criminal justice. He hoped to be a police officer so his military training would not have gone to waste after he left the service.

But Specialist Fox did not make it home alive. He died in Iraq on September 29, 2008, of wounds sustained when he encountered small-arms fire while on patrol. On this anniversary of the war, we need to remember these sacrifices and do what we can to honor the memory and the wishes of the soldier who has given the ultimate sacrifice.

Specialist Fox wanted his mother figure, not his mother, who was deceased, but his mother figure, a woman who was awarded temporary custody when he was 17, to oversee his burial arrangements, as soldiers are asked to designate someone. Her name was listed on the form that he filled out to direct the disposition of his remains. However, because of current Federal law, it is prohibited that servicemembers designate nonrelatives to make those arrangements.

It is a travesty, Mr. Speaker, that our laws do not allow a soldier's wishes to be honored, especially for something as final, as simple, and as appropriate and meaningful as the disposition of their remains.

Someone who puts their life on the line in defense of their country should be allowed to have whomever they wish to make arrangements for their memorial service. I attended his memorial service in West Memphis, Arkansas. There were few people there. There were no other public officials.

It was unfortunate that even his mother figure wasn't able to make it, she was in Knoxville. But if she would have had the opportunity to make the arrangements, I think we would have seen something different.

It is with this experience that I, along with Congressman JOHN DUNCAN of Tennessee, where his mother figure lived and where he otherwise might have been buried, and DANA ROHRABACHER of California, Congresswoman WATSON and Congresswoman GWEN MOORE are filing the Honor the Written Intent of Our Soldier Heroes Act today, or Honor the WISH Act.

This bill will allow service men and women to designate whomever they want to direct the disposition of their remains. I hope my fellow Congress people will join me in sponsoring this act and help move it forward for passage. It seems only appropriate and fitting that we honor the wishes of our soldiers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ALLEGHENY NATIONAL FOREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I bring a serious economic concern from my district today. In the northwest corner of my district in beautiful rural Pennsylvania lies the Allegheny National Forest, established 86 years ago when the Federal Government purchased 513,000 acres that it encompasses.

By agreement in 1923, the subsurface mineral rights in the forest did not convey with the purchase, and oil and natural gas have been harvested ever since. Because of the value of timber harvested and the oil and natural gas produced, the ANF serves as the economic engine of the region, providing good-paying, family-sustaining jobs for many in the oil, natural gas, timber and forest products industry.

In addition, the ANF is not taxable, since it is owned by the Federal Government, making the municipal governments even more reliable on the development of oil, natural gas and the timber in it. Mr. Speaker, what's important to note here is that the Federal Government entered into an agreement with the owners of these subsurface minerals, an agreement which has been honored for 86 years.

Unfortunately, that process has come to a halt. In reacting to lawsuits brought by environmental groups, Forest Service and Justice Department lawyers, who most likely have never stepped foot in the Pennsylvania ANF, are now managing the forest, instead of dedicated ANF Forest Service professionals, who despite many challenges over 8 decades, have carried out their duties admirably.

So when the Forest Service does not issue new permits to proceed with harvesting oil and natural gas, people lose their jobs and the local economy suffers. To demonstrate that this is much more than a legal battle between the Forest Service and environmental groups, I will read a part of one of my many communications I have received from constituents.

''With local drilling being slowed to a virtual halt, we have seen the 'ripple effect' significantly decrease our business. The timber industry is in the worst shape that we have ever seen, and now loggers are not even needed to clear right-of-ways for roads, locations and pipelines.

''For the first time in 30 years we have had to reduce our workforce and contribute to the nearly double-digit unemployment rate.''

I find it to be the height of hypocrisy that the Secretary of Energy recently asked OPEC not to decrease its oil production, while at the same time our

government is taking actions to prevent the production of our own oil and natural gas. Importing 60 percent of our oil and sending $700 billion to foreign, often unfriendly countries should dictate government policy that promotes the production of our own oil, not the opposite.

If the Allegheny Defense Project, which is run out of Portland, Oregon, more than 3,000 miles from the beautiful Pennsylvania ANF, continues to use the legal system and their environmental shield to stop the legitimate and environmentally safe harvesting of timber, natural gas and oil from the ANF, or any other forest, I ask that they consider the effect of such efforts on the communities, families and individuals who depend on the safe and sound harvesting of those commodities to keep their jobs and to pay their bills.

Oil and gas production is western Pennsylvania. It's part of our life. It's what we do. It's where Colonel Drake sunk the world's first commercial oil well 150 years ago this year. The safe and environmentally sound harvesting of our resources in the Allegheny National Forest has been going on for decades. There is no reason it should be delayed or stopped now, especially during a recession.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 63 days since the Forest Service has issued any permits for new oil and gas wells in the ANF. This is unacceptable.

I trust that the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture will resolve this problem quickly so that our community can get back to work producing our own oil and natural gas. And, if not, I will return to this floor and continue to do all I can until it is resolved.

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 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 California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BONUS MYSTERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to thank our leader for giving us an hour to talk about something that happened today, this week, that really has us befuddled.

Mr. Speaker, I like a good mystery, I just finished reading another Agatha Christie last night, ''Black Coffee,'' and it wound up being the personal secretary to the manor and Lord, who poisoned him with cyanide.

□ 1615

But it took me until the last couple of pages until I figured it out that this Edward Raynor had in fact poisoned his boss.

Well, who would have thunk that we would have a real live mystery here on Capitol Hill. But we have one. And we're going to talk about a variety of things relative to AIG and the stimulus package and these bonuses that have been paid out that really have people's anger up, at least in Ohio—the phone calls I'm getting. We'll hear from other Members.

But here's what happened. A few weeks ago, the President of the United States indicated he wanted to put forward a stimulus bill and, unlike some commentators, I want President Obama to succeed. I think he's doing the best job that he can.

He entrusted the leadership of the House and Senate to write the bill. The bill was a little over 1,000 pages. I think it was 1,117 pages long. We were nervous because it was spending $1 trillion. When I say my Republican colleagues and I were nervous, it proposed to spend $1 trillion rather quickly. We asked early in the week before the vote, Do you think we could read the bill before you ask us to sign on to spending $1 trillion?

So we had a little motion here on the floor and every Member of the House—every Republican, every Democrat—said: You will have 48 hours to read this bill before we ask you to decide whether it's a good piece of legislation or a bad piece of legislation.

Well, it left the House, it left the Senate, and it went to a conference committee which, Mr. Speaker, I know you know, but others may not know; that's where we send some guys and gals over from the House, they send some over from the Senate. They get together, they work out the final product and then they bring it back to the House and Senate for a vote.

Well, something happened on the way to the vote in that we weren't given 48 hours to read the bill. We were given 90 minutes to read the bill. We made the observation that that's 90 minutes to read 1,000 pages, and a lot of us read pretty quickly, but that was a big challenge. So could you please not ask us to do this, because when you do something that quickly, somebody's going to be embarrassed.

That leads us to our mystery. Today, we had some legislation where there was a lot of gnashing at teeth and pulling of hair, saying that AIG are crooks, somebody called them traitors, so forth and so on, and they shouldn't have gotten these bonuses.

Well, when the bill left the Senate, there was an amendment in the bill offered by a Democratic Senator from Oregon, WYDEN, and a Republican Senator from Maine, OLYMPIA SNOWE, that said there were not going to be—if you took money for the bailout and you're an institution, you couldn't give these crazy bonuses to people. You couldn't give them $18 million, $20 million worth of bonuses. That seemed pretty reasonable.

Well, when it went into this meeting, all of a sudden that language came out and this language that I have put up on the easel here was inserted.

For those who want to read it, it's title 7, section 111, subparagraph 3, subparagraph iii.

Now, unlike the Wyden-Snowe language that said we weren't going to do it, this language specifically says that any bonuses, any executive compensation, any million-dollar golden parachute, any retention pay that was agreed to before February 11, 2009—guess what? It wasn't covered. So the bill specifically authorized the payment of these bonuses.

Well, as we warned, and we are not happy that our prediction came true, but there were some people this week that were embarrassed by that. So we passed a bill to tax these bonuses at 90 percent. Stupid idea. But we wouldn't even have had that discussion if somebody, somebody put this paragraph into the bill that specifically allowed the taxpayers of this country to go ahead and pay for these bonuses at AIG. So we do have a Who Dunnit.

From our social studies we know that there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives and there are 100 Senators. I had a piece of paper with the breakdown, and I've misplaced it, but I think after the last election there are 178 Republicans in the Chamber and there are 247 Democratic Representatives. Over in the Senate, there are 41 Republican Senators, 58 Democratic Senators, and we can clear somebody of this mystery already because the Minnesota Senate race has not resolved so we know that Al Franken or Norm Coleman didn't put this paragraph into the bill.

During the debate today I asked the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, if he did it. And he said no. So we're going to cross BARNEY FRANK off the mystery list. Now we are down to only—well, let me say this. I didn't do it. So we are down to 533.

I'm joined by other Members here today.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. MCCOTTER of Michigan, did you put this into the bill?

Mr. MCCOTTER. Through the Chair to the gentleman from Ohio, I was not

in the room that inserted the pro-AIG language into the stimulus.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Thank you very much. Let me get to Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Did you write this?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. No, sir, it was not me.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, did you write this?

Mr. COLE. No, sir. But I do have some information that might help you as you move forward. I wouldn't say that this would be definitive. I think you should ask every individual, as you're doing.

But I do have a signed list of people that were in the room—that were principal negotiators in the room. I think they need to be able to answer for themselves, as one of them, Mr. FRANK, already has.

I do want to point out in defense of some of our colleagues, Mr. LEWIS' from California name is there, but it's scratched out because he wasn't allowed to be in the room. There's also Mr. CAMP from Michigan. His name is scratched out, too, because he also was not allowed to be in the room.

And then there's the distinguished Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi. His name is also crossed out because he wasn't allowed to be there. Then there's Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa. His name as well is scratched out.

So I don't know that that would prove that they did not do it, but I think that's a very strong indication they did not. Coincidentally, they're all Republicans. But I thought that might help you as you pursue your vision.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Thank you, Mr. COLE. I think, as Angela Lansbury in Murder She Wrote, or Agatha Christie in her books, we're going to call that a clue. I think we have a clue and we're moving in the right direction.

Are there any other Members that want to say anything? Sir, do you want to identify yourself and indicate whether you wrote this?

Mr. FLEMING. Before today, I've never seen that. So I would have liked to have been there, however. I can assure you of that.

Mr. LATOURETTE. You know what? We're getting someplace. So now, by my count, we only have about 525 people to go. I pledge to you, Mr. Speaker, that I will spend as long as it takes to identify who wrote the language.

We are making a little light of it, but it's not funny. Because what you have here on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, you have a Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of the Banking Committee over there, and he says, Well, yeah, maybe I wrote it, but I only wrote it because somebody in the administration told me to write it.

Well, again, going from our social studies, we know for a fact that the administration can't write laws. This is the United States Congress. So somebody had to pick up a pen and scratch out the Wyden-Snowe amendment which would have prohibited these bonuses and then written this new paragraph—it's only about 50 words long—and inserted this. And somebody needs to own up to this because you can't have all the drama that we had on the floor today where: I don't know; this is outrageous; they're crooks.

Well, the person that wrote this let this happen. And that's why we find ourselves in our situation today. We have a lot more that we are going to talk about.

Now it's my pleasure to yield to Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for the way in which he framed the debate and did it in a way we can all understand. But this has been a troubling episode as well.

I think I guess what I'd call Bonusgate begins, I like to think, with three words. We've heard a lot of the three words recently. We've heard the word inherit, we've heard the word transparency, and we've heard the word accountability.

Well, this is not a situation that was inherited by this administration or by this majority. This was a situation that came into being on their watch. This is a situation where they have not been transparent. Quite the opposite. They have done everything they can to obscure what happened, when it happened, who's responsible.

Finally, it's certainly an incident where, at least to this point, nobody has been held accountable for anything. It's just something that somehow is unfortunate, but we are going to move collectively to try and correct before we have even identified who created the problem for us in the first place.

What do we know? Well, we do know a lot. We do know that Secretary Geithner has been involved in designing legislation around both the bailout and the stimulus literally since November—really, since September, when he was involved in his capacity as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve in New York.

We do know that, frankly, he was aware at some point late last year or probably early this year, at the minimum, there were going to be large bonuses paid. Certainly, the Fed had been informed that, and we would expect in his position there and as Secretary of the Treasury he would have been informed.

We do know that he had the means to stop this. He literally released $30 billion at the beginning of this month to AIG. At that point, he could have said, Look, you do this; no money. You're bankrupt.

I suspect something could have happened where these bonuses wouldn't have been paid out.

We also know that he didn't bother to tell the President of the United States, for whom he works and to whom he is responsible, anything about this until the day before it happened. That's what the Secretary has said, that's what the President has said.

So we know that Mr. Geithner has been around this problem a lot and we know that he did not—or, it appears he did not inform the President.

The second thing we know relates to the stimulus bill. My friend, Mr. LATOURETTE, went through that pretty well. We had a bill that was rammed through, literally was put together in a hurry, where this body guaranteed its Members by unanimous bipartisan vote we would have time to read it. We weren't given the time that in this body we said we would give Members.

We know that the bill eventually ended up in a conference committee. We have a pretty good idea who the six people were there, one of whom we now presume had nothing to do with this. I would certainly take the chairman at his word.

And we know that that language was inserted in that conference. It was not something that was inherited from the last administration. It was not something, to be fair, that was even in the first version of the stimulus bill. It was something that was specifically put there.

And so, while we know that the majority didn't read the bill and we know that the minority didn't read the bill, and I doubt the President read the bill, somebody read the bill. Somebody read the bill well enough to know, Hey, there's language in here that's going to prevent the payment of bonuses—and we need to get that out and put something in. So somebody did indeed finally read the bill.

We also know that today, rather than confront those questions, we decided we'd do everything we could on the floor of this body to look like we were doing something. As a matter of fact, I would argue we made a lot of the same mistakes.

We presented a bill that hadn't gone through committee, that people hadn't seen, that hadn't been discussed, because we needed to show that we were going to act. And we presented a resolution which, thank goodness, did not make it through, which essentially would have exonerated the administration.

Now those are all things that we know. What should we do, is now the real question, it seems to me. The first thing we should do is do what the President did in the very first week of this administration and say: I made a mistake. I think the classic word was: I screwed up.

I think the President and the administration, certainly the majority, screwed up. I think admitting it would be helpful.

The second thing I would do if I were the President of the United States is fire the Secretary of the Treasury. I wouldn't wait for him to resign. I would make the point that if there's something this explosive and this important and this damaging and you know about it for months and you don't bother to tell me about it until the day before it happens, when I'm in

almost no position to do anything about it, I'm sorry, you're not really who I need to be the Secretary of the Treasury. Goodbye.

□ 1630

I think the President would score enormous points within his own party. Indeed, earlier this evening we actually heard essentially a Democratic Member of Congress calling in this floor for him to do exactly that, something he ought to do.

Finally, we need the people in that room to just simply fess up. One out of six of them did it; and, if they did it at somebody else's instructions at the White House, then they ought to tell us who that was. Who sent that language down? Or, ''I drafted it,'' or whatever. But there is not that many people involved. I still retain faith that the truth is going to come out here and that people will step up and do the right thing.

The great British statesman Winston Churchill was often exasperated with our people and with the United States. He used to like to say, ''You can always count on the American people to do the right thing, after they have exhausted every other possibility.''

I would suggest that is what the administration has been doing, they have been exhausting possibilities. But in the end, they just simply need to do the right thing: Fire the Secretary, in my opinion, who certainly has not served this President well; admit, whoever put this language in there, that they did it, and tell us who instructed or asked them or requested that they do it; and, finally, just level with the American people instead of pass smokescreen, whitewash legislation, which, by the way, is dangerous in and of itself, as my friend from Ohio alluded. You don't use the Tax Code as a punitive weapon directed at people. It is pretty close to a bill of attainder. It is an extraordinarily bad and blunt instrument, and to do it only to provide cover is, I think, a dangerous thing. I don't think many of my colleagues who voted for this on the other side expect that this will become law. This was a political exercise on this floor put together at the last minute to give people cover when they went home.

So let's show Mr. Churchill for once that perhaps he is mistaken; perhaps we can do the right thing without exhausting every other possibility. I ask the administration to step forward and do that, provide the kind of leadership that the President promised that he would give us in the campaign, leadership that is transparent, leadership that is accountable.

I yield back to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Thank you very much, Mr. COLE. And thank you not only for your comments but also for the clue.

I know that other Members may be wandering around the Capitol giving tours or taking care of constituents, and just in case they didn't hear, Mr. Speaker, I will indicate that we are attempting to solve a mystery.

I have something called a Face Book, and the Face Book has a picture of every Member of Congress in the House and the Senate, and we are going to try to find out, if we can, and maybe others will be willing to help us, who put this paragraph in the stimulus bill that shielded the $170 million of bonuses that AIG paid to their executives after they got another $30 billion.

Parenthetically, I heard an argument, people have been beating up these executives as traitors and everything else. I have got to say, I kind of admire a bunch of folks that have bilked the taxpayers out of $175 billion and—but, anyway.

So what we are doing is we are crossing people off, and I think we are down to about 525 left. Any Member that wants to come and have his or her picture crossed out so we know it is not them, we are happy to do that.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield to the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, Mr. MCCOTTER of Michigan.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Coming from the Great Lakes State, when I was younger I was always fascinated with the history of maritime travel in our beautiful homeland. And so when I was younger, I saw a book, it was called The Phantom Freighter, it was a Hardy Boys mystery, and I read it. I loved how they worked through to find the motivations and to finally unmask the culprit, and eventually I read the whole series. It has kind of rekindled in me today that sense of wonder at who and why something was done, and to work through the mystery to find out: Who could possibly be the hidden hand behind the mystery amendment?

I commend my colleague from Ohio for his search to cut through the fog of our times to find that hidden hand that wrote the mystery amendment, and I will do everything I can to help him with this search, as I trust members of the media will.

Look, in many ways, because this was in the stimulus bill, it has stimulated a lot of reportorial interest in who actually did this. I think that we can assume that if you can unmask the culprit, there may very well be a Pulitzer in it for someone for doing so. But when we look at this, in all seriousness, what we have seen is a classic example of a rush to judgment causing problems.

Now, as a matter of civics, since the subject was broached, when the stimulus bill came to this floor with this amendment inserted into it, it was voted upon by the Members of the House. Not one Republican voted for a stimulus bill with this amendment in it, which means that every Republican voted against approving and protecting AIG's bonuses.

On the Democratic side, every Democrat that voted for that stimulus bill voted for that amendment that approved and protected AIG's bonuses. The President of the United States signed the stimulus bill that included the amendment that approved and protected AIG's bonuses into law. And now that the public is aware of the AIG bonuses, we have seen another rush to misjudgment where we turn the Tax Code into a penal code, where we shred the Constitution to use it as a political fig leaf, and set a heinous precedent in the future for other people who may be disliked or disfavored given the political mood of the moment.

In fact, one of the things, whether you agree with the Constitutional analysis or not, is this: This bill still allows the bonus recipients to keep 10 percent of their bonuses, and it doesn't do a thing to prevent the $30 billion that has already been committed to AIG from being drawn upon. I think that if we were going to do anything today, it should have been to get 100 percent of those bonuses to the taxpayers and prevent another dime going to AIG in bailout money. That is just me and 90-some others of my colleagues.

When we look at where we are today with the resolution of inquiry that the gentleman from Ohio introduced, I think I can establish the motive behind the hidden hand that wrote the mystery amendment. I do not believe that this was a mistake. I do not believe that this was simply a matter of venality for a hometown constituency. I think this was an actual matter of economic policy by this administration. If I may explain.

We heard from Mr. Liddy of AIG yesterday that he was very much afraid of losing the people who had caused the problem at AIG before they had managed to fix it. He believed that if these individuals left, he would see a meltdown again of AIG, which he believes would help create economic chaos throughout America.

I believe that, in consultation with individuals from the United States Government and potentially the Federal Reserve Board, he made the determination that these bonuses, retention bonuses were necessary to keep those people at AIG, facilitating what he believes is an orderly unwinding of the mess.

When viewed in the light of having to keep the people who created the problem so they could fix it before they left, this amendment makes sense. This amendment makes sense as a matter of policy, because on January 28, CNN's Mary Snow reported that AIG was expected to receive hundreds of million dollars, at least, in bonuses. That is out in the public realm.

You see, the Senators put forward their amendment to preclude the very types of bonuses AIG received. If you are looking at this as a matter of economic policy, you say to yourself: The AIG bonuses that are coming down the pike are not public. You say to yourself: The politicians in Congress are

not going to allow this to happen because the public is going to be apoplectic.

You see the opportunity in the stimulus bill with $1 trillion of spending being rushed through in the dead of night. You say to yourself, ''Oh, oh, the Senators have already put forward an amendment to preclude such bonuses. We are going to have to remove it, and we are going to have to put something in its place to approve, protect, and grandfather the AIG bonuses so we do not lose the, quote/unquote talent that produced the problem and that has to fix it.'' It now makes perfect sense. But having established the motive, we have yet to establish the culprit.

The public is apoplectic, as I said earlier, because they do not believe that as a matter of economic policy this amendment is fair to them; that it is patently inequitable, and they do not want the people who caused the problem to benefit from being propped up courtesy of billions of dollars of taxpayer money.

Now, the response in Congress is not to look at the economic policy to make the determination that AIG is too big to fix, that it should be wound down immediately, that taxpayers should be protected. Instead, as I mentioned earlier, we saw a political fig leaf put forward.

The mood was also reminiscent of what I experienced as a young man watching a very important artsy film called Animal House. We all remember the scene where they are sitting around Delta House drinking beer, bemoaning their horrible grades at the midterm exams, and Dean Wormer walks in. Immediately the members of Delta House start to hide their beer under their seats and in the back, and the dean looks at them and says, ''You know, drinking is illegal in fraternities here at Favor College.''

When the public found out about this bonus to AIG executives, when they found out what this amendment allowed and was voted for by a majority of this Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, you saw the political equivalent of Delta House hiding their beer so Dean Wormer would not be upset. In the event Dean Wormer was not fooled, and neither has been the American public, they want to see the situation resolved; they want all the money back in those bonuses; they want to prevent more money going to AIG; and, as the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out, they want to find out who the hidden hand behind the mystery amendment was.

We talk about transparency in government, we talk about accountability in government, and you are telling me that we can't even determine who put this amendment into a $1 trillion spending bill that was approved by this Democratic Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States. I would hope that this inquiry becomes a bipartisan cause in the interest of answering that question for the American people.

I yield back to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his thoughtful remarks, and I thank him also because from Mr. COLE of Oklahoma we got a clue and now from the gentleman of Michigan we have a motive and, thankfully, also the name, ''The Mystery of the Hidden Hand.'' I think that is what we are going to call this thing, The Mystery of the Hidden Hand.

And, Mr. Speaker, just in case you need your memory refreshed, what we are talking about here is the fact that in the $1 trillion stimulus bill, which we were given 90 minutes to read and which we indicated maybe that could cause a problem, somebody might be embarrassed, language was removed by somebody, The Hidden Hand, that was put in over in the Senate that would have prohibited AIG from using taxpayers' money and paying out millions of dollars in bonuses to their executives.

Now, The Hidden Hand wasn't done with that, because that didn't accomplish his or her purpose—I think we have got to include women in this, too. It could have been a woman. The Hidden Hand then wrote this paragraph in this $1 trillion bill that specifically protected and said, ''Here is 30 more billion dollars of our taxpayers' money, AIG. And, you know what? This protects you. If you want to give out bonuses, $1 million, you go right ahead.'' And today, this Mystery of the Hidden Hand, we don't know who did it. But we are going to work it out.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to a new member of the House, Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana. I have the Face Book, Mr. FLEMING, and I have crossed you out. You are not The Hidden Hand. And it is my pleasure to yield to you for your observations.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, I was on the other side of C–SPAN. I was watching what was going on. I was only elected in December.

I come from North Louisiana, where people respect the institutions, and we are talking about two very big and very important institutions: AIG, which we know is too big to fail. That is the reason why we have been bailing AIG out. And then, of course, our Presidency and Congress itself.

I guess the rhetorical question I have after this embarrassment, which is, first of all, how did this screw-up happen? And, where is that person or persons who is willing to own up to the mistake that was made here?

But going back to the beginning. We remember that in the first TARP issue, money was of course dealt out very quickly, almost overnight, as a result of the need or perceived need for bailout, and we found that money was going to spas in California, and pheasant hunting in the U.K. That should have at least given us some warning that this kind of abuse would happen.

Then, we fast forward. We released the money again, no strings attached, and we find out that some kind of deal was struck, only with Democrats in the room, that first put in and of course then took out in conference, we think, this very important clause that would have avoided bonuses, very rich bonuses, over $1 million in some cases, to people who were part of the problem.

□ 1645

It really comes down to this: Is it incompetency, or is it dishonesty? I think that is the second question that we have to answer beyond who was involved in this. Certainly, we have the Secretary of the Treasury, who was approved under dubious conditions to begin with, having somehow forgotten to pay or perhaps incompetently did not pay his taxes. And then he was up to his hips in this whole situation with the bailout but somehow didn't realize that this clause would be put in and then somehow jerked out. Even the administration has more or less offered him up as a scapegoat by saying that they really didn't know really what was going on and that really happened on his watch. I certainly think first and foremost that Mr. Geithner should resign. I think he has done enough damage as it is.

Also today there was a disgrace in the House where we had rammed down our throats a stimulus bill which no Republican supported and which did not contain a protective measure that should have been in to avoid these disgraceful bonuses. It was released only hours before. And being, of course, over 1,000 pages, it was impossible for anyone on this side of the aisle to have any idea of what was in that bill, much less some small clause as this.

After all of that, hoping to gain that money back and perhaps some honor to this House, the Republican freshmen advanced a bill that would have put such strings attached to the $30 billion left in the bailout that would make it impossible for them to receive it without paying this back 100 percent. Instead, that bill never made it to the floor, and we had upon suspension another bill that was, honestly, a horrible bill, although it was the best bill we have to date, which only took back, through taxes, 90 percent of the money that was paid out in bonuses.

Of course, the question is, is this even constitutional? Is it constitutional to pass a bill that has pointed at a very small segment of the society to punish them and to do it on a retroactive basis? I'm not a lawyer. I don't know. But it would be very interesting to see what comes to light. I would also like to know what part our Speaker had in this. It just seems like that once light is thrown into a situation like this, all the leadership who is behind it blow out like a covey of quail.

So I ask today that perhaps we have investigations, perhaps we find the

folks who were really behind this. In any event, we need to avoid this from happening again. So in closing, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the question is, is it incompetency or dishonesty? I certainly hope it is not the latter. And if it is incompetency, I think we need to renew some leadership positions and get us back to a competent pathway.

And with that, I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for adding his thoughts to the mystery of the hidden hand.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time of the hour remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned the freshman bill that attempted to get to the bottom of this, because sometimes the criticism, and I think it is legitimate criticism sometimes, is that the Republican party is the party of ''no,'' that we don't have any solutions and that all we do is say ''no'' around here.

The freshman bill is an opportunity, and it is a positive idea. Mr. MCCOTTER and I and about 20 of our colleagues earlier this week introduced something known as a ''resolution of inquiry.'' And Mr. Speaker, if any of your constituents are looking for a project, maybe they could contact the Congress and say, ''support H. Res. 251'' which simply says, let's get to the bottom of this. Let's have Secretary Geithner come to Capitol Hill with his papers and with his documents, and maybe he, as the Secretary of the Treasury, can shed some light on the mystery of the hidden hand, how good language was taken out of the $1 trillion stimulus bill and bad language was inserted.

So that measure, H. Res. 251, has been referred to the House Committee on Financial Services. Under the rules of this House, they have 14 days to report it out to the House.

Sometimes when we engage in that type of legislative activity, we are told that we have got a lot of important things, we are very busy here in the House of Representatives, and we really don't have time to get to the bottom of the mystery of the hidden hand, even though that bill spent $1 trillion of taxpayers' money.

I just want to move to a couple of other charts. I want to keep the paragraph up just in case anybody, any Member should be watching and he or she wants to exclude themselves as the hidden hand, I want them to know what it is we are talking about.

Last summer, many people remember, Mr. Speaker, when the cost of gasoline was going through the roof. Thankfully now that the international situation has died down, supply and demand has taken over and speculators have been driven out of the market, people now in my district are paying about $1.89 for regular. But last year, when gas just kept going up—and again let me say this. I have consistently said that this is the second Congress, the 111th Congress is the second Congress where there are more Democrats in the House than there are Republicans. They are the majority party. And quite frankly, in the last Congress, I thought they should have been the majority party because we screwed up as Republicans, and we deserved a little bit of a wake-up call. And we are very proud of the fact that Congress created the first woman Speaker of the House since the founding of our country, Ms. PELOSI of California. But we were consistently told that we couldn't talk about how are we going to solve this energy crisis last year because we were too busy. We had a lot of other important things to do.

I used this chart last year, and it is going to segue into what we are doing this year when the last Congress started and Speaker PELOSI was named the Speaker. Gasoline was $2.22 a gallon. And so we weren't so worried about gasoline, obviously, but we had important work here, and we passed legislation, and I'm sure these folks and their parents are very proud, congratulating the University of California, Santa Barbara soccer team. We were too busy to do anything about gasoline.

Well, gas shot up to $2.84. I began to get some phone calls in my office—Mr. MCCOTTER, I'll bet you did too—and so maybe we should begin to focus on gas prices. Well, no, we enacted, and we are very proud of this, National Passport Month. That is what they decided was the most important issue facing the country. Moving forward, gas goes up to $3.03. And so I know we are going to talk about gasoline today. No. We commended the Houston Dynamo soccer team. I think that we are all told in politics that you have to get the ''soccer mom'' votes. I think we were well on our way in that last Congress.

Gas goes up to $3.77, so I know we are going to talk about gas prices, how do we solve the pain at the pump. The most important issue of the day here in the Congress was National Train Day. I like trains. Gas goes up to $3.84. Well, we honor great cats and rare canids. And I have to tell you, I didn't know what a canid was when the bill came to the floor, but it is a dog. So we honored cats and dogs on that day when our constituents were paying $3.84. Gas goes up a little bit more to $4.09. You know we are going to talk about gas prices, right? No. We declared the International Year of Sanitation.

Then, finally, when gas hits $4.14, before it begins to come down, you know that we had to debate energy prices. We passed the Monkey Safety Act here in the United States Congress.

So you would think that we were chastened by that and perhaps in this Congress, when we have a financial meltdown and 16 Americans are losing their jobs every minute in this country, Mr. Speaker, people have had their 401(k)s wiped out, and so I know that maybe they didn't, you know, they were new in the majority, maybe they couldn't get things rolling. Now that they have 2 years under their belt, you know that we are going to deal with this financial crisis in a serious way.

This Congress started on January 6 of this year. That was the opening of the 111th Congress. And so we have been at it since January 6. We are now into the middle of March. And the stock market on that day was 9015. And then, of course, because I want to be fair to the new President of the United States, we get to, the stock market drops, and so maybe Congress could have acted in here, but certainly President Obama doesn't bear any responsibility because the next January 20, of course, we all know, was the date of the inauguration. And millions of people came, we were all excited, and we continue to be excited. The stock market then fell down after Inauguration Day to 7936. And the most important thing for us was to support the goals and ideals of national teen dating. Now, I have got teen-agers. I like teen dating. But when the stock market is going down, people are losing their life savings, clearly, we must have something more important to talk about than teen dating.

Well, here is a big drop from 7888 to 7114. And on that day, we have commended Sam Bradford for winning the Heisman trophy. Now, I'm sure that Mr. Bradford is an outstanding football player. I wish him a lot of success as he moves forward through his professional career. But, again, as the stock market has dropped by this time 1,900 points, maybe we can do something about the economy.

Well, then, it continues to go down. And not to be outdone, we had to pass the Monkey Safety Act again because when we passed the Monkey Safety Act in the last Congress, the Senate didn't pass the Monkey Safety Act, so we had to bring the Monkey Safety Act back to pass it this time. I don't want to make light of what caused that. There was a horrible situation in Connecticut where a woman had her face bitten off by a chimpanzee, and luckily she has now gone to the Cleveland Clinic, and she has had the first successful transplant in the country. That is certainly a serious matter. I don't have a problem with making sure that we have a Monkey Safety Act in this country to take care of that situation and others. But clearly, when the stock market has dropped almost 2,000 points, maybe we could do something else.

We run it out to March 3, and do you know what? Rather than helping people with the economy, we passed the Shark Conservation Act on May 3 as the stock market hit 6726. And lastly, the run-out to March 9, this was personally one of my favorites, because I didn't remember, I wasn't the sharpest knife in the drawer when I was going to school. So when they said we are going to have Supporting Pi Day, I thought, yeah, I like French silk. I like all the pies. But it was mathematical pi, which we know is 3.1416. And as the

stock market goes down and approaches the mid 6,000s, the legislation, the most important thing that we could do here in the United States Congress was to celebrate and honor Pi Day.

Folks, listen, there is a reason we get the reputation back home sometimes that we can't walk and chew gum at the same time. I am not saying that all of these things aren't fine things. But when the economy is in the tank, when the stock market is dropping, when people are hurting, when 16 Americans are losing their jobs every minute, maybe, just maybe, we could do something rather than the Monkey Safety Act not once, but twice.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Thank you. To the Chair, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we want to make clear about the resolution of inquiry that was drafted and introduced by the gentleman from Ohio is that it is an attempt to get an answer for the American people, and what we want to do is be fair both in providing them the answer and in terms of the people who could be the mysterious hidden hand behind this amendment. We want to get to the bottom of it. We do not want to rush to judgment and cast aspersions on others. We believe that this would be very fair to all involved, especially someone like Secretary Geithner, who no one has said was in the room, who himself has not said whether he was or wasn't. We do not want to prejudge the situation. We would like and welcome Democratic support for this, because we believe that in many ways, the Democratic majority was as blindsided by this amendment as was anybody else.

□ 1700

Of course, we warned that it might take time to read the bill that you vote on, but in the end I truly don't believe that the majority of Democrats in this body supported and approved and wanted to protect the AIG bonuses. We have to be fair about that.

But what they do have the opportunity to participate in now is to get behind the resolution of inquiry so they can show their constituents that they want a fair, orderly process to get the answer to the question of who was the hidden hand behind the mystery amendment. We also would like to have the support of members of the general public who could participate in this and put forward their own theories of who was the hidden hand. If they chose to do so, they can e-mail me at Thaddeus at republicanhousepolicy.com with their theories on potential motives for this mystery amendment and who they believe could be the hidden hand.

As we have seen throughout this process, someone did this. Now I can understand why no one is rushing up to accept the, quote, ''credit'' for this fine and noble amendment; but we need to know. Again, we welcome Democratic participation and public participation.

But we should not let this opportunity pass us by to get to the bottom of this because the worse thing to happen would be for this to recur. I don't think that is in the interest of the American people, and I don't think it is in the interest of anyone who was elected to serve them in this Chamber. We are sent here to vote on important matters of the day. We are sent here to make very important decisions as employees of the sovereign American people, and they deserve to know what we are voting on because they have to go home and account.

When they don't know what they are voting on, and in many ways get caught in an honest mistake supporting a larger issue while another issue festers beneath the surface, they will be called to account for something that they had no way of knowing. The vast majority of Members wanted to know what was in the bill, and they were not given the time to do so. That is unfortunate. But let's get to the bottom of the mystery of the hidden hand so Members will know what they are voting on when a bill comes to the floor.

One of the things that we have to take into account is the next problem can be avoided. That's why again we welcome Democratic participation and we welcome public participation in getting to the bottom of who was the hidden hand.

In voting today, we have also seen a spillover consequence of what happens when government reacts in a crisis. There is the old joke that is too unfortunately true, is that when in a crisis, government will throw your money at something and hope it goes away. We now have the corollary that when a political crisis happens that threaten politicians, they will rush to judgment and they will take money away as quickly as they can to solve it. We need to break that.

I come from Michigan. We have an 11.6 percent unemployment rate. My constituents cannot understand an economic policy that pays people to stay in their jobs, especially when those were the people who caused the problem that cost them their jobs in the first place by creating a global credit crisis that brought us to the precipice of a global depression. They cannot understand the sanity behind the logic of keeping people who were smart enough to break something, as if they were smart enough to fix it and rewarding them for it. They cannot understand how people who got rich causing the problem are now going to be overcompensated for fixing the problem that they caused.

What they want is for us to be responsible. What they want in a time of economic chaos is for their subservient government to help reestablish order and equity to our economy. They want us to help build institutional trust again within the financial community.

This amendment in front of us today did more to undercut the attempts to restore public confidence in financial institutions than anything I can think of because when you go home, the reason people do not want to put their hard-earned money out there is for fear of losing their job and seeing their nest egg become smaller. They do not have faith in public and financial institutions that are proven no longer to be too big to fail, that appear to be too big to fix, and they are also very concerned that the economic chaos and institutional disorder that has affected them so direly in these past months is now being replicated by their Federal Government, a government that spends a trillion dollars in a rush to judgment, a government that talks about a $3.6 trillion budget, that talks about trillion dollar tax increases. This is chaos to my constituents.

And now we add to that the fact that amidst all the talk of trillion dollars, trillion dollars borrowed, spent, trillion dollars taxed, they find out that no one in their government can tell them who wrote the amendment that let AIG executives receive bonuses. They deserve better than this. They deserve an answer because the first thing we have to do in the wake of this AIG bonus disaster is restore public confidence in the one institution they look to to help provide order and sanity and equity within their lives in times of chaos, and that is their Federal Government. Let us not fail them again.

I yield back to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank my friend from Michigan.

The Speaker of the House spoke today very eloquently, and it is the whole issue of who gets Federal taxpayer dollars and what we require in return. The gentleman from Michigan has been one of the champions in the House relative to the auto industry. I happen to agree with you that we need to make cars in this country, just like we need to make steel in this country. But we told the auto manufacturers that if there was going to be Federal assistance, I didn't happen to agree with it, you did, but if there was going to be Federal assistance, they had to cram down the contracts of the people who worked in the auto plants. And I assume those are contracts. I assume they signed a contract they were going to make X dollars an hour, and the Congress and Democratic leadership and others said well, if you get some money from the taxpayers, you have to renegotiate those contracts.

About 3 weeks ago we had a piece of legislation on the floor that really baffled me, and it was called the Cram-Down Bill. Even though we tried to get an amendment that said that you couldn't participate if you lied to get a mortgage, that bill basically said if you went to your bank and you lied on

the application to get a $100,000 mortgage, you weren't supposed to get it, you made up your income and you didn't talk about what you owed, the majority gave the judges of this country the ability to cram down that mortgage and say you don't owe $100,000 any more, you only owe $60,000.

So clearly if that is where we are going to go, if we are going to target people who make cars in this country and we are going to reward people who lie on their mortgage applications, it is obnoxious. Some people say what's the big deal, it is 50 words. What the big deal is we have said to the auto guys, cram down your wages. We have said to the mortgage holders, cram down your mortgage. But in the dead of night, the hidden hand inserted language that not only didn't prohibit the awarding of $170 million in bonuses to people, it protected those bonuses; and today, they are shocked. It is a little bit like the man who is taking a bath and throws his clock radio in the bathtub and says, I'm shocked. That's what we have here.

Mr. MCCOTTER. On your line of thought regarding the sanctity of contracts, in many ways we heard that these contracts here could not be voided, that the sanctity of contracts prevailed.

The reality is this amendment was necessary because the sanctity of contract ''ended'' when a company that would have gone bankrupt but for taxpayer money being injected to save it occurred. That is why this amendment was necessary for precisely the reasons you talk about.

When you look at the disparate treatment of auto workers who have to give up hard-earned, negotiated contractual benefits in exchange to show viability for taxpayer bridge loans, when you talk about responsible lenders having to foot the bill for people who have even lied on their mortgage applications to be bailed out while mortgage contracts are crammed down and rewritten, they cannot abide a company that says we have a sanctity of contract when the reality is there would have been no bonus, no contract if they had gone into bankruptcy. Again, as you have pointed out, but for the Federal taxpayers, the American people's hard-earned savings going in to bail that company out, a company that has not been asked to restructure but to wind down, those contracts were no longer void.

And it also shows the point that had this Congress known, both Republicans and Democrats, I believe, would have demanded that any further bridge-loan assistance to a company, a financial institution, had to have as an attachment, as a precondition, the preclusion of any executive compensation in the terms of a bonus.

Again, we were not allowed that opportunity because in the dead of night, this mystery amendment was offered by a hidden hand.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we have launched the mystery of the hidden hand. Again, the mystery of the hidden hand is somebody, and we just want that person to identify themselves so we can move on to something else. Somebody took out a paragraph in the stimulus bill spending a trillion dollars of taxpayer money that said that AIG and others, anybody who got taxpayer money, could not hand out excessive executive bonuses. The hidden hand removed it and inserted this paragraph in section 7700 that permitted and protected the $170 million of bonuses that people are now shocked AIG paid out.

We have established motive. We have identified a clue. Mr. COLE was kind enough to give us a clue, and we started with 535 suspects and we have winnowed it down to, well, we are down to about 524 now.

So I am going to bring the face book, Mr. Speaker, next week and every day to the floor, and I will seek out Members of this body and ask them if they are the hidden hand. If they didn't put this paragraph in, I am going to cross their face off. When I am done with the House, I am going to go over to the Senate, if they will let me over there, and I will ask the Senators: Are you the hidden hand? Did you foist this fraud upon the American taxpayer and then not have the courage to own up to it?

Mr. Speaker, we will be back. We will solve the mystery of the hidden hand. The taxpayers deserve no less.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a very critical anniversary before us tonight, the Iraq anniversary. The Iraq war anniversary is tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and it is critical that we give this moment due attention.

I am here as the person who leads our Progressive Special Order hour, the Progressive Message, and I want to just start off by thanking Mr. JARED POLIS of Colorado who is here with me tonight who is a member of the Progressive Caucus and who has some very clear remarks to share with me right now.

Congressman, let me yield to you and can you reflect on this auspicious occasion, the anniversary of the Iraq war.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON. I would like to read briefly from warnewstoday.blogspot.com. Frequently in our mainstream media, it seems as if everything is wonderful in Iraq. That couldn't be further from the truth. Every day, Mr. Speaker, there are casualties and deaths of Iraqis. And yes, our American men and women continue to lose their lives overseas.

Today alone, Mr. Speaker, a leading politician from the Iraqi Islamic Party has been assassinated west of Baghdad.

Incident number two, a magnetic bomb targeted a police officer's car in the Shaab neighborhood of eastern Baghdad. It went off at 7:15 p.m. The officer was injured and taken to a hospital.

Incident number three, from today, Mr. Speaker, gunmen shot and wounded two Interior Ministry personnel when they attacked their vehicle in central Baghdad on Wednesday.

Incident number four from today in Kut, police forces found an unknown civilian body, as they do many days, hard to identify, happens often, on the outskirts of town.

In Kirkuk, gunmen killed a landlord and his wife when they stormed their house.

□ 1715

In Mosul, again, today, Mr. Speaker, an employee from the Displacement and Migration Department on Wednesday was shot by an unknown gunman in northern Mosul.

Also in Mosul, a gunman killed a civilian in a drive-by shooting 390 miles north of Baghdad. A roadside bomb killed two civilians when it struck a U.S. patrol in eastern Mosul. And again today, unknown gunman on Thursday killed the Mayor of Dober Dan Village. Again today in Iraq, police found the body of a man shot in the head and chest in a town near Mosul.

When I had the opportunity to go to Iraq last year, Mr. Speaker, and talk to people who served on town councils, mayors—these were in the city of Baghdad, autonomous zones, they had their own city council—it was a high-risk occupation. I was informed that nearly a quarter of the people that serve in those capacities on those local city councils have been assassinated, Mr. Speaker.

There are many who would have us believe that the situation in Iraq is rosy. While it might be pleasant to believe that, Mr. Speaker, today, on the sixth anniversary of the war, we need to face reality. This war will end when we choose for this war to end, Mr. Speaker.

Along with several of my colleagues, and yourself, Mr. Speaker, we signed the Responsible Plan to End the War in Iraq almost 2 years ago. Joined by our colleagues, Representative EDWARDS, Representative MASSA, Representative PINGREE, Representative PERRIELLO, and myself, as well as a number of retired military personnel, we put forth a plan not only to end the war, but to ensure that this sort of travesty never occurs in our country again, to restore our Constitution and our liberties.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman from Colorado yield for a moment?

Mr. POLIS. I will.

Mr. ELLISON. You are fresh off the campaign trail, Congressman. You have been knocking on doors, talking to folks, and you know what people are thinking. You haven't been around here long enough to get jaded, and so your level of enthusiasm for the work

is still very fresh. What are the American people saying about our involvement now on its sixth year in Iraq?

Mr. POLIS. There are a lot of distractions here at home. We have the most severe recession since the Great Depression. We have scandalous uses of public money that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about that we addressed today with regard to bonuses paid to AIG executives. But there are many Americans who, even today, have their sons and daughters, their brothers and sisters, the mothers and fathers of young Americans in school serving overseas in Iraq today, putting their lives in jeopardy every day and, yes, losing their loved ones every day. And you can bet that for those families that are affected by that, that is one of the most important issues to them.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, if you would yield back for a moment, I would like to ask you again; in the course of your work, you're walking around Colorado, you're walking around your district, you're talking to folks, did you talk to any American families who had loved ones who were stop-loss, who are now on their second, third, fourth deployment? Did you see anything like that as I yield back to you, Congressman?

Mr. POLIS. Absolutely. And not only does that divide families, does that compromise the ability of families to provide the kind of family life for their kids that they want to, to support themselves at the level that they want to, not only does it do that, but it divides these families, it compromises our competitiveness as a country, and it weakens our national defense to have men and women serving who would, in many cases, rather be almost anywhere else.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, if you would yield back, I can tell you that as a Member of Congress myself—now I'm a sophomore Member, and you and I are closer to not being Congressmen and being long-term veterans—my heart always breaks a little bit whenever I talk to a spouse who says my wife or husband is going to be leaving here for a year or 18 months, or how about the situation where a woman walks up and says, see this baby who is 9 months old? She never met her daddy. Is this the kind of thing that you saw while you were on the campaign trail?

Mr. POLIS. I saw many families across our district that were directly affected by this. And as you know, with that duration of service—well beyond what many of our men and women thought they were signing up for—the psychological toll when they return is terrible. To serve under those conditions for several years in a row, continually being re-upped, that becomes your reality, the existence in that war zone. It is very hard, when you finally do return, to rejoin this reality we have here in this country.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, as you have done your work, you're fresh off the campaign trail, I wonder, did you ever have any occasion to talk to family members who said, you know, my son came back, but he's kind of different than he was when he left; he used to have a smile, he used to have a joke for everybody, and now it seems like the weight of the world is on this 22-year-old guy, now it seems like my daughter can't find her smile again?

In my great State of Minnesota, we had a young person who sought mental health care, and there wasn't enough room and they couldn't get in right away. And before this person could come back, they took their own life because they couldn't get the helicopters out of their head, they couldn't get the horror, they couldn't get these kind of images out of their mind, and yet, we've learned that suicide is a serious issue for our fighting men and women, particularly in connection with Iraq.

Have you encountered these kind of medical challenges that our veterans are facing in connection with this war?

Mr. POLIS. I have held hands with veterans and their families and borne witness to the tremendous stresses. It is a difficult topic for any of us to talk about without getting emotional. These are men and women who have served our country proudly. We need to make sure that we have the right mental and physical health support services when they return, but most importantly, to bring them out of harm's way.

It is hard to adjust. I talk to many who are living at home, who are depressed, who are living in a basement. They had their whole lives ahead of them, have had to serve several years overseas, have become part of that reality of seeing the cost of war, their coworkers and people in their unit blown up in front of their eyes, sometimes receiving physical injuries, sometimes only mental injuries, but turning back, having a very difficult time reintegrating and getting back to work.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, let me tell you, tomorrow marks the beginning of the seventh year of the war in Iraq. Throughout that time, we have lost more than 4,000 of America's bravest men and women. The number, to date, that I have is 4,259, but of course the way this war has been going, it could be 4,260 or 4,270.

We have spent over $600 billion, with long-term cost projections in the trillions, and we have seen Iraqi civilian casualties estimated at the hundreds of thousands. We know that there are over 30,000 Americans who have been injured. And of course the numbers of deaths are easy to count, but the injuries are more difficult because not all the injuries are manifested in terms of a limb or a scar; but of course we've seen those, too. Let me tell you, if you go to Landstuhl Air Force Base, the hospital there in Germany, you see bright-eyed, young people who have suffered catastrophic injuries, and of course we've seen them back home.

We all know, Congressman, that the purported reasons for going to Iraq—you remember what they are. Would you care to tick off a few of the reasons you and I were told, as Americans, that we needed to go into Iraq? Do you remember what some of those reasons were back almost 6 years ago, Congressman?

Mr. POLIS. We were misinformed and led to believe there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Mr. ELLISON. Weapons of mass destruction. And all we have been found with, Congressman, is weapons of mass distraction, as we have been given misinformation, disinformation due to a combination of political pressure, cherry-picking effects, and poor intelligence. All these assertions ended up being wrong, wrong, wrong and dramatically undermined American credibility around the world.

Congressman, you also would probably have to agree with me that this war has had a corrosive effect on our standing in the world. Whether you're talking about Abu Ghraib, whether you're talking about Bagram, whether you're talking about—whatever you're talking about, our country, which is known as a beacon of civil and human rights, as the rule of law prevails in America, we have seen this conflict sort of eat at what we stand for. I wonder, are these things that you've encountered as you were out there on the campaign trail and as you have been a Member of this body for the last several weeks?

Mr. POLIS. There is great frustration that this war continues to compromise our very important war on terror. One of the most important fronts on the war on terror is the diplomatic front. This war has undermined our ability to engage other nations on the diplomatic front and continues to this day.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, yielding back, Congressman, you and I also know that you are right when you say one of the purported reasons was weapons of mass destruction, which you and I learned was not true. We also know that we were told—we went through sort of this link that was sort of made between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. What have we learned? The bipartisan—bipartisan, that's Republicans and Democrats—9/11 Commission found that there was ''no operational relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda.'' Claims that 9/11 hijacker Muhammad Atta met with Iraqi agents in Prague turned out to be false. Do remember that one, Congressman?

Mr. POLIS. I remember those insinuations that were made by the administration at the time. Many people were led to believe that somehow, in some way, shape or form, Iraq and Saddam Hussein were aligned with al Qaeda, and it couldn't have been further from the truth.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, as you yield back, we were told weapons of mass destruction, links with Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. And some people said, well, at least Saddam Hussein is gone—and of course we're glad he is

gone, but it almost seems like, when the argument was made, that folks acted like it was a cost-free endeavor, that he was just gone and we didn't have to pay dearly as a Nation for it.

But one of the questions that I want to also direct to you, Congressman, is, $8 billion in reconstruction funding disappeared under the Bush administration's watch. According to Iraq's Public Integrity Commission, roughly $8 billion in the country's reconstruction funds were ''wasted or stolen'' between 2007 and the beginning of the invasion. How does that strike you?

When you think about waste, fraud, and abuse, you might have heard that story about that billion dollars in bills sitting on a wooden pallet. How does that strike you? How does that strike your constituents?

Mr. POLIS. You know, our colleagues today from the other side were here holding forth about accountability for this $160 million, where did this $160 million go? Who knew and when? And those are questions that we need to answer, but let me say that that pales—$160 million wrongfully paid to AIG executives, $8 billion unaccounted for, where is the outrage and where is the investigation?

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, I think that is a question that we all need to ponder. But Halliburton, after receiving no-bid reconstruction contracts from the Bush White House, wasted hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. A 2005 report by Senator BYRON DORGAN and Congressman HENRY WAXMAN cited internal Pentagon audits that question ''more than a billion dollars in the company's bills for work in Iraq.''

It just boggles the mind. If the American taxpayer, in their generosity, says let's get water going in Baghdad, let's get electricity going in Baghdad, at least if we spent the money, the people there ought to get it; wouldn't you say so, Congressman?

Mr. POLIS. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. And there have been other costs, those that are less easy to quantify, such as the cost to America's image, which you spoke of very well, Congressman POLIS. And though it is difficult to assign numbers, we know the view of our great Nation has suffered—although I'm happy to report we're on the mend now—and the cost is just really very difficult to calculate.

Let me just remind folks that this is the Progressive message. We are talking about the anniversary of the Iraq war, we are talking about what's going on. We are the Progressive Caucus, and we're talking about a vision of peace and a vision of a progressive message in our country.

I want to get to this panel in our slides, Congressman. And I want to say, after 6 years of the Iraq war, here is sort of the cost that I just alluded to. Here is what we've had to pay. Here are some of the hits—flush with cites on the bottom of each one because we're not just up here talking, we back up what we say at the Progressive message. U.S. troops killed in Iraq, 4,259 as of today.

Mr. POLIS. Each one with a family.

Mr. ELLISON. Each one with a family, each one with a story, each one with a future, each one with a patriotic passion for their Nation, each one who wanted to come home. And each one didn't have to ever go to Iraq because the premise for our involvement was, as you and I just mentioned, those reasons were discovered to not be accurate, the weapons of mass destruction and Saddam Hussein in connection with al Qaeda.

U.S. troops wounded in Iraq, 31,102. And again, these are traumatic brain injuries, these are lost limbs, these are severe injuries—some will heal, some are injuries for a lifetime, as you know, Congressman. And I will yield if you want to comment on any of these. Iraqi civilians killed in the war, about 150,000; that's according to the World Health Organization. Please look it up yourself if you have any questions about that number. And you would have to imagine, in a country of about 29 million people, that there is no Iraqi family that has not seen death and destruction, and this has to be extremely traumatizing.

□ 1730

Iraqi civilians forced from their homes, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, about 4.7 million persons who have been homeless as a result of this conflict. That's a big deal. U.S. troops deployed in Iraq, right now we have got about 138,000 people there and, again, a conflict that, according to the reasons offered to us by the Bush administration, not one should have been there based on the reasons they offered to us.

Impact of war on the U.S. economy, $1.3 trillion. That's the Congressional Joint Economic Committee Report. I hope folks who might be seeing this, Mr. Speaker, will be willing to look at the Congressional Joint Economic Committee Report, which will cite the impact of this war on our economy as $1.3 trillion. That's a lot of money. That's a whole lot of money.

Cost of the Iraq War to the average American family, according again to the Congressional Joint Economic Committee Report, that's about $16,500 per American family. We have paid dearly, too dearly for our involvement in this conflict. And in my view, Mr. Speaker, the cost of even one life is too dear, even $1 is too dear, but we have made much, much more than that.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLIS. At top of the chart, it says after 6 years of war in Iraq. I ask you how many more anniversaries must we observe? Is five enough? Is six enough? We have been in this war longer than our Nation was involved in World War II. After 6 years how many more? There was a young boy 12 years old playing video games when this war started who is serving and being injured in Iraq today. How many more years, Mr. ELLISON?

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, I have just got to tell you that 1 more minute is too much. Our President has said that 16 months is our out date, and I think it's incumbent upon all of us to make sure that it is that or less because, quite frankly, I don't look forward to coming up here another year from now saying that we're still present in Iraq in the way that we are now. We need to out of there. We need to wind our way out. Iraq needs to go back to the people of Iraq. Iraqis need to get ahold of their country and govern their own affairs.

Sometimes we talk about the Iraq War and even here I've used the word ''war,'' but really at this point we are not talking about a war. We are talking about an occupation. And when I say that, I don't mean that in any sort of a derisive way. It's the legal word that is appropriate for this situation. In a war you can win or lose, but in an occupation you can only stay longer than you should or you can leave sooner than you should, but eventually you've got to go; right? So with this America involvement in Iraq, it is time to say to the Iraqi people, ''This is your country. We will not abandon you. We will not leave you because, of course, we're deeply implicated in your country at this time, but the reality is the military engagement needs to come to a close.''

Let me ask you this, Congressman POLIS: When you think about this statistic, Iraqi civilians forced from their homes and the number of about 4.7 million, how does that strike you when you consider Iraqi boys and girls who used to live one place but now can't because of this military conflict? How does that impact their development? How does that impact their ability to grow up to be strong citizens of the world in, say, 5, 10, 15 years?

Mr. POLIS. As you know, Mr. ELLISON, close to a million of them have been forced from their country and reside in Jordan, reside in Syria, reside in Lebanon in everything ranging from refugee camps to short-term rental housing. It has been an issue in the greater Amman area, do we let them in the school with our Jordanian kids? They're out of school for a while. Sometimes they're in; sometimes they're out. It's spotty. Many of them might never be able to go back. The areas they lived in might be controlled by competing tribes, their houses taken over, forced away at gunpoint.

This dislocation is historical in scope. We are talking about a sizable amount of people within Iraq who have been displaced, some to other countries, some to other parts of Iraq.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, I just want to point out to you and to everyone watching, Mr. Speaker, that when one child is forced from their home or one adult, for that matter—a

home is like a bowl. Can you imagine making a cake without a bowl? Where are you going to put the eggs? Where are you going to put the milk? Where are you going to put all the ingredients for that cake so that you can make that cake and put it in the oven? Try to imagine raising a family. You don't know where you're going to be. You don't know where your school is going to be. No familiar places. You're a stranger everywhere. This kind of displacement has an impact on a child's ability to learn, a child's ability to embrace the environment that they're in. The child begins to sense that maybe their parents can't really protect them, that maybe they're vulnerable and perhaps that anything could happen to them at any time.

This does not bode well for the future. We're talking about a region of the world that has known way too much conflict, and this conflict is one that we surely need to end. And this idea of displacement, I think, is another thing that we need to talk about in terms of the impact on the development of this society as we talk in this Progressive message this hour and the anniversary of the war in Iraq.

Congressman, let's turn for a moment, then, to veterans' care, if you will. We must begin to take seriously the promise to care for our veterans. Our veterans, prominent men and women, you have them in Colorado and I've got them in Minnesota. Actually, they are from all over this country. And the fact is with tens of thousands of injured troops returning home, we must work diligently to ensure that they do not fall through the cracks and that every soldier receives care and benefits that they have earned and deserve.

During the 110th Congress, when I was a freshman Member, I was proud to have voted for the largest increase in funding for Veterans Affairs in history, upon passage of H.R. 2642, the Fiscal Year 2008 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies appropriations bill. We made a real commitment to military hospital construction, improving the quality of care for veterans, improving the lives of veterans, making sure that we shorten the period of time and that their veterans' benefits got to them in a quick way. We not only talked patriotism, we did patriotism as we passed this largest Veterans Affairs funding bill in the history of our country.

In the fall of 2007, I worked closely with the Minnesota congressional delegation to ensure that members of the Minnesota National Guard Unit, the 1/34th Brigade Combat Team receive their full active component GI Bill entitlements. That particular unit, that particular brigade combat team, returned to Minnesota after a 22-month mobilization and deployment to Iraq, the longest tour of any ground combat unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Unfortunately, members of the unit were informed after they returned home, Congressman and Mr. Speaker, that they were not eligible for their full GI benefits because their orders to return home cut them a few days short of the eligibility for these benefits. After my office was informed of this decision, I and Mr. TIM WALZ, my congressman and the highest-ranking enlisted Member ever to come to Congress, wrote a letter to the Department of Defense to appeal the decision. The Army responded positively, and most of the soldiers of this very brave, courageous, and successful combat unit were granted waivers to access those educational benefits.

And I just wanted to share that with you, Mr. Speaker and Congressman, because I think it's important that the world know that Members of Congress are fighting for their constituents who have served our country bravely.

And I just want to ask you, Congressman POLIS, if you have any thoughts you want to share with us about our veterans at this time and about our Nation's commitment to this group of Americans. Whether or not we agree on the war, we all agree that the warrior needs to be supported. Any comments as I yield to you?

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON. We have some fortunate news for Colorado veterans. Yesterday morning several of my colleagues from the Colorado delegation and I met with Secretary Shinseki, and he announced that they are moving forward with a new VA hospital at Fitzsimmons to serve our veterans in Colorado. Due to the hard work of your classmate and our colleague Congressman PERLMUTTER and my predecessor who is now on the other side, Senator UDALL, who have for years fighting to improve it. And I have toured the old VA hospital in Colorado. And this new one is going to have a spinal trauma unit. It's going to be state of the art, and it's what we needed.

But there are too many places in our country, as you know, Mr. ELLISON, where veterans don't have the quality of health care that they have earned by serving our country so proudly.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, I just want to congratulate you and all the delegation of Colorado on this wonderful news. I believe that Mr. Shinseki is one of the best Veterans Affairs Secretaries our country has ever seen, and I expect that we will be able to work closely with him to not only help the constituents of your great State but probably many others around our country.

I also just want to mention that I'm proud to have the Minneapolis VA hospital in my district, and Minneapolis VA is one of the facilities in our country that I feel very proud to be able to represent. The Minneapolis VA Medical Center has been awarded the 2008 Robert W. Carey Trophy Award for performance and excellence. If I sound like I'm a little proud of them, you're right, I am. The annual Carey Trophy Award, the most prestigious national quality award that the VA bestows, recognizes a VA organization that implements management approaches resulting in high levels of performance and service to our veterans. So I am just real happy to mention that. And I am proud, along with you, as we see veterans in Colorado, Minnesota, all over the country being able to benefit from a responsive Congress, a grateful Congress, for the great service that these brave men and women have given to our country.

Mr. POLIS. Will you yield for a moment?

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLIS. Let me also add how important it is that the rest of our agenda, the Recovery Act, health care have passed so that our returning veterans are returning to an economy that's growing, that has jobs, that has health care if they were not injured in combat. They deal with the very real issue of health care sometimes for the first time in their lives, if they've been in the military for some period of time right out of college or even before college, and the importance of the Recovery Act, creating over 3 million jobs, hopefully many of which will go to our returning veterans.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, great point. The fact is that our veterans are Americans, of course, some of the finest Americans. They come back to their country; they expect a country that's working. So they can come back and maybe get a green job that will help them build our country on the civilian side. They can help weatherize our neighborhoods. They can help build senior housing, low-income housing. They can do so many things our country needs and help build us a renewable future.

So I think you're absolutely right to introduce the broader economic context that we're in. One thing we don't want to see is to have these veterans who have given so much for so many come back to a country where we're not building, where we're not preparing for the future. So you're right. I'm glad you mentioned the American Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I'm glad you mentioned our efforts to build a health care system that everyone can benefit from. I'm glad you mentioned these important things because, of course, veterans are folks who come into a broader context, and it's not only veterans' benefits that benefit veterans. It's a working, functioning America in which everybody has a slice of the pie.

So, Congressman, as we are wrapping up today, I just want to thank you again for being here with us this afternoon. The Progressive message has to always come week in, week out. Whether or not Members are on a Thursday night jumping on a plane trying to get back home or not, the Progressive message has to be part of what we do every week. And I just want to yield to you to sort of offer some final thoughts as we begin to wrap up our comments tonight.

Mr. POLIS. I would just say that let us hope that next year we are celebrating an anniversary of the end of the Iraq War and not the seventh anniversary of this unjust war in the wrong place.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me join with you in that hope and in that wish. I think I can speak for the members of the Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker, when I say that we will be working hard to make that dream a reality.

I also want to point out that there have been a great many Americans, I'm sure Minnesotans and I'm sure Coloradans as well, who have been calling for, working for, pushing for America to assert its soft power in the world and to help make peace in this world and be a source of peace in this world.

□ 1745

You can bet there is a committed group of Americans who are in the United States Congress who are people who call themselves the Progressive Caucus, and you can find out what we are doing on this Web site, it's cpc.grijalva.house.gov. We are going to be here giving this progressive message every week, and we are the Progressive Caucus.

As I wrap it up, and I just want to thank you for joining me tonight, we are going to be here week in, week out, through rain, shine, winter, summer, talking about a progressive message, a progressive message for America, for the world.

Congressman POLIS, let me thank you again for joining me tonight.

I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of an event in district with the President.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal business.

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 Ms. LEE of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 23, 24, 25 and 26.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1541. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 18, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1127. To extend certain immigration programs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

947. A letter from the Director, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's nineteenth annual report for the Pentagon Renovation and Construction Program Office (PENREN), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2674; to the Committee on Armed Services.

948. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the need for and feasibility of a mental health scholarship program, pursuant to Section 1117 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA); to the Committee on Armed Services.

949. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2008 report on the Military Retirement Fund (MRF), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 183; to the Committee on Armed Services.

950. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to conduct a streamlined A-76 competition of the administrative management and correspondence services function performed by six military personnel at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

951. A letter from the Chair, Congressional Oversight Panel, transmitting the Panel's monthly report pursuant to Section 125(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-343; to the Committee on Financial Services.

952. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Implementation Report: Energy Conservation Standards Activities,'' pursuant to Section 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

953. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting correspondence from Senate Secretary Emma Lirio-Reyes of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

954. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on all data mining activities, pursuant to Section 804 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

955. A letter from the Secretary General, Inter-Parliamentary Union, transmitting proceedings of the Parliamentary Conference on the World Trade Organization, which was held jointly by the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the European Parliament in Geneva on September 11 through September 12, 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

956. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

957. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

958. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

959. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

960. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

961. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

962. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

963. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

964. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

965. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

966. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

967. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

968. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

969. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

970. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report detailing activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1997f; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

971. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Great White Fleet, East Waterway, Seattle, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0410] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

972. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; USNS Capella and USNS Pollux, Boston, MA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0409] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

973. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; International Bayfest Boat Parade, Green Bay, WI. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0481] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

974. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk Fireworks Display, Santa Cruz, CA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0522] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

975. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Rochester Harborfest, Lake Ontario at the Genesee River, Rochester, NY. [USCG-2008-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

976. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Toyota/Sea Doo US Regional Championship, Salisbury, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0488] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

977. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Columbia River, All Waters Within a 100-yard Radius Around the M/V MAERSK JEWEL [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0484] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

978. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Firework Events; Great Lake Annual Firework Events [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0531] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

979. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Cape Fear River, Wilmington, North Carolina [USCG-2008-0468] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

980. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seattle Yacht Club's ''Opening Day'' Marine Parade [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0286] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

981. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Upper Mississippi River, Dubuque, Iowa [USCG-2007-0172] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

982. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, Nassau County, NY, maintenance [USCG-2008-0346] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

983. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Sacramento River, Sacramento, CA, Event — Sacramento International Triathlon [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0317] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

984. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Area; International Bay City River Roar, Saginaw River, Bay City , MI. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0585] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

985. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quarterly Listings; Anchorages, Safety Zones, Security Zones, Special Local Regulations, Regulated Navigation Areas, and Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Correction [USCG-2008-0181], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. S. 383. An act to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110–343) to provide the Special Inspector General with additional authorities and responsibilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–41, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. S. 383 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FARR, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1605. A bill to seek the establishment of and contributions to an International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 1606. A bill to establish a new automobile voucher program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1607. A bill to provide for and promote the economic development of Indian tribes by furnishing the necessary capital, financial services, and technical assistance to Indian-owned business enterprises, to stimulate the development of the private sector of Indian tribal economies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to require the Administrator of the Internal Revenue Service to verify income for purposes of determining the eligibility of persons for certain Department of Agriculture payments and benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to limit the annual percentage rate of interest that may be charged by recipients of financial assistance under such Act with respect to consumer credit card accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 to repeal a provision prohibiting the use of funds for a cross-border motor carrier demonstration program to allow Mexican-domiciled motor carriers to operate beyond the commercial zones along the international border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1612. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, 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. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the research credit permanent, increase expensing for small businesses, reduce corporate tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to community health coalitions to assist in the development of integrated health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1615. A bill to amend section 435(o) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding the definition of economic hardship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. STARK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. DENT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANCE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1616. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for low-income individuals infected with HIV; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1617. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for a privacy official within each component of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WATT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BACA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, concerning length and weight limitations for vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARROW, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WATT, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. KILROY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SIRES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit preexisting condition exclusions for children in group health plans and health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets; 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. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 1620. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for reciprocity in regard to the manner in which nonresidents of a State may carry certain concealed firearms in that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 1621. A bill to withhold Federal funds from schools that permit or require the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance or the national anthem in a language other than English; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide for a program of research, development, and demonstration on natural gas vehicles; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1623. A bill to protect children from sexual exploitation by mandating reporting requirements for convicted sex traffickers and other sex offenders against minors intending to engage in international travel, providing advance notice of intended travel by high risk sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, preventing entry into the United States by any foreign sex offender against a minor, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the gross income of members of the uniformed services of the United States certain amounts of military basic pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1625. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 1626. A bill to make technical amendments to laws containing time periods affecting judicial proceedings; 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. DENT:

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Air Force to use Civil Air Patrol personnel and resources to support homeland security missions; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCCOTTER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 1628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit hardship loans from certain individual retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide penalty free distributions and loans from certain retirement plans for the purchase and refinancing of principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1630. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to include the Territory of Guam in the list of affected areas with respect to which claims relating to atmospheric nuclear testing shall be allowed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include participation in clean-up operations at Eniwetok Atoll as a radiation-risk activity for purposes of laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 1632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income of long-term capital gains on property purchased before the end of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1633. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a member of the Armed Forces to designate anyone as the person authorized to direct disposition of the remains of the member if the member dies while on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to extend the period during which States may allow low emission and energy-efficient vehicles to use high occupancy vehicle facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1635. A bill to authorize alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering for new Metrorail capital projects in Northern Virginia and surrounding areas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1636. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the qualification of the director of food services of a Medicare skilled nursing facility or a Medicaid nursing facility; 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. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1637. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit universal defaults on credit card accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1638. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer individuals detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to facilities or locations in Virginia or to house such individuals at such facilities or locations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 to extend Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers from usury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for a study of the Cascadia Marine Trail; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1642. A bill to provide loans and grants for fire sprinkler retrofitting in nursing facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a prospective payment system instead of the reasonable cost-based reimbursement method for Medicare-covered services provided by Federally qualified health centers and to expand the scope of such covered services to account for expansions in the scope of services provided by Federally qualified health centers since the inclusion of such services for coverage under the Medicare Program; 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. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a tax credit for qualified donations of employee services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1645. A bill to provide grants to promote financial and economic literacy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WU, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for hiring veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to require that concurrent resolutions on the budget limit the growth of Federal spending to the mean of annual percentage growth of wages and gross domestic product (GDP) in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, 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. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 1649. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to reduce the size of core curriculum classes in public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 1650. A bill to enhance the oversight authority of the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to expenditures under the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a right for an alien to file a motion to reopen a case in removal proceedings if the alien can demonstrate that counsel or a certified representative provided deficient performance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1652. A bill to require institutions receiving certain assistance from the Troubled Asset Relief Program or the Federal Reserve to have employee bonus payment plans approved in advance of the payments being made; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1653. A bill to provide for nuclear disarmament and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits against income tax for qualified stem cell research, the storage of qualified stem cells, and the donation of umbilical cord blood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYES (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BACA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 1655. A bill to enhance the safety of ports of entry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1656. A bill to require TARP payments to be conditioned on the top 10 highest wage earners at a company having repaid any bonuses received during the previous 5 fiscal years; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1657. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to notify members of the Armed Forces and State military departments of exposure to potentially harmful materials and contaminants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the recovery by the United States of charges from a third party for hospital care or medical services furnished to a veteran for a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KILROY (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NYE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding executive and employee bonuses paid by AIG and other companies assisted with taxpayer funds provided under the Troubled Assets Relief Program of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H. Res. 264. A resolution expressing the opposition of the House of Representatives to any proposal intended to alter current law to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to bill third-party insurers of veterans who are being treated for service-connected disabilities or injuries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 265. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. INGLIS):

H. Res. 266. A resolution celebrating 90 years of United States-Polish diplomatic relations, during which Poland has proven to be an exceptionally strong partner to the United States in advancing freedom around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. HIRONO):

H. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz, expressing appreciation to Iranian-Americans for their contributions to society, and wishing Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran a prosperous new year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. BARROW):

H. Res. 268. A resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Earth Hour 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 269. A resolution supporting the goals of Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 270. A resolution recognizing the establishment of Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States and the contributions of those programs efforts to decrease hunger and help feed those in need; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 271. A resolution recognizing the need to support the development and enforcement of a well-informed national long-term care strategy to solve the problems of cost, quality, and access to long-term care in the home and community, and the imperativeness of including long-term care in the comprehensive health care reform agenda; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, 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. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 272. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to strike rule XXVIII, popularly known as the ''Gephardt rule'', and to provide that any measure that increases the statutory limit on the public debt shall be stand alone and require a recorded vote; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FOXX, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr.

MCMAHON, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H. Res. 273. A resolution recognizing the 188th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 23: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 24: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 74: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 144: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 152: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 179: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 209: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 211: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 213: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 270: Mr. MICA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 272: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 303: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 333: Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 347: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 391: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 422: Mr. HERGER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 444: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 482: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 497: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 509: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 515: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 557: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 574: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 614: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 616: Mr. BONNER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 626: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 676: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 682: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 684: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 699: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 721: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 730: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 731: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 735: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 775: Mr. KISSELL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 816: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 836: Mr. CARTER, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 868: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 873: Mr. DICKS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 875: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 877: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 885: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 916: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 948: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JONES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H.R. 981: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 984: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 988: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1020: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1021: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1024: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1029: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1032: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1052: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1077: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1081: Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H.R. 1092: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1132: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 1136: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1139: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1146: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1147: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1150: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1173: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1176: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1182: Mr. WAMP, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1185: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1201: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1203: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1204: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1206: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. INGLIS.

H.R. 1207: Mr. AKIN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1208: Mr. CARTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1209: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1210: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1214: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1221: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1237: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1238: Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1240: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1245: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1247: Mr. STARK and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1255: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1256: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1277: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1285: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1289: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1298: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 1314: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1326: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1327: Mr. BARROW, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1329: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1351: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1362: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1389: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1392: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WAMP, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 1403: Mr. CAO.

H.R. 1405: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1437: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1452: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1459: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1470: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1472: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1479: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1499: Mr. DICKS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1509: Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1511: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1520: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1521: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1523: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1528: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1530: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1531: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1547: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1548: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1550: Mr. STUPAK and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1551: Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 1558: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1564: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1575: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1577: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. MINNICK.

H.R. 1581: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1582: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1586: Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1603: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MACK, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. COLE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BONNER.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MASSA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Res. 42: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MACK, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 81: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Res. 130: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H. Res. 204: Mr. MASSA.

H. Res. 215: Mr. NYE and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 234: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H. Res. 238: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Res. 241: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 242: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 244: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H. Res. 247: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HARE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 249: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H. Res. 251: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H. Res. 260: Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.