

Australia. Of the 151 appropriations, only 34 even have claims of reporting jobs.

The bill claims to save 3.7 million jobs, but does so at a cost of \$222,000 each. Private sector jobs only cost \$50,000 each. The bill quotes one economist, Mark Zandi, six times, but doesn't mention the Congressional Budget Office. CBO reports that only \$26 billion of this trillion dollar bill can be spent in 2009.

CBO says over \$70 billion of the spending will not be spent during the entire 4 years of the Obama administration. And one last thing, there is no mention of the \$2 trillion congressional leaders plan to borrow or how our kids will pay it back.

PS-14—A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Bayonne Public School No. 14. PS-14 was recently honored as a National Blue Ribbon School for its innovative gifted and talented program. The school not only prepares students for the technological challenges of the 21st century, but they also offer an accelerated academic program and provide exposure to the arts.

In addition to national recognition, New Jersey Department of Education recognized PS-14 as a "star school" because it implements cutting-edge policies, allows parents, local businesses and the community to get involved, and has not lost focus on student achievement, which is most important.

I want to congratulate principal Janice Lo Re and the Bayonne school superintendent, Dr. Patricia McGeehan, for this outstanding recognition.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot this week about what the Democrats' \$825 billion stimulus package should do or may do or what Democrats hope it will do. Let's look at what it really will do:

It will bill every American household with a \$6,700 tab. That's the cost of the Democrats' plan for every American family. Put another way, it will cost every American—every man, woman and child in this country—\$2,700. The cost of this bill is almost as much as the amount the Federal Government spends every year in discretionary spending.

The bill will spend millions of dollars in digital TV coupons. The bill will spend \$200 million to plant grass on the National Mall. And the bill will ensure our children, grandchildren and great grandchildren will encounter not necessarily a great economy, but an enormous national debt. This is totally irresponsible and should not be allowed to pass.

CONGRESS MUST ACT

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I met with constituents and local leaders. In my district, like districts across the country, families are struggling, parents are losing their jobs, and communities are worried about their future. During these tough times, we can and we must work to create good jobs to turn our economy in a new direction, the right direction.

People across our great Nation have entrusted and empowered us to do our part to get America back on track. They asked for action, and we have to responsibly act.

The people of my district—all across the 16 counties of New Mexico's Third—need clean water for their homes and farms, rural development in our smallest and most isolated communities, renewable energy generation that creates highway jobs, and infrastructure projects that repair roads and create opportunity.

I take this responsibility seriously. And I will work hard to make my district's priority a priority in this Congress.

□ 1015

BIG BROTHER TAKETH AWAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they say the economy is going into the abyss because government doesn't spend enough money.

Even though the stimulus packages of last year didn't work and the billions to bail out the elite robber baron banks hasn't been effective, the government solution is "Let's spend more money," like \$850 billion. That's almost a trillion dollars. A trillion dollars stacked up in \$20 bills is 3,000 miles high. That's the distance from D.C. to Peru. All this money will be forcibly taken away from taxpayers.

This bill gives earmarks to special interest groups like millions of dollars for the National Endowment of the Arts, millions for fancy cars for government bureaucrats.

Why not do this: Don't spend taxpayer money! Don't go into debt with China. Cut taxes for everybody that pays taxes, and let Americans decide how to spend their money and not our greedy, big bloated brother, the government.

Government cannot tax, borrow, and spend our way into prosperity. It has never happened. This bill isn't economic stimulus. It's old fashioned squeaky piglet, pork barrel politics that will poison the pocketbook of every American.

And that's just the way it is.

DEFICIT SPENDING WILL NOT EXPAND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in agreement with the gentlewoman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from South Carolina. As this body considers whether to burden future generations of Americans with more debt in the name of improving the economy, it is imperative that we look at the facts.

The proposed legislation will create or save 3 million jobs. At \$825 billion, the economic stimulus bill, in its current form, will spend \$275,000 per job. Additionally, deficit spending will not expand the economy. If that were true, then the current \$1.2 trillion deficit, the largest in history, would already be rescuing the economy. We wouldn't need another \$825 billion.

Trade groups state that every \$1 billion in highway "stimulus" can create 35,000 new construction jobs. But Congress must borrow that \$1 billion out of the private sector, costing the private sector the same number of jobs. Any type of effective stimulus cannot create jobs for some while costing jobs for others.

Ladies and gentlemen, we do not need to continue down the path of wasteful spending. If we are going to steady the U.S. economy, we must stimulate American enterprise while returning to the practice of making fiscally responsible decisions on behalf of the American people.

URGING SUPPORT FOR TITLE X ABORTION PROVIDER PROHIBITION ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of Americans from the National Mall to prayer services in small-town churches will mark the sad 36th anniversary of Roe versus Wade, the worst Supreme Court decision since Dred Scott.

As most Americans know, it is simply morally wrong to end an unborn human life by abortion. But it's also morally wrong to take the taxpayer dollars of millions of pro-life Americans and use it to promote abortion at home or abroad. As many Americans fail to recognize, the largest abortion provider in America is also the largest recipient of Federal taxpayer dollars through title X. This should not be.

Yesterday, with more than 60 cosponsors, I reintroduced the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act, a bill that would deny any Federal funding to Planned Parenthood of America.

On this dark anniversary, let us rededicate ourselves to protecting the unborn and to protecting taxpayers on matters of conscience. I urge my colleagues to join me in bipartisan spirit

in cosponsoring the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mrs. MALONEY, New York
Mr. BRADY, Texas

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the 14 million undocumented immigrants who would otherwise not have a voice.

Immigrants are not only a valuable part of our country's workforce, but they also add to America's rich diversity. Sadly, immigration raids tear apart immigrant families, instill fear, and disrespects America's core family values.

We are a Nation devoted to family. No one should live in fear of being taken away from their homes. Strong border enforcement is necessary, but this only addresses part of the situation. Together, we must work to address the 12 to 14 million undocumented immigrants. Every day that we do nothing, a family is torn apart by this broken immigration system.

Our current immigration system is outdated. We need a system that addresses the needs of the current immigration situation in America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing real comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, the honeymoon is over. Let's begin to address comprehensive immigration on behalf of the 12 to 14 million people here in the United States.

DISAPPROVAL OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE EMERGENCY ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 62 and as the designee of the majority leader, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts moves that the House proceed to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) relating to the disapproval of obligations under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 115 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 3

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the obligation of any amount exceeding the amounts obligated as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 115(a) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 115 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) as the proponent and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

I will be discussing the substance of this later, but I want to explain what is a somewhat complicated legal and parliamentary situation. First, I do want to note that it is a refutation of the skeptics that this process is going forward.

In September, we were asked by the Bush administration's top economic appointees to pass a bill giving them the authority to deploy \$700 billion to repair the credit markets, without any hindrance. I agreed with them that action had to be taken, and, in fact, even if you did not think the action was necessary, when at a time of economic trouble the two chief economic advisers to the President of the United States tell us that if you don't do something there will be problems, there are going to be problems. I don't think they self-created this. I don't think it was a self-fulfilling prophecy. But it was a self-reinforcing one. So we felt we had to act.

But we were able in the negotiations to get one major concession, namely, to say that we would vote the ultimate authority for \$700 billion but that after the first \$350 billion had been deployed, and I don't want to say "spent" because most of it has been lent or invested in ways that it will come back, but we said that at that point if the administration wanted to spend the second 350, and I just misspoke when I said "spent"—deploy it—they would have to notify Congress. Fifteen days would then be a waiting period during which the money was not available and during which time Congress would get to vote on resolutions to cancel the

program. And to reassure Members that they would have a chance for those votes, procedures were drafted by the appropriate Rules Committees in both branches so that neither the House Rules Committee nor the Senate-extended debate could have interfered with this.

Now, we did have one drafting error because for this to work, it would have had to have been passed by both Houses and either signed by the President or have a veto overridden.

The two Chambers that drafted this, the leadership, the rules groups, did a very good job of protecting Members to make sure the bills could come to the floor. That's why we're here. But they did them in isolation. So there's a certain futility to what we are doing today because the Senate has already defeated the Senate version of this; so no matter what happens in the House today, the program goes forward.

People should understand President Bush, at the request of President Obama, asked for the second \$350 billion a week ago Monday. That means, I believe, next Tuesday this will be available to the Obama administration because the Senate voted down the resolution of disapproval. The House will still vote, and there will be some indication of what Members think about going forward, but it will not have binding effect. And I think that was a drafting error. It should have been that if one House defeated it, it didn't come up in the other House. But here we are.

There is one other distinction to be drawn. Yesterday, the House passed a bill by a fairly large vote that said that if the second \$350 billion is deployed, it should be done with the following conditions: significant money for foreclosure relief; restrictions on the money being used for acquisitions by a receiving bank of another bank; a requirement that there would be an agreement in which banks would specify what they were going to do with the money before they got it; greater restrictions on compensation; a request that the administration do some things to come to the relief of cities, other entities, small businesses; a requirement that this funding be distributed in a way that was equitable to smaller banks. We voted on that yesterday.

Now, my Republican colleagues in particular had a dilemma there. A number of the things that we had in the bill yesterday are popular and indeed many of them agree with. They, I think, were reluctant to have to vote on this because on the other side, you had some of the leading conservative journals of opinion, the Wall Street Journal editorialist, a major paper from the Heritage Foundation, denouncing the notion of helping reduce foreclosures, criticizing the effort to put in community banks. And so my Republican colleagues offered a recommittal motion yesterday which would have, if it had succeeded, in essence wiped out the conditions we are seeking to impose and made yesterday's