Delaying the transition is confusing to our consumers, expensive for our broadcasters, will slow down deployment of broadband services, and has potentially dangerous implications for public safety. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to keep the digital transition on the right path and oppose Senate bill 238.

REMEMBERING THE 1969 SANTA BARBARA OIL SPILL

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, 40 years ago today, on January 28, 1969, a ''blowout'' erupted below Union Oil's Platform A 6 miles off the Santa Barbara coast. Before it was capped, more than 3 million gallons of oil spewed into the sea.

For weeks national attention was focused on the spill's disturbing, dramatic images: oil-soaked birds, unable to fly, slowly dying on the sand; 35 miles of sandy beaches coated with thick sludge; over 800 square miles of ocean covered with an oily black sheen.

I lived in Santa Barbara in 1969. I recall how our community came together to save wildlife and clean up our beaches. But the spill's impact went far beyond the ecological and economic damage to our community.

The disaster was considered to be a major factor in the birth of the modern-day environmental movement. There followed a wave of national environmental legislation, including the Clean Air and Water Acts, and laws to protect coastal areas and endangered species.

Now, after 40 years, as we still face the responsibility to protect and preserve our environment, we must never forget this important moment in our Nation's history and commit ourselves to speeding the transition to a clean energy economy.

□ 1015

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY IN HONOR OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on House Administration from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 27 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 27

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used on February 12, 2009, for a ceremony in honor of the bicentennial of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 92 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 92

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. Further general debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations shall insert in the Congressional Record not later than February 4, 2009, such material as he may deem explanatory of appropriations measures for the fiscal year 2009.

Sec. 3. The chair of the Committee on Ways and Means may file, on behalf of the Committee, a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 598.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a point of order against consideration of the rule.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of the rule because the rule contains a waiver of all points of order against the provisions in the bill and amendments made in order by the rule and, therefore, it is in violation of section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act.

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

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

The gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, thank you very much.

I will be using most of my arguments from the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate dated January 26, 2009. The CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that enacting the provisions in division B would reduce revenues by $76 billion in fiscal year 2009, by $131 billion in fiscal year 2010, and by a net of $212 billion over the 2009–2010 period.

So combining the spending and revenue effects of H.R. 1, the CBO estimates that enacting the bill would increase the Federal budget deficit by over $170 billion over the remaining months of the fiscal year 2009, by $356 billion in the year 2010 and $174 billion in 2011, and it continues on, $816 billion over the period 2009 to 2019.

There is a wide range of Federal programs here which increase the benefits payable under the Medicaid unemployment compensation nutrition assistance program, and the legislation would also reduce individual and corporate income tax collections and make a variety of other changes to tax laws. This is basically an unfunded mandate.

CBO anticipates that this bill would have a noticeable impact on economic growth and employment in the next few years. Following long-standing congressional budget procedures, this