Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that ''a top defense-lobbying firm'' that ''specializes in obtaining earmarks in the defense budget for a long list of clients'' was ''recently raided by the FBI.'';

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009 that the ''FBI searched the lobbying firm . . . and the residence of its founder . . .'';

Whereas The Hill reported on March 4, 2009, that the firm ''has given $3.4 million to 284 Members of Congress'';

Whereas Politico reported on February 13, 2009, that ''federal investigators are asking about thousands of dollars in campaign contributions to lawmakers as part of an effort to determine whether they were illegal 'straw man' donations.'';

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 20, 2009, that they have ''located tens of thousands of dollars worth of [the raided firm]-linked donations that are improperly reported in the FEC database.'';

Whereas Roll Call also reported that ''tracking Federal Election Commission records of campaign donations attributed to [the firm] is a comedy of errors, misinformation and mysteries, providing more questions than answers about how much money the lobbying firm actually raised for Congressional campaigns.'';

Whereas CQ Today reported on February 19, 2009, 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;

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that in 2008 clients of this firm had ''received $299 million worth of earmarks, according to Taxpayers for Common Sense.'';

Whereas The Hill reported on February 23, 2009, that ''clients of a defense lobby shop under investigation are continuing to score earmarks from their patrons in Congress, despite the firm being on the verge of shutting its doors permanently'' and that several of the firm's clients ''are slated to receive earmarks worth at least $8 million in the omnibus spending bill funding the federal government through the rest of fiscal 2009 . . .'';

Whereas the Washington Post reported on June 13, 2008, in a story describing increased earmark spending in the House version of the fiscal year 2009 defense authorization bill that ''many of the earmarks serve as no-bid contracts for the recipients.'';

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009, that ''the Justice Department's fraud section is overseeing an investigation into whether [the firm] reimbursed some employees for campaign contributions to members of Congress who requested the projects.'';

Whereas Politico reported on February 12, 2009, that ''several sources said FBI agents have spent months laying the groundwork for their current investigation, including conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions.'';

Whereas House Resolution 189, instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the relationship between earmark requests already made by Members and the source and timing of past campaign contributions, was considered as a privileged matter on February 25, 2009, and the motion to table the measure was agreed to by recorded vote of 226 to 182 with 12 Members voting present;

Whereas House Resolution 212, instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the relationship between earmark requests already made by Members on behalf of clients of the raided firm and the source and timing of past campaign contributions, was considered as a privileged matter on March 3, 2009, and the motion to table the measure was agreed to by recorded vote of 222 to 181 with 14 Members voting present;

Whereas the reportedly fraudulent nature of campaign contributions originating from the raided firm, 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; and

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

Resolved, That (a) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or an investigative subcommittee of the committee established jointly by the chair and ranking minority member, shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between earmark requests for fiscal year 2009 already made by Members on behalf of clients of the raided firm and the source and timing of past campaign contributions related to such requests.

(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 this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2009

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a) 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 Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

Mr. DINGELL, Michigan

Mr. WITTMAN, Virginia

□ 1215

JAMES BUTLER BONHAM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today, March 6, is an important day in not only Texas's history but American history because this is the day that the Alamo fell with 187 volunteers from all States in the United States and numerous foreign countries. Even though all of the defenders of the Alamo were killed, ten times that number was killed on the enemy side, the invading Mexican army.

March 2, earlier this week, was the day that Texas declared independence from Mexico. And during that final successful battle at San Jacinto, Texas gained independence and was a free and independent nation for over 9 years.

There are many Texas heroes, remembering, of course, they came from all over the world, at the Alamo. We've heard about William Barret Travis, the commander; Davy Crockett; Jim Bowie. We later hear about Sam Houston at the battle of San Jacinto.

But we often don't remember a person by the name of James Butler Bonham. A 29-year-old, he was from the University of South Carolina, grew up in Red Bank, South Carolina. He was a boyhood friend of William Barret Travis. And it was his job, along with Juan Seguin, to try to seek out reinforcements to the Alamo. He would break through enemy lines numerous times to try to bring people to come in aid at the Alamo. He was successful in bringing 32 men from Gonzales. He breaks through the lines his final time, goes to Washington-on-the-Brazos to try to get more recruits. They refused to go because they were trying to build a government. And when he left that time on March 3, he made the report that ''I will report back to my friend William Barret Travis or die in the attempt that no one is coming.'' He broke through the enemy lines one last time, and 3 days later, he and the other 186 defenders of the Alamo gave the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

Another example in American history of the character and integrity of people who have lived before us that believe some things are worth fighting for and one of those is freedom, liberty, and independence.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO WADAHAWA SINGH GILL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Rev. Wadahawa Singh Gill, who passed away last week at age of 87.

For many years Rev. Gill was the spiritual leader of the Sikh community in Northern California. He was an amazing man who not only ministered