money, every single time, to the tune of $3,128 per family per year. That is what we are beginning to see. This is going to increase your cost of doing business in your home every single day of living, that maintenance of life that we all go through.

We're very concerned about this part of the proposal, the cap-and-tax. It is part of the $1.4 trillion increase.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back my time, and I thank you for yielding the time.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at noon.

## PRAYER

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

Lord God Almighty, Creator of all things great and small, the ancient Celtic people took such joy in nature's secrets as well as its beauty. They found Your presence in every spring, every lake, forest and glen. Each was a sanctuary where prayer came easily, and the poetry of creation became a spark of Your own Divine light.

Be with Congress today. Bless its aspirations and its work. Be close to this Nation, and intimately present to its people.

In the midst of anxieties, busy work, and grave responsibilities, grant them a moment to be touched by Your glorious creation so they, too, find praise on their lips and joy in their hearts for another day, and a sense of Your eternal goodness.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KINGSTON 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.

## CONCERNS OVER AIG BONUSES

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I am deeply outraged this morning that while millions of people suffer through this difficult economy, AIG executives are seeking to take $165 million in bonus pay. The scope and depth of this waste and greed are just shocking and unjustifiable. It is beyond my imagination that they would do that.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in North Carolina where the median household income is just a little bit more than $30,000 per year. These Americans must work extremely hard every day just to meet their obligations.

It is patently unfair that hard-working Americans could be asked to work harder to pay more taxes that are needed simply to provide AIG executives with multimillion-dollar bonuses. It is patently unfair.

I encourage this body and President Barack Obama to take every avenue possible to stop these bonuses or, if they are legally unstoppable, to tax them beyond belief.

## NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

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. 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.

## WHAT'S GOOD FOR DETROIT IS GOOD FOR WALL STREET

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week, we saw the latest outrage from Wall Street when it was exposed that AIG paid out hundreds of millions of dollars in bonuses, much of which went to workers in the division that helped actually cause the economic meltdown, and all with taxpayers' money. The excuse we are given is that those are contractual obligations and they must be paid, and we are supposed to just accept that.

Let us contrast that with how American auto workers are treated when General Motors or Chrysler need bridge loans from the government. They are told that they make too much money and that their contracts are killing the companies, and that they must take less or else the Federal Government will let the companies die.

So let's get this straight; AIG employees, who helped implode the economy, are given bonuses with taxpayers' money because it's in their contract, while UAW workers whose companies were badly hurt by the economic meltdown—partially caused by AIG—are told that their contracts must be disregarded or renegotiated. That is a vivid example of the double standard where people who work on Wall Street get their contracts upheld, but people who work on the line, it doesn't matter, and let them eat cake. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

## RESPONSIBLE CORPORATE EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, like everybody else in this Chamber, I am outraged about AIG. They got $170 billion in taxpayer funds to bail them out of a situation which was largely of their own creation. And they then made it worse by giving $165 million in bonuses to people who had participated in the outrage about which all Americans are so infuriated.

The Federal Government is trying to save this corporation because it's too big to fail, but we don't have to save a bunch of money-grubbing rascals who had a part in the collapse of our economy, which they helped to bring about.

I am introducing a bill today which is going to address the problem. It is entitled, the ''Responsible Corporate Executive Compensation Act of 2009.'' It will impose a 95 percent tax on bonuses paid to employees of TARP recipients.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and help make certain that hardworking Americans are not the only ones who have to sacrifice during this time of severe economic stress and uncertainty.

## WE OWE OUR VETERANS EVERYTHING

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration announced plans for veterans to rely on private insurance company payments for the treatment of their war wounds. The American Legion's Commander Rehbein and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America Executive Director Reickhoff have already expressed very strong concerns.

The government broke these soldiers in battles across World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan. We, the citizens of America, owe veterans care through our government. Veterans should not depend on private insurance companies who bear no moral bond to soldiers or their pain.

One of President Washington's first missions was to care for veterans. President Lincoln promised ''to care for him who bore the brunt of battle, his widow and his orphan.''

President Obama eloquently portrays Lincoln as his hero, and it is clear what Lincoln would advise today.

Care for our veterans, Mr. President. Private companies owe them very little. We, the American people and our Federal Government, owe them everything.

□ 1215

## DISCRIMINATION IS STILL ALIVE AND WELL

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, discrimination is alive and well all across America. You may not have heard about it on the radio or seen it on television, but it's still alive and well. You won't see it on television because discrimination today is beneath the skin, beneath the skin of our entire society, as insurance companies, omnipotent as they are, continue to discriminate based on the preexisting condition of a citizen.

These insurance companies no longer discriminate on the basis of skin color. Rather, they discriminate against women because of the calcium, or the lack of it, in their bones. They discriminate against people who may have coronary artery disease or any of a number of medical conditions.

The lessons of both my profession and my faith have made it clear: We are all really the same beneath our skin. We're all made of the same clay. And 40 years after the civil rights movement has established that all citizens of any color shall be able to drink from the same water fountain, sit on the same bus, and attend the same medical clinic, our Nation still remains divided, not by skin color but by skin chemistry.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we bring an end to discrimination in health care.

## THE FLOGGING OF GRANDMA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week was International Women's Day to proclaim human rights for all women.

Obviously, Saudi Arabia didn't get the memo. In the name of religion, the